
Pennsylvania State Parks Visitor Use Monitoring (VUM) Study – Year 2 Survey Results

(Ohiopyle State Park, Laurel Hill State Park, Keystone State Park, Tobyhanna State Park, Promised Land State Park, and Jacobsburg State Park)



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

July 9, 2015

Pennsylvania State Parks Visitor Use Monitoring (VUM) Study – Year 2 Survey Results

by:

Andrew J. Mowen, Ph.D.
Alan R. Graefe, Ph.D.
Michael D. Ferguson, M.S.
Austin Barrett, M.S.

Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management
The Pennsylvania State 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 Synthesis of Marcellus Shale Open-ended Responses.....	57
Appendix D Survey Instrument.....	62

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 2 data collection effort (description of the State Forest visitors is provided in a separate report). Surveys were conducted in six State Parks

(Ohiopyle, Laurel Hill, Keystone, Tobyhanna, Promised Land, and Jacobsburg), which are located adjacent to or near two State Forests (Forbes State Forest - District #4 and Delaware State Forest - District #19). 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. It should be noted that the Jacobsburg Environmental Center was under construction at the time of this data collection and that results could change after its completion.

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 approximately 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).

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 6, 2012 through October 27, 2013. Across all State Parks, interviewers approached a total of 2,029 visitors to request their participation in the study. Among these visitors, 1,717 people were willing to participate resulting in an overall study response rate of 85%. 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
Ohiopyle	312	75.7
Laurel Hill	253	80.6
Keystone	304	81.2
Tobyhanna	295	88.8
Promised Land	314	94.5
Jacobsburg	239	90.1
Total	1717	84.6



RESULTS

Visitor Profile

- Nearly three-fifths (58%) of the survey respondents were males (Table 2).
- The average age of this adult sample was 47 years with 22% representing the 18-35 year age group, 36% representing the 36-50 year age group, 31% representing the 51-64 year age group, and 10% representing the 65 and older age group.
- Approximately 59% reported household incomes less than \$75,000.
- A large majority of the State Park visitors surveyed (94%) reported their race/ethnicity as White/Caucasian. Other ethnicities reported included Asian, Hispanic, and African-American.
- Approximately nine out of ten (90%) visitors were residents of Pennsylvania.

Table 2. State Park Visitor Socio-Demographic Profile

Variable	% or Mean	n
<i>Income</i>		
under 25,000	7.6%	111
25,000 - 49,999	22.0%	320
50,000 - 74,999	29.5%	430
75,000 - 99,999	19.0%	277
100,000 - 149,999	14.7%	214
150,000 or over	7.2%	105
<i>Age</i>		
Average Age	47 years	
18-35	22.3%	371
36-50	35.9%	596
51-64	31.4%	522
65 and Older	10.4%	173
<i>Race/Ethnic Background</i>		
White	93.8%	1574
Black or African American	2.1%	35
Hispanic	2.6%	44
Asian	1.5%	25
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	57.9%	1169
Female	41.9%	850
<i>Residency Status</i>		
Pennsylvania Resident	89.7%	1538

Trip Visitation Patterns

- Nearly three-fifths (59%) of all visits to these State Parks were day trip only users, and about 40% indicated their trip was part of an overnight stay (Table 3).
- For overnight visitors, the average length of stay in the park was 4.4 nights. For day use visitors, the average length of stay in the park was 5.4 hours.
- Among those who indicated that their visit was part of an overnight trip, nearly 9 out of 10 (88%) indicated that they were staying at a State Parks accommodation, while 12% indicated that they were staying overnight outside of the State Park.
- Of those who were staying overnight in State Parks, the most frequently cited locations were tent campsites (47%) or RV campsites (44%).
- Of those who were staying overnight outside of State Parks, nearly half of them indicated that they were staying at a private camp or cabin (43%).
- Visitors traveled an average of 60.8 miles from their home to the State Park. Almost 4 out of 10 visitors (39.5%) reported traveling more than 50 miles from their home to the State Park.
- Visitors in this study reported that they made an average of 9.2 trips to that State Park (where they were surveyed) over the last 12 months. About 38% reported visiting only once, about 29% reported visiting two to four times, and about 32% reported visiting 5 or more times.
- Visitors reported an average group size of 4.9 people. Only 8.1% visited alone, while 31.7% visited in groups of 2 people, 39.5% visited in groups of 3 to 5 people, and 20.8% visited in groups of 6 or more people.
- About 52% 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=830), 16% reported 1 child, 15% reported two children, and 17% reported three or more children.

Table 3. State Park Trip Visitation Patterns

Variable	% or Mean	n
<i>Trip Type - Overnight Trip</i>	40.8%	698
<i>Trip Type - Day Trip</i>	59.2%	1014
<i>Length of Stay</i>		
Overnight Trip	4.4 Days	719
Day Trip	5.4 Hours	990
<i>Type of Overnight Accommodation</i>		
State Park	88.4	623
Non-State Park	11.6	81
<i>State Park Accommodation Type</i>		
Tent Campsite	47.1	294
RV Campsite	44.4	277
Inn or Lodge	<1	4
Cabin	<1	29
Cottage/Yurt	<1	14
Group Campsite	<1	5
<i>Non-State Park Accommodation Type</i>		
Private Camp/Cabin	43.2	35
Private Campground	16.0	13
Friend/Family House (free)	16.0	13
Hotel/Motel	12.3	10
Bed & Breakfast	<1	5
Other	<1	5
<i>Distance Traveled from Home to State Park</i>		
Total Distance Traveled	60.84 miles	1700
Travel Distance of 50 Miles or More	39.5	677
<i>Number of Trips to the State Park</i>		
Average Trips Per Year	9.2 trips	1694
1 Trip Only	38.3	656
2 to 4 Trips	29.4	505
5 or More Trips	32.3	554
<i>Group Size</i>		
Average Group Size	4.9 people	1705
Visited Alone	8.1	138
2 People Per Group	31.7	542
3 to 5 People Per Group	39.5	675
6 or More People Per Group	20.8	355
<i>Children Under 16 in Group</i>		
No Children in Group	51.5	881
1 Child in Group	16.3	279
2 Children in Group	14.8	253
3 or More Children in Group	17.4	298

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 for that 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 as their primary or most important activity for that visit. Appendix A provides a comparison of these activity variables (participation, primary activity) across the six different State Parks in this study.

- Relaxing/hanging out (61%), walking (56%), sightseeing (53%), viewing natural features (49%), hiking (45%), picnicking (43%), and fishing (31%) were activities mentioned with the most frequency among these State Park visitors.
- Relaxing/hanging out (15%), fishing (13%), hiking (10%), picnicking (10%), and RV camping (9%) were most frequently mentioned as visitors' primary or most important State Park activities.
- Relaxing/ hanging out was one of the more popular activities in State Parks (61.3%) and visitors who participated in this activity tended to cite this as one of their primary activities (15.2%).
- There are several activities in which primary participation was low relative to overall participation, suggesting that they are ancillary activities for participants. These include sightseeing (4%), viewing natural features (2.5%), walking (2.1%), driving for pleasure (3.3%), and swimming (4.5%).
- More than one-third of all State Park visitors (37.4%) reported camping (RV, tent, or other) as an activity, but relatively fewer visitors reported camping (18.8%) 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	31.1	12.5
Hunting	1.1	<1.0
Viewing, Learning about Nature & Culture		
Sightseeing	52.7	4.0
Viewing natural features (e.g. scenery, wildlife, birds, flowers, fish, etc.)	48.5	2.2
Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	10.6	<1.0
Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	6.5	<1.0
Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	19.6	<1.0
Non-motorized Activities		
Hiking	44.7	10.0
Walking	55.9	7.8
Horseback Riding	<1.0	<1.0
Bicycling, including mountain bikes	17.7	3.5
Non-motorized boating (canoeing, kayaking, rafting, sailing, etc.)	16.3	3.5
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	<1.0	---
Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	<1.0	<1.0
Motorized Activities		
Driving for pleasure on roads	15.5	<1.0
Snowmobile use	<1.0	<1.0
ATV use	<1.0	---
Motorized boating	1.7	<1.0
Camping or Other Overnight		
RV camping	16.7	9.2
Tent camping	17.6	8.6
Other camping	3.1	<1.0
Other Activities		
Picnicking and family gatherings	43.3	10.0
Relaxing, hanging out	61.3	15.2
Swimming	27.1	4.2
Beach Use (no swimming)	25.0	2.2
Attending a program offered at the park (environmental, historic, outdoor recreation)	3.4	<1.0
Visiting a special event or festival	2.9	<1.0
Other activity	7.1	2.9

* 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 84% of the scores in the “good” or “very good” categories.
- State Park visitors were most satisfied with the feeling of safety, park cleanliness, scenery, value of money invested in the visit, and the condition of the natural environment (95% or more reporting good/very good).
- Attributes receiving lower ratings (< 90% good/very good) included restroom availability, quality of park programs, 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 more than 98% indicating they were satisfied or very satisfied. This evaluation was consistent with prior research.

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	4.78	98.2	0.6
Scenery	4.73	96.5	0.4
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	4.74	96.5	5.7
Cleanliness of this park	4.66	97.3	0.4
Condition of the natural environment	4.67	96.5	0.6
Helpfulness of employees	4.67	93.7	35.4
Restroom availability	4.53	89.5	5.8
Quality of park programs	4.57	88.0	68.7
Condition of developed recreation facilities	4.45	90.0	10.1
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	4.47	91.6	2.5
Condition of trails in this State Park	4.54	94.4	36.7
Adequacy of signage	4.37	87.4	3.3
Restroom cleanliness	4.34	84.2	20.0
Overall Satisfaction ^b	4.73	98.4	---

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 65% 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 close to three-fourths agreeing or strongly agreeing that the park meant a lot to them and that they enjoyed recreating at the State Park more than other places. More than half of the visitors agreed or strongly agreed that they receive more satisfaction out of visiting the State Park than from visiting other places as well as indicating a strong attachment to the State Park.

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	4.65	95.7
To be outdoors	4.66	95.8
For relaxation	4.60	93.3
To experience natural surroundings	4.64	93.7
For family recreation	4.23	81.9
To be with my friends	3.94	70.7
For physical exercise	3.86	65.9
For the challenge or sport	3.41	49.0
To develop my skills	3.15	41.4

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	4.15	75.2
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	4.01	71.8
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	3.79	59.8
I am very attached to this place	3.68	53.1

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 (57.3%) 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 (23%) and about one-tenth responded that they would have gone somewhere else for a different activity (7.6%) or came back another time (7.6%).
- Overnight visitors were mostly on trips of 3-5 days (51.5%).
- Nearly one half of all day users were more likely to indicate spending 6 or more hours away from home (42.3%) with only a minority (18%) indicating that they would be spending 1-2 hours away from home.
- A vast majority of respondents (97.7%) 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 (49.7%) was 4 or more people and only a relatively small portion of visitors (6.9%) said that their expenditures covered just one person (themselves). Furthermore, about 29% 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	57.3	980
Gone elsewhere for a different activity	7.6	130
Come back another time	7.6	130
Stayed home	23.0	393
Gone to work at your regular job	1.5	26
None of these	2.9	50
Total	100	1709
Time Away from Home (Days)		
1-2	37.6	271
3-5	51.5	371
6 or more	11.0	79
Total	100	721
Time Away from Home (Hours)		
1-2	18.0	179
3-5	39.7	395
6 or more	42.3	420
Total	100	994
Was State Park the Primary Destination for this Trip?		
Yes	97.7	1677
No	2.3	40
Total	100	1717
Number of People Covered by Expenses		
1	6.9	74
2	28.7	307
3	14.8	158
4 or more	49.7	532
Total	100	958

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:

- Nearly two thirds of respondents (62.3%) 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 (36.5%), gasoline and oil (33%), and camping fees (27.5%) received the highest proportion of expenditures among those visitors who reported spending something in each category.
- About 21% of State Park visitors reported spending something at restaurants and bars.
- Few visitors reported spending much on “motel, lodge, cabin, bed & breakfast”, “outdoor recreation and entertainment,” and “local transportation” expenditure categories.

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	62.3 %
Economic Expenditure Items	Proportion of Visitors Spending Something in Each Category (%)
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	3.0
Camping Fees	27.5
Restaurants and Bars	21.0
Groceries	36.5
Gasoline and oil	33.0
Local Transportation (bus, shuttles, etc.)	<1.0
Outfitter Related Expenses (guide fees and equipment rentals)	6.4
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment (park fees, movies, mini-golf)	2.7
Sporting Goods	12.3
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	9.8

- 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 \$116.66.
- Motel, lodge, cabin, and B&B expenditures were made by only about 5% of State Park visitors, but the average amount spent in this category was \$318.85
- Outfitter related expenses (including guide fees and equipment rentals) were made by only about 10% of State Park visitors, but the average amount spent in this category was \$205.68.
- The most frequently indicated expenses (groceries and gas/oil) averaged \$66.57 for groceries and \$55.26 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.	\$318.85	\$9.69
Camping Fees	\$93.26	\$25.62
Restaurants and Bars	\$57.99	\$12.20
Groceries	\$66.57	\$24.32
Gasoline and oil	\$55.26	\$18.22
Local Transportation (bus, shuttles, etc.)	\$20.83	\$0.07
Outfitter Related Expenses (guide fees and equipment rentals)	\$205.68	\$13.22
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment (park fees, movies, mini-golf)	\$64.48	\$1.73
Sporting Goods	\$48.52	\$5.98
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	\$57.12	\$5.61
Total	N/A	\$116.66

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 50 visitors indicated that this activity had changed their use (1.8%) and experiences (1.5%) 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, Ohiopyle and Laurel Hill State Park visitors were slightly more likely than visitors from the other four parks to indicate changed recreation use (2.6% and 2.4%, 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 displacement from other natural resource areas, traffic-related issues, concerns with hunting, and general environmental concerns including pollution, habitat destruction, and water quality.

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	31	1.8
	No	1680	98.2
Has Marcellus activity changed your recreation experience at this state park?	Yes	25	1.5
	No	1681	98.5

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 6, 2012 through October 27, 2013 (n = 1,713 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 State Parks were more likely to be white (93.8), male (57.9%) and older (only 22.3% reported that they were 18-35 years). The average age across all visitors was 47 years with 42% indicating that they were 51 years or older. When combining the initial household income categories, nearly half (49%) reported incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999, 30% reported incomes of \$49,999 or less, and 22% 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 a day visit (59%) in the region, and that for those who did stay overnight (41%) the most common type of accommodations were those provided by the State Park (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 relatively high with an average of 9.2 trips to the State Park over the last 12 months and about 38% indicating that they visited only once. A large majority of visitors (90%) were Pennsylvania residents, and they tended to travel less than 50 miles to get to the State Park (60%). Visitors were more likely to come in groups of 3 or more people (60%) and only 8% said that they were visiting by themselves (alone). A majority (52%) 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, Ohiopyle State Park was more likely than the other parks to attract visitors from outside of Pennsylvania (27%), travel the greatest distance from home (199 miles on average), possess income levels over \$100,000 (28%), have the lowest age (an average of 44 years old), be male (64%), and were the least likely to use the State Park provided accommodations (80%). Conversely, Jacobsburg State Park visitors were the most likely to be Pennsylvania residents (99%), traveled the shortest distance to the park (an average of 16 miles), yielded the highest number of annual

trips (20) and typically recreated with small groups (3 individuals on average) whom predominantly did not have any children (70%).

With respect to the other parks in the sample, Tobyhanna State Park visitors were less likely than the others to be overnight visitors (37%), but for those individuals that did stay overnight, they were the most likely to utilize the State Park provided accommodations (97%) and this typically involved tent and RV campsites. Promised Land State Park users were found to be older (an average age of 48 years old) and consisted of the largest female population (47%) as well as accruing by far the longest average day use length of stay (7 hours). Keystone State Park visitors were found to recreate with larger groups of children (23%), and to partake in the lengthiest overnight stays (averaging nearly 6 days) and this typically involved RV and tent camping in State Park provided accommodations. Laurel Hill State Park users were found to be the least diverse (99% white), and had the largest average group size (7.1 persons) with the majority of groups (70%) recreating with three or more people.

In terms of primary activities across the different State Parks, Laurel Hill (20.2%) and Keystone (24.6%) State Park visitors were more likely to cite “fishing” as their most important activity. While Tobyhanna (18.1%) and Promised Land (22.1%) State Parks were most likely to cite “relaxing and hanging out” as their most important activity. Jacobsburg (32.8%) State Park users were more likely to note “hiking” as their primary activity while Ohiopyle (12.6%) State Park visitors were more likely to cite “non-motorized boating” as well as “hiking” as their most important activity.

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, park programs and restroom cleanliness. These results are consistent with the findings from the Year 1 and Year 2 PA-VUM Forestry study.

The economics section of the study asked visitors about their monetary expenditures in and near the State Parks. More than half of visitors (57.3%) 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 (62.3%) 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, groceries, and camping fees. In general, Ohio State Park and Laurel Hill State Park visitors spent the most across all spending categories for their trip (averages = \$284.86 and \$198.90, respectively) followed by Keystone, Promised Land, and Tobyhanna State Parks visitors (averages = \$167.91, \$159.36, and \$147.39, respectively). Jacobsburg State Park visitors spent by far the least across all spending categories for their trip (average = \$40.12).

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, experiencing natural surroundings 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 substantial majority of visitors across all six State Parks reported that Marcellus shale-related activity had not affected their use of (98.2%) or recreation experience at (98.5%) 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 displacement from other natural resource areas, traffic-related issues, concerns with hunting, and general environmental concerns including pollution, habitat destruction, and water quality. 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.

This report provides a representative snapshot of recreational use across the six Pennsylvania State Parks surveyed in 2012 and 2013. 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 Presque Isle State Park (2012) 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	Ohiopyle	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
<i>Income</i>	Valid Percentages					
under 25,000	7.5	7.0	11.8	6.3	6.6	6.2
25,000 - 49,999	20.9	18.8	25.6	27.3	17.6	21.1
50,000 - 74,999	22.8	27.7	32.7	35.2	30.1	28.4
75,000 - 99,999	20.1	22.5	15.7	14.8	21.3	20.1
100,000 - 149,999	16.0	19.7	8.7	13.7	15.8	14.9
150,000 or over	12.7	4.2	5.5	2.7	8.5	9.3
<i>Age</i>						
Average Age (Mean)	44	47	47	46	48	45
18-35	29.1	17.0	21.1	21.1	21.8	23.0
36-50	34.8	41.3	34.9	35.6	29.5	41.3
51-64	26.8	34.0	31.1	33.1	35.7	27.2
65 and Older	9.4	7.7	12.8	10.2	13.0	8.5
<i>Race/Ethnic Background</i>						
White	96.0	99.2	95.9	87.5	92.3	92.4
Black or African American	1.3	<1.0	3.1	3.8	1.9	1.7
Hispanic	1.3	<1.0	<1.0	5.2	4.5	3.4
Asian	1.3	---	<1.0	3.5	1.3	2.5
<i>Gender</i>						
Male	64.3	59.4	60.1	54.4	52.7	54.0
Female	35.7	40.6	39.9	45.6	47.3	46.0
<i>Residency Status</i>						
Pennsylvania Resident	72.7	94.1	94.7	90.8	90.1	99.2

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

Variable	Ohiopyle	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
<i>Type of Trip (Valid %)</i>						
Overnight Trip	49.2	52.2	42.7	36.9	56.1	---
Day Trip	50.8	47.8	57.3	63.1	43.9	100.0
<i>Length of Stay (Mean)</i>						
Overnight Trip (days)	4.09	3.15	5.81	4.07	3.73	---
Day Trip (hours)	6.83	6.53	5.63	4.99	7.32	3.19
<i>Type of Overnight Accommodation (Valid %)</i>						
State Park	77.9	91.7	94.7	97.2	85.2	---
Non-State Park	22.1	8.3	5.3	2.8	14.8	---
<i>State Park Accommodation Type (Valid %)</i>						
RV Campsite	24.1	56.1	50.3	25.7	59.3	---
Tent Campsite	67.5	35.5	37.0	72.3	31.3	---
Inn or Lodge	<1.0	<1.0	---	---	---	---
Cabin	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	---	<1.0	---
Cottage/Yurt	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	---
Group Campsite	<1.0	<1.0	---	<1.0	<1.0	---
<i>Non-State Park Accommodation Type (Valid %)</i>						
Private Camp/Cabin	17.6 (6)	36.3 (4)	42.8 (3)	---	80.7 (21)	---
Hotel/Motel	23.5 (8)	18.1 (2)	---	---	---	---
Private Campground	14.7 (5)	45.4 (5)	42.8 (3)	33.3 (1)	---	---
Friend/Family House (free)	17.6 (6)	---	14.2 (1)	66.6 (2)	15.3 (4)	---
Bed & Breakfast	11.7 (4)	---	---	---	<1.0 (1)	---
Other	14.7 (5)	---	---	---	---	---

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

Variable	Ohiopyle	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
	Valid % or Mean					
<i>Distance Traveled from Home to State Park</i>						
Average Distance Traveled	119.67 mi	49.54 mi	41.17 mi	52.16 mi	73.42 mi	15.83 mi
Travel Distance of 50 Miles or More	71.3	39.3	15.1	39.2	59.6	3.8
<i>Number of Trips to the State Park</i>						
Average Trips Per Year	7.97 trips	5.01 trips	10.39 trips	6.43 trips	7.68 trips	19.76 trips
1 Trip Only	48.4	36.8	33.6	42.7	38.5	26.8
2 to 4 Trips	26.0	34.4	31.3	28.7	31.2	25.1
5 or More Trips	25.6	28.9	35.2	28.7	30.3	48.1
<i>Group Size</i>						
Average Group Size	4.98	7.10	5.82	4.34	4.56	2.68
Visited Alone	6.8	2.8	6.6	8.5	5.1	20.5
2 People Per Group	31.9	27.4	28.1	30.4	30.9	43.1
3 to 5 People Per Group	37.1	44.4	39.7	43.3	41.1	30.1
6 or More People Per Group	24.2	25.4	25.5	17.7	22.9	6.3
<i>Children Under 16 in Group</i>						
No Children in Group	57.1	40.9	43.2	51.5	48.7	69.5
1 Child in Group	12.5	20.6	19.6	16.4	15.6	13.4
2 Children in Group	14.7	15.9	14.3	14.7	16.9	11.7
3 or More Children in Group	15.7	22.6	22.9	17.4	18.8	5.4

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

* % ≠100% because respondents could report > one	Ohiopyle		Laurel Hill		Keystone	
Type of Activity	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary
Consumptive Activities						
Fishing	10.6	3.6	41.9	20.2	52.0	24.6
Hunting	2.2	1.4	---	---	1.6	---
Viewing, Learning about Nature & Culture						
Sightseeing	64.4	9.4	47.0	2.1	27.0	<1.0
Viewing natural features	55.8	2.9	41.9	<1.0	32.6	---
Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	19.2	1.1	8.3	---	4.3	---
Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	10.9	---	4.3	---	1.0	---
Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	24.7	---	16.6	<1.0	10.5	---
Non-motorized Activities						
Hiking	49.7	12.6	44.7	5.0	31.9	1.7
Walking	52.6	6.1	51.8	3.7	45.4	6.6
Horseback Riding	2.2	<1.0	<1.0	---	---	---
Bicycling, including mountain bikes	29.5	10.8	16.6	<1.0	12.8	<1.0
Non-motorized boating	19.9	12.6	12.6	<1.0	16.8	3.1
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	<1.0	---	---	---	<1.0	---
Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	2.9	1.1	<1.0	<1.0	---	---
Motorized Activities						
Driving for pleasure on roads	22.1	1.4	19.8	---	9.2	---
Snowmobile use	<1.0	---	---	---	---	---
ATV use	---	---	---	---	<1.0	---
Motorized boating	<1.0	---	<1.0	---	1.3	<1.0
Camping or Other Overnight						
RV camping	9.6	3.6	27.7	15.7	22.0	10.4
Tent camping	27.9	7.2	16.2	7.4	17.1	8.3
Other camping	2.6	<1.0	4.3	<1.0	5.3	1.4
Other Activities						
Picnicking and family gatherings	59.6	5.8	56.5	14.0	51.3	11.4
Relaxing, hanging out	63.1	11.9	69.6	15.3	60.2	16.6
Swimming	28.2	4.0	26.9	4.1	33.2	8.0
Beach Use (no swimming)	6.7	<1.0	35.6	3.7	26.3	2.1
Attending a program offered at the park	5.4	---	4.7	---	3.3	1.0
Visiting a special event or festival	3.2	<1.0	9.1	3.7	1.6	11.4
Other activity	5.4	2.2	5.9	1.7	7.9	3.1

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

* % ≠100% because respondents could report > one	Tobyhanna		Promised Land		Jacobsburg	
Type of Activity	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary	Participation*	Primary
Consumptive Activities						
Fishing	32.4	11.1	40.1	10.6	6.3	4.6
Hunting	<1.0	---	1.6	<1.0	<1.0	---
Viewing, Learning about Nature & Culture						
Sightseeing	61.1	3.1	61.5	2.6	54.0	6.7
Viewing natural features	48.5	3.5	58.0	1.0	53.6	5.9
Visiting historic and pre-historic sites/areas	5.5	---	10.5	---	16.3	---
Viewing wayside exhibits, interpretive kiosks	5.1	---	6.7	---	11.3	<1.0
Visiting a nature center, nature trail, or visitor center	17.4	---	24.2	---	24.3	2.1
Non-motorized Activities						
Hiking	44.0	8.4	43.0	3.3	57.3	32.8
Walking	62.5	5.2	58.6	3.6	66.1	23.5
Horseback Riding	---	---	---	---	3.3	3.4
Bicycling, including mountain bikes	14.7	<1.0	21.7	3.0	8.4	6.7
Non-motorized boating	20.5	1.0	23.9	2.6	---	---
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	---	---	---	---	---	---
Cross-country skiing, snowshoeing	---	---	<1.0	---	---	---
Motorized Activities						
Driving for pleasure on roads	13.7	<1.0	21.3	1.3	4.6	---
Snowmobile use	<1.0	<1.0	---	---	<1.0	---
ATV use	---	---	---	---	---	---
Motorized boating	3.4	---	4.1	---	---	---
Camping or Other Overnight						
RV camping	10.2	7.3	28.3	16.8	---	---
Tent camping	24.6	17.4	15.9	9.6	---	---
Other camping	<1.0	---	5.4	1.3	---	---
Other Activities						
Picnicking and family gatherings	42.7	12.9	52.9	12.5	10.9	2.5
Relaxing, hanging out	65.5	18.1	74.2	22.1	29.3	5.0
Swimming	29.0	2.4	34.7	5.3	5.9	<1.0
Beach Use	38.2	3.5	38.2	2.3	2.1	<1.0
Attending a program offered at the park	2.0	---	4.5	---	---	---
Visiting a special event or festival	2.0	<1.0	1.9	---	---	---
Other activity	8.2	4.5	6.4	1.7	9.2	4.6

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

State Park Feature/Attribute	Ohiopyle		Laurel Hill		Keystone	
	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good
Feeling of safety	4.74	97.4	4.83	98.8	4.80	98.3
Scenery	4.79	97.1	4.79	98.4	4.60	93.4
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	4.66	95.1	4.74	97.1	4.72	95.8
Cleanliness of this park	4.55	96.4	4.70	97.6	4.71	97.7
Condition of the natural environment	4.61	95.8	4.73	97.2	4.62	95.4
Helpfulness of employees	4.51	90.7	4.74	95.1	4.63	91.6
Restroom availability	4.10	75.5	4.58	91.2	4.57	92.1
Quality of park programs	4.48	91.5	4.63	92.9	4.55	91.4
Condition of developed recreation facilities	4.27	83.8	4.59	94.9	4.53	93.6
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	4.27	83.5	4.56	94.7	4.51	93.6
Condition of trails in this State Park	4.47	93.4	4.61	97.0	4.42	91.8
Adequacy of signage	4.17	80.6	4.50	93.2	4.35	86.5
Restroom cleanliness	3.91	69.3	4.26	84.7	4.42	88.8
Overall Satisfaction	4.62	96.1	4.77	99.6	4.74	99.0

* 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	Tobyhanna		Promised Land		Jacobsburg	
	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good	Mean*	% Good or Very Good
Feeling of safety	4.76	98.3	4.83	98.7	4.74	97.9
Scenery	4.72	96.6	4.80	97.8	4.64	95.4
Value for the money invested in this State Park visit	4.78	97.1	4.77	96.5	4.75	98.5
Cleanliness of this park	4.68	96.6	4.74	99.0	4.57	95.8
Condition of the natural environment	4.69	97.9	4.73	97.1	4.61	95.4
Helpfulness of employees	4.77	95.8	4.73	95.0	4.64	94.5
Restroom availability	4.69	95.1	4.69	93.0	4.49	89.8
Quality of park programs	4.52	88.4	4.76	97.1	4.41	88.4
Condition of developed recreation facilities	4.44	90.5	4.54	91.9	4.28	84.5
Maintenance of facilities (roads, shelters, buildings)	4.61	96.2	4.45	90.2	4.45	92.1
Condition of trails in this State Park	4.62	96.2	4.53	93.3	4.56	94.9
Adequacy of signage	4.45	90.4	4.51	91.8	4.25	81.8
Restroom cleanliness	4.57	89.6	4.49	88.0	4.29	83.4
Overall Satisfaction	4.72	97.9	4.79	99.0	4.74	99.2

* 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...	Ohiopyle		Laurel Hill		Keystone	
	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important
To get away from the regular routine	4.64	95.2	4.73	97.2	4.66	97.3
To be outdoors	4.64	95.8	4.67	95.2	4.59	93.0
For relaxation	4.50	90.7	4.75	96.8	4.55	93.0
To experience natural surroundings	4.65	95.2	4.62	90.9	4.44	88.7
For family recreation	4.00	76.8	4.47	90.1	4.40	87.0
To be with my friends	4.03	74.0	4.03	73.0	3.91	72.4
For physical exercise	3.86	67.7	3.80	61.9	3.69	59.5
For the challenge or sport	3.56	54.7	3.45	49.2	3.26	43.9
To develop my skills	3.02	37.3	3.24	42.5	3.00	37.5

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

Reason for Visiting...	Tobyhanna		Promised Land		Jacobsburg	
	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important	Mean	% Very or Extremely Important
To get away from the regular routine	4.61	95.2	4.75	97.1	4.51	91.6
To be outdoors	4.68	97.3	4.75	97.1	4.64	95.8
For relaxation	4.62	95.2	4.73	96.5	4.41	86.6
To experience natural surroundings	4.72	96.2	4.77	96.8	4.62	93.3
For family recreation	4.20	81.6	4.37	85.4	3.92	69.9
To be with my friends	3.92	70.0	4.07	74.5	3.61	57.7
For physical exercise	3.83	64.2	3.73	61.8	4.33	83.7
For the challenge or sport	3.39	47.8	3.27	46.3	3.54	52.7
To develop my skills	3.22	45.1	3.16	41.4	3.29	46.0

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

Place Attachment Item...	Ohiopyle		Laurel Hill		Keystone	
	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree
This place means a lot to me	3.99	66.8	4.22	81.0	4.12	71.9
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	3.85	67.1	4.03	75.7	3.96	70.2
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	3.58	51.6	3.79	59.9	3.70	54.3
I am very attached to this place	3.50	45.5	3.74	57.5	3.66	52.3

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

Place Attachment Item...	Tobyhanna		Promised Land		Jacobsburg	
	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Mean	% Agree or Strongly Agree
This place means a lot to me	4.06	72.6	4.35	84.1	4.17	76.5
I enjoy recreating at this place more than other places I could visit	3.96	68.2	4.19	78.3	4.03	71.8
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this place than from visiting most places	3.82	61.6	3.98	70.1	3.85	61.8
I am very attached to this place	3.61	49.0	3.90	63.4	3.68	51.3

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

	Ohiopyle	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
Economics Question:	%	%	%	%	%	%
What visitor would have done if unable to visit the State Park						
Gone elsewhere for the same activity	50.6	58.6	50.7	66.6	61.8	56.1
Gone elsewhere for a different activity	9.0	6.8	7.0	6.1	8.0	8.8
Come back another time	3.5	8.0	7.3	8.5	7.6	11.7
Stayed home	26.1	21.1	30.5	17.4	21.7	20.1
Gone to work at your regular job	2.3	2.8	1.7	1.4	<1.0	<1.0
None of these	8.4	2.8	3.0	---	<1.0	2.5
Time Away from Home (Days)						
1-2	42.5	46.7	54.1	29.8	18.6	50.0
3-5	49.4	40.7	34.6	59.6	68.9	50.0
6 or more	8.1	12.6	11.3	10.5	12.4	---
Time Away from Home (Hours)						
1-2	3.9	5.1	14.6	20.1	3.6	42.6
3-5	29.6	39.8	36.8	43.6	32.8	49.4
6 or more	66.4	55.1	48.5	36.3	63.5	8.0
State Park the Primary Destination for this Trip?						
Yes	93.6	98.8	100.0	97.3	97.1	100.0
No	6.4	1.2	---	2.7	2.9	---
Number of People Covered by Expenses						
1	7.6	7.2	6.0	6.9	4.5	16.7
2	27.7	27.1	28.9	26.0	30.8	37.0
3	11.3	15.5	14.4	16.2	17.4	13.0
4 or more	53.4	50.3	50.7	50.9	47.3	33.3

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

	Ohiopyle	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
	(Valid %)					
Proportion of visitors spending any money within 50 miles of this State Park	75.2	71.1	66.4	59.0	71.3	22.7
Economic Expenditure Items	Proportion of Visitors Spending Something in Each Category (Valid %)					
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	6.4	5.5	2.3	<1.0	2.9	<1.0
Camping Fees	31.8	32.8	29.1	30.0	35.7	---
Restaurants and Bars	37.9	21.7	12.6	17.7	24.2	8.8
Groceries	28.6	45.5	43.4	41.0	46.5	10.1
Gasoline and oil	39.2	37.2	31.5	34.5	40.1	10.9
Local Transportation	1.0	1.2	---	---	---	---
Outfitter Related Expenses	17.7	6.7	4.6	6.8	1.3	---
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment	4.5	5.9	1.7	2.0	1.9	---
Sporting Goods	8.7	14.6	17.2	16.4	14.3	<1.0
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	16.1	14.6	10.6	5.8	8.9	1.7

Table 20. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditures – A Comparison across the Six State Parks - Among visitors spending something in each category

	Ohio	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
Economic Expenditure Items	Average Amount Spent – Among Visitors Spending Something in Each Category					
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	373.00	300.71	205.71	600.00	291.11	250.00
Camping Fees	107.58	86.86	110.16	67.24	92.53	---
Restaurants and Bars	65.65	57.46	55.55	55.50	57.43	33.24
Groceries	60.75	84.23	80.85	58.69	57.40	20.88
Gasoline and oil	74.16	59.88	50.29	49.62	48.78	21.31
Local Transportation	26.67	15.00	---	---	---	---
Outfitter Related Expenses	357.84	86.88	53.71	31.25	22.50	---
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment	103.71	49.07	51.40	54.17	32.67	---
Sporting Goods	117.59	49.14	36.00	34.58	37.73	7.00
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	39.14	53.16	70.56	84.12	65.54	37.25
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table 21. Summary of Specific Trip Expenditures – A Comparison across the Six State Parks – Among *all* visitors

	Ohio	Laurel Hill	Keystone	Tobyhanna	Promised Land	Jacobsburg
Economic Expenditure Items	Average Amount Spent – ALL VISITORS					
Motel, Lodge, Cabin, B&B, etc.	23.99	16.64	4.77	2.05	8.34	1.05
Camping Fees	34.24	28.49	32.10	20.19	33.00	---
Restaurants and Bars	24.91	12.13	6.99	9.85	13.90	2.93
Groceries	17.39	38.28	35.07	24.04	26.69	2.11
Gasoline and oil	29.09	22.25	15.82	17.11	19.57	2.33
Local Transportation	0.26	0.18	---	---	---	---
Outfitter Related Expenses	63.28	5.84	2.49	2.13	0.29	---
Outdoor Recreation & Entertainment	4.67	2.91	0.85	1.11	0.62	---
Sporting Goods	10.21	7.19	6.20	5.67	5.41	0.06
Souvenirs, Clothing, Other Misc.	6.29	7.77	7.48	4.88	5.84	0.63
Total	\$214.33	\$141.68	\$111.77	\$87.03	\$113.66	\$9.11

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

Item		Ohiopyle		Laurel Hill		Keystone		Tobyhanna		Promised Land		Jacobsburg	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Marcellus Use	Yes	2.6	8	2.4	6	<1.0	2	2.4	7	1.9	6	<1.0	2
	No	97.4	303	97.6	246	99.3	300	97.6	286	98.1	308	99.2	237
Marcellus Experience	Yes	2.3	7	2.0	5	<1.0	2	1.7	5	1.3	4	<1.0	2
	No	97.7	302	98.0	244	99.3	300	98.3	288	98.7	310	99.2	237

APPENDIX B.

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

State Park 2012-13 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
Ohiopyle	472
Laurel Hill	330
Keystone	409
Tobyhanna	358
Promised Land	373
Jacobsburg	284
TOTAL	2,226

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

Ohiopyle State Park (n=472)

No Suggestions (187)

Satisfied (7)

Improve Recreation Facilities (214)

Access (2)

Improve falls access (2)

ATV (3)

All quads, four wheelers, ATVs

Be able to ride 4 wheelers

Develop ATV trails

Restrooms (49)

Add lights

Add more bathrooms at picnic areas

Better change house with more stalls

Better shower drains

Better showers

Clean up bathrooms (9)

Closer restrooms (2)

Improve bathrooms (6)

Improve showers

More restrooms (19)

More restrooms at the falls

More shower facilities (2)

Move bathroom closer to the bridge and the concessions

No port-a-johns

Provide bathrooms in cabins

Restrooms near Ferncliff parking lot

Campgrounds (43)

Add more showers

Add water and electric to sites

Be able to lock yurt

Better picnic tables (3)

Better signage at campground

Campgrounds are a little run down

Cut the number of sites by 50%

Develop the campsites more

Fire ring too high (3)

Fix locks on the cabins

Get mouse out of wall tent

Have better signs to campground

Hooks for hanging things in cabins

Improve tent sites (2)

Keep the campground open longer

Larger campsites (2)

Level tent camping spots (3)

- Lighting in tent areas (2)
- Make tent sites a little safer
- More grass for tent areas
- More pet sites
- More primitive campsites
- More spacing between sites (4)
- More trees (2)
- Provide better descriptions of campsites
- Put tent site next to yurt
- Put water closer to camp
- Update restrooms (3)

Firewood (2)

- Exact change for firewood
- Make wood available

General Trails (14)

- A walking path from cucumber falls (2)
- Add longer hiking trails
- Better connecting trail from campground to bike trail
- Better trails (2)
- Gentler slope to bike trail from campsite
- Make steps less narrow
- More bike trails (2)
- More trails
- More walking trails
- Stick to maintained trails
- Trails to connect playground

Improve Facilities (22)

- Add more grills/picnic areas
- Bridge at upper Great Gorge Trail
- Cut down the trees at the put-in
- Develop town more
- Finish construction (8)
- Make the park bigger
- More benches
- More cleanliness (2)
- More kiosks
- More shops
- Picnic facilities (3)
- Playground swings are rotted

Improve Road Maintenance (3)

- Road maintenance
- The grade was too steep
- Upgrade roads

Light Issues (2)

- Better lighting
- Lights to the bathrooms

Marina/Swimming (1)

- Get rid of trailers at Lower Yough boat launch

Misc. (13)

- Add a bait shop
- Add a cell tower for better service
- Add a gas station in town
- Food facilities (2)
- Have a dog daycare
- Maintenance of natural plants
- Open a water park
- Provide emergency supplies at "camp stores."
- Segway rentals
- T-shirt souvenir quality went down
- Vending machines
- Water fountains on the trail connect river with rail trail

Parking (22)

- Add more parking (12)
- Better parking (2)
- Closer parking to cabin
- Larger parking area
- More parking at the falls (3)
- More parking in town
- Overnight parking
- Parking on peak days is difficult

Signage (28)

- Add longer sign with directions on them
- Add more signage (6)
- Add signage on the Middle about how far to take out
- Better signage (7)
- Better trail markings (3)
- Bigger signs
- Map availability (2)
- More information for maps/trails
- More mile markers (2)
- More signs for campground
- Sign with facts about the falls
- Signs for water fountains
- Sign at the entrance from 381

Trash (10)

- Add recycling cans
- Enforce littering laws
- Make people pick up their dog poop
- More garbage cans at beach area
- More litter control on trails (2)
- More trash cans (4)

Park Management (62)

Access (5)

- Allow boating at higher than 4 water
- Handicap access
- Improve accessibility to river for those with disabilities
- Make the park accessible to dogs
- More access points to the trail

Alcohol (4)

- Alcohol (unspecified if positive or negative)
- Allow alcohol (3)
- Get rid of beer

Fishing (4)

- Groom/terrace river banks for fishermen
- Set aside area for fly fishing
- Stock more fish
- Stop fishing poachers

Internet (2)

- Improve website (2)

Misc. (30)

- Open additional days for boating
- Advertise across the state
- Better emergency response
- Better trail maps
- Bus transportation
- Do away with the fee system
- Do not over develop the park
- Eliminate parking fee
- Eliminate smoking
- Enforce quiet time in campgrounds
- Facilities should be open longer (2)
- Have admission fees
- Improve traffic situation
- Keep industry out
- Later check-out time
- Later quiet hours (2)
- Less construction (2)
- Less strict rules in campground
- Lower the cost of camping
- More wi-fi hotspots
- Not an upbeat town in the off season
- People fishing at falls area impairs photography
- Shuttle all boaters back to the put in
- Stop cutting trees
- The construction is upsetting boaters
- The park is too regulated for kayakers
- Visitor Center Maps

Park Employees (5)

- Accountability of workers
- Be more friendly (2)
- Knowledgeable park rangers
- More ranger presence

Pets (1)

- No pets

Programming (9)

- Add adventure programs during the week
- Make presentation more lively during park programs
- More Festivals
- More night activities/hikes
- More programming for new activities (2)
- More programming for kids (2)
- Movie nights in the summer

Wildlife (2)

- Complete inventory of biodiversity in the park
- More deer

Natural Gas Drilling (2)

- Don't ever frack anywhere near here
- Allow gas drilling

Laurel Hill State Park (n= 330)

No Suggestions (130)

Satisfied (24)

Improve Recreation Facilities (132)

Access (3)

- Better fishing access from picnic area
- More access to the lake for fishing
- To the small spillway

Improve road maintenance (2)

- Fix the roads
- Open gates for access to closed roads

General trails (3)

- Complete bike trails
- Minimal development on trails
- More accessible trails

Campground (39)

- Add camping near lake
- Add gravel pads to pet area camping
- Add pet sites
- Allow pets
- Allow short term cabin rental
- Armor the picnic area
- Better maintaining of campsites
- Clean bathrooms in the RV campground
- Clear out dead trees
- Drainage in campsites is a problem (3)
- Eliminate the reservation system
- Expand pet sites
- Full hook ups for RV's (4)
- Fix the drainage in campground
- Have heat in the bathroom (2)
- Improve drainage (2)
- Level the campsites (2)
- Make camp sites wider
- Modern cabins are needed
- More bathhouses camping
- More camping sites
- More cottages for handicapped people
- More electric pet sites
- More fire rings
- Need speed bumps
- Offer sites with more privacy
- Rehabilitate the group camps
- Reposition fire rings
- Sites are too narrow

Try to keep picnic area dry
Water in campground

Firewood (2)

Have a place to buy firewood nearby
Lower price for firewood

Restrooms (29)

Better access to restrooms
Clean restrooms (5)
Handicapped bathrooms
Maintain shower facilities
More restrooms (5)
More shower facilities
Near cabins/pavilions (3)
Need warm water in the bathrooms
Restrooms near 150E
Restrooms near lakeview pavilion should be more accessible
Shower-heads are too low (3)
Update restrooms (6)

Trash (5)

Better trash cans
More trash cans (4)

Improve facilities (13)

Better beaches
Dredge the lake/dam area
Extend hunting zones
Keep the grounds looking nice
Maintain the park
More grills (2)
Picnic tables (3)
Playground facilities
Repair/replace picnic tables (2)

Signage (12)

Better directions within the park
Better signage on the roads (2)
Better signs on trails (4)
Educational signage about natural history
Group tent area sign needs to be bigger
More maps through the park
Update park maps (2)

Marina/Swimming (8)

Bigger swimming area
Concrete in swim areas should be marked
Keep the area open for swimming
Make swimming area bigger
Should have peddle boats
More canoes
Swimming pool
Widen the boat ramp

Misc. (8)

- Cell Tower (3)
- Have more parks
- Maintain the weeds at the beach better
- Miniature golf course
- More benches
- Shaded areas for pets

Parking (7)

- Better parking for RV's
- Closer parking to picnic areas
- During the off-season be more relaxed about car parking rules
- Handicapped parking closer to the beach
- More parking (2)
- More parking by boat launch

Light Issues (1)

- Add lighting in the pavilion

Park Management (44)

Access (1)

- To picnic tables

Park Employees (6)

- Drop of park staff at the beach picnic areas
- More rangers (2)
- Need lifeguards (4)

Programming (3)

- Advertise kids programs more widely
- More organized activities
- More recreation activities by the lake

Alcohol (11)

- Allow alcohol (10)
- Moderate alcohol consumption

Pets (2)

- More pet access (2)

Misc. (9)

- A greater emphasis on natural resource protection
- Advertise (2)
- Harvest trees for revenue
- Keep funding the park
- More selective cutting of the forest
- No smoking in the park
- Open in May
- Tell camper to bring water containers

Fishing (10)

- More fishing areas
- Stock more fish (9)

Concessionaires (2)

- Keep boat rentals open longer
- Train outfitters to be more accommodating and personable

Keystone State Park (n= 409)

No Suggestions (171)

Satisfied (11)

Improve Recreation Facilities (169)

Improve road maintenance (4)

- Fix holes in roads in the campsites
- Improve the roads (2)
- Trim the trees hanging over the road

Access (8)

- Better handicap access to picnic areas
- Have handicap accessibility all the way to the water
- More accessible steps to the bathrooms (5)
- Put in an access to the Lolahana Creek

General trails (10)

- Add steps at steep slopes in campsites
- Better bike trails (3)
- Improve bike trail along bridge
- Longer trails needed
- Make lake trail more wheelchair accessible
- More challenging hiking trails
- More hiking areas
- More trails

Restrooms (27)

- Add a handicapped toilet
- Add another bathroom past cabins on the access road
- Add another restroom next to Yurts
- Add more restrooms (9)
- Better water pressure in the cabin showers
- Change shower-heads (2)
- Check bathrooms more often
- Clean bathrooms (3)
- Fix the restrooms (3)
- Keep a restroom open during winter
- More time on shower
- Repair showers
- Restroom closer to handicap fishing
- Restrooms available during the winter

Campground (49)

- Add another campground bathroom
- Add camping for pets near lake
- Add water hook-ups for RV's (2)
- Adding lakeside campsites
- Cost is expensive
- Drainage in campground needs improvement (6)
- Improve campsites (2)

- Larger camp sites (3)
- Level sites (5)
- Maintain/clean restrooms in camping area
- Make the theater handicapped accessible
- More "one way" signs on campsites
- More grass in campsites
- More gravel in RV spots
- More lakeside campsites
- More campground parking (3)
- More pet campsites (2)
- More privacy
- Offer more options for renting of cabins and yurts.
- Pave the campsites (2)
- Provide AC in cabins (2)
- Put more camp sites along the lake
- Sewage and water hook ups (3)
- Start the movie night earlier to end at 9am
- Trim the trees and grass around campground (2)
- Update bathroom in campground
- Update campground reservation system
- Water for campsites

Trash (16)

- Cigarette butts in the sand on the beach
- Closer dumpsters
- Litter is a problem
- More trash cans (13)

Parking (3)

- More parking (2)
- Update parking lots

Improve facilities (27)

- Bigger kids area
- Cut the grass and weeds (2)
- Expand the beach area (2)
- Get nicer sand
- Lighter picnic tables
- Make park bigger
- More grills (9)
- More park benches
- New picnic tables (7)
- Shade areas on the beach (2)

Signage (12)

- A sign should be put up that tells visitors to not fish from the dock
- Better signage (3)
- Better trail maps
- Lighted signs that direct you to the park from 981
- More one-way signs
- More signs on trails (3)
- Signage to campground from 981

Slow down signs in campground

Marina/ Swimming (3)

Improve swimming section

More paddle boats

Water splash play area for little kids

Misc. (7)

Add a Frisbee golf course

Keep spending money on State Parks

Open up the little country store that used to be open in the park

Permanent kitchen in Pavilion #2

Playground between campground loops would be nice

Supply bags for dog poop

We need vending machines

Light Issues (3)

Add lights

Boat launch needs a light

Put lights in handicapped area

Park Management (58)

Access (2)

More bike friendly

Wish that we could go to the other side under the bridge

Alcohol (2)

Allow alcohol (2)

Concessionaires (4)

Cheaper

Have concession near mooring area

Offer boating concessions later into the year

Stand should be open on Mondays

Park Employees (13)

Bring back/add lifeguards (7)

Have staff at the gate of the cabins

Hire more rangers (2)

Nice camp host

Rangers do a great job

Pay raise for park rangers

Pets (1)

Let dogs go to the beach

Wildlife (1)

Would like to see more deer

Fishing (27)

Designate area for fishing apart from boating

I like the fish habitat project

Stock more fish (25)

Internet (1)

More user friendly online reservation system

Programming (2)

Add more evening programs

Advertise kids programs

Misc. (5)

Cabin check-out times should slightly later

Enforce speed limit in camping area

Keep the park open (2)

More advertising

Tobyhanna State Park (n= 358)

No Suggestions (175)

Satisfied (28)

Improve Recreation Facilities (107)

Access (3)

- More access to shoreline
- More fishing access points (2)

Parking (1)

- More parking allowed

General trails (5)

- Even out the steep slopes on trails
- Fallen branches need to be cleared
- More hiking trails (2)
- Wider trail that goes around the lake

Restrooms (8)

- Keep more bathrooms open during the off-season (3)
- Hot water in shower
- Maintenance on the restrooms (2)
- New restrooms (2)

Campground (24)

- Add more electric hookups to campsites (4)
- Allow more than one car per campsite
- Clean out fire pits
- Cut the grass around campground
- Expand how long the campground is open (2)
- Get rid of some stones in campsite
- Have a sign indicating if the water is potable at the group site
- Improve tent sites by adding wood chips
- More access to running water in campground
- More drinking water (2)
- More handicapped sites
- More remote campsites (2)
- New picnic tables for campsites
- Offer fishing access points to lake in campground
- Set limits on the hours that generators can run
- Sites have too much gravel
- Space the campsites out more (2)

Trash (9)

- Doggie bags should be provided
- More trash cans (8)

Improve facilities (25)

- A bench at the play area would be helpful
- Benches on walking path
- Better grounds maintenance in beach area (4)
- Dredge the lake of the lake grass

- Expand the beach area
- Improve picnic tables (9)
- Park clean up days
- Repair grills (2)
- Repair picnic tables at beach area (4)
- The shooting range needs an overhang

Signage (8)

- Have better signage (2)
- Have signs posted on the beach area
- Make campsite signs easier to read
- Make trailheads easier to see when it snows
- More information about park offerings (2)
- Provide information on ice status

Firewood (1)

- Make firewood more accessible

Misc. (22)

- Add a volleyball court to beach (2)
- Better cellphone service
- Camp Store (5)
- Maintain the way it is
- More dog friendly facilities
- More drinking water (3)
- More exercise facilities
- More swings in the playground (2)
- Snack Bar
- Vending Machines (5)

Light Issues (1)

- Install lights in the parking lots

Park Management (48)

Park Employees (10)

- Better patrols at night (2)
- Bring back lifeguards (2)
- Don't close the park, cut back on Rangers
- Have Rangers do more rounds and stop to talk to visitors (2)
- Rangers are really friendly (2)
- Several Rangers need to be more personable and friendly

Alcohol (2)

- Allow alcoholic beverages
- No tolerance policy for alcohol

Concessionaries (4)

- Extend boat rental hours
- Hire a concession stand to sell food
- More boat rentals
- Offer bait at the boat rental concession

Pets (8)

- Leash laws should be more lax for well-behaved dogs
- More access for dogs on beach

- More areas for dogs (3)
- More areas for pets
- More restrictions for pets (2)

Fishing (9)

- Maintain trout population
- Manage the seaweed from fishing areas
- Stock different types of fish
- Stock more fish (6)

Programming (7)

- More available programs for children/families (2)
- More organized activities on holidays
- More water activities
- Offer more park programming (3)

Misc. (8)

- Better algae control at beach
- Church service at the State Park
- Keep investing in State Parks (2)
- Make it clear how to handle disputes with other campers after hours
- Make noise regulations more clear
- People using generators is annoying
- Stay open later for photography

Promised Land State Park (n= 373)

No Suggestions (151)

Satisfied (17)

Improve Recreation Facilities (155)

Improve road maintenance (14)

- Better maintenance of roads surrounding the lake (2)
- Do maintenance on the asphalt road
- Improve roads (7)
- Improve the lake roads
- Road surface improvement
- Roads are bumpy and have potholes (2)

Access (1)

- For fishing

ATV (1)

- Get rid of ATV's

General trails (3)

- Make trails accessible to mountain biking
- Trail at bridge on lowers lake road needs maintenance
- Widen trails

Restrooms (17)

- Better access from boat launch
- Better access to restrooms for handicapped
- Clean the restrooms/porta-johns (4)
- Height of TP disposers should be higher in the restroom stalls
- Maintenance of restrooms (5)
- Maintenance of showers
- More restrooms for beach area
- Move the porta-potty to another location
- Open restrooms earlier (at sunrise)
- Inform visitors about when the restrooms will open in the early spring

Campground (41)

- Add more full service campsites (3)
- Better view of lake from campsite (2)
- Build a shower house (2)
- Don't segregate the dogs from certain campsites
- Ensure RV pads are higher than the sewage drain
- Grassy areas for tent camping
- Have a 24 hour person to contact about problems in the campground
- Less gravel (2)
- Less strict reservation policies
- Level the sites better (4)
- Lower the camping fees
- More hot water capability in campsites
- More pet sites in campground
- More remote campsites

- More shade-bearing trees
- Mow the campground (11)
- Offer season long camping permits
- Open the restrooms/dump stations at the Lower Lake campground
- Playground for children in camping area
- Quicker maintenance for campsites after a storm
- Should allow 2 cars per campsite
- Signs indicating where to wash dishes
- Trim the brush around campfire rings

Trash (7)

- Empty trash frequently (2)
- Keep it clean
- More trash cans
- Move dumpsters to the corner of the parking lot
- Remove the curbs at the dump station (2)

Improve facilities (32)

- Benches
- More dog available facilities (4)
- More grills (4)
- More water fountains (3)
- Picnic tables (18)
- Remove some vegetation from the lake
- Softer sand on the beach

Firewood (2)

- Offer a place to purchase firewood (2)

Light Issues (2)

- Have lights for dusk and dawn
- Install a light at the boat access

Signage (11)

- Bigger lettering on signage
- More detailed maps (2)
- More directions and signs
- More information available (3)
- Need speed detection sign
- Post signs telling visitors that they will be ticketed for parking in the grass
- Post when spraying chemicals for bugs or weeds
- The no-fishing signs are wrong and need to be corrected

Misc. (12)

- Add a game room
- Add a cell phone tower (2)
- Cutting down the weeds (2)
- Improve water quality in the lake
- Keep this place rustic
- Playground
- Trim down the tree branches to better see the lake
- Vending machines (2)
- Wifi

Parking (3)

- Mark parking for either campground or beach use
- More handicapped spots
- More parking spaces

Marina/Lake/Swimming (9)

- Build fishing platform off the bridge over the spillway
- Clean out rocks at main beach swimming area
- Consider adding a swimming pool
- Deepen swimming area (2)
- More boat mooring spots on beach
- Swimming area bigger (2)
- Want an in-ground pool

Park Management (50)

Park Employees (11)

- Better trained office staff
- More campground Rangers to ensure safety
- More patrols
- Need lifeguards (4)
- Park Ranger's don't seem knowledgeable or nice
- Rangers should let guests know about programs or events when on their rounds
- They are always very helpful
- Train employees in customer service

Access (1)

- Allow leases to place non-permanent docks

Alcohol (2)

- Allow alcohol
- Allow alcohol in moderation

Pets (3)

- Designate areas for pets and areas for no pets
- Less area for dogs
- Some restrictions for dogs

Fishing (5)

- Make sure the lake has fish
- Bigger fish
- Clean up lake grass/algae for better fishing
- Stock more fish (3)

Internet (7)

- Website is not very user-friendly
- Improve the website (4)
- Post pictures of each campsite online as part of the reservation process
- The website reservation system needs to be re-done

Programming (6)

- More children's programs/activities (4)
- More information about park programs
- More interactive activities

Misc. (15)

- Allow rock climbing in the park
- Cell phone service

Charge out of state visitors more for camping fees
Extend campground office hours (3)
Improve cell phone reception
Keep the funding
Later noise curfew
Less regulation
More promotion of the park
Music levels should be regulated at the beach
Put sand on top of the frozen lake
Reservation policies are too strict
Watch for speeders at the Cabin Entrance at Lower Lake (Bear Wallow Rd.)

Jacobsburg State Park (n= 284)

No Suggestions (140)

Satisfied (25)

Improve Recreation Facilities (97)

Improve road maintenance (1)

Cleaning the bridge

General trails (24)

Add more freestyle elements to trails

Better signage on trails (4)

Fitness trails

Have some smaller trails for mountain biking

Keep trails clean

Manage the horses better

More bike trails

More land for hiking trails

More trail maintenance (4)

Need water on trails

Open more trails to horses (2)

Some trail signs need to be redesigned

Trails are eroding and need better drainage (4)

Wood fences are broken on trail.

Restrooms (3)

Improve restrooms (2)

More restrooms

Campground (2)

Allow overnight camping

Camping would be a great activity for the park

Trash (13)

Clean up litter (2)

Littering is a problem

Make people clean up after their dog (3)

Make riders clean up after their horses

More garbage cans at the woods

More trash cans (5)

Improve facilities (15)

Add benches (3)

Better picnic tables (5)

Improve the beach

More beaches

More picnic tables at the horse area

More water fountains available

Playground for kids

Provide a water source for horses at the horse trailer lot (2)

Signage (23)

About what to do when you see horses on the trails

- Better signage in the horse parking lot
- Better signs at the park for people in vehicles
- Better signs for marking trails (3)
- Do a better job of posting the "no hunting areas"
- For the main parking area
- Improve signage for bikers
- Information about the trees on the trail
- Kiosks with more maps
- Make signs and information sources more prevalent
- Maps are not in good condition (2)
- Mark the trails better so visitors don't get lost (2)
- More information/maps on trail locations
- More signs on trails (5)
- Post notices about when they will fire guns/cannons in the horse parking area

Misc. (6)

- Add a bike rack at the main parking lot
- Add a playground
- Benches
- Create bike lanes in the park
- Drinking water available
- Vending machines

Parking (8)

- Keep clean
- More parking (5)
- Parking (unspecified)
- The need for parking will grow with the completion of the new Visitor Center

Marina/ Lake/ Swimming (2)

- Can visitors play in the water?
- More swimming areas

Park Management (22)

Access (1)

- Enforce the "no hunting areas"

Park Employees (1)

- More patrols

Programming (6)

- Looking forward to seeing the new environmental center (5)
- More programs
- Not sure about the new environmental center, liked the old one.

Pets (2)

- Enforce leash laws
- People should take care of their dogs better

Wildlife (1)

- Expected to see more wildlife

Fishing (5)

- Enforce fishermen to clean up snagged fishing lines
- Stock more fish (4)

Misc. (6)

More public control over decisions related to the State Park
More updates on the visitor center progress
Restrict hunting
Spray the ticks to kill them
Strict smoking laws
Use funding efficiently

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)

Open-Ended Responses	Number of Responses
Marcellus Shale: Use- Yes (Q19a)	28
Marcellus Shale: Use- No (Q19b)	1,262
Marcellus Shale: Experience- Yes (Q20a)	11
Marcellus Shale: Experience- No (Q20b)	570
TOTAL	1,871

*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 = 28

No Comment (3)

Visible Impacts (1)

Equipment in parking lot (1)

Displaced/ Closed Areas (1)

Drilling elsewhere keeps me here (1)

Visiting More (8)

Other areas are inaccessible (3)

Drilling brought me here (4)

Easier navigation (1)

Visiting Less (2)

Visit less - Generic (2)

General Concerns (16)

Environmental quality (4)

Water quality (8)

Anti-Drilling (2)

Effects wildlife (2)

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

No = 1,262

No Comment (535)

No Effect on Use (363)

Don't Notice/Haven't Seen Activity (182)

Have not seen it (121)

Have not noticed it (38)

Have not encountered it (23)

Don't Know About It (268)

Don't know about it (221)

Didn't know it was going on here (47)

New to Area/Unable to Assess (21)

Never been here (11)

Don't visit often (7)

Not familiar with area (3)

Pro-Drilling (25)

All for it (6)

Doesn't bother me (12)

Employed by industry (3)

Economic development (4)

Not Drilling Here (319)

No activity here (290)

Not in this park (29)

Not Drilling Here Yet (Implies concern for future) (46)

Not impact yet (41)

No yet, will change eventually (5)

General Concerns (38)

Apprehensive (4)

Pollution of the environment (5)

Stay out of the parks (8)

Water concerns (3)

Completely against it (17)

Needs more research (1)

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

Yes = 11

No Comment (14)

Effects on Wildlife (1)

Less wildlife (1)

Traffic Issues (2)

Traffic increase (1)

Dangerous drivers (1)

Environmental Degradation (3)

Decreasing water quality (3)

Pro Drilling (2)

Greater discretionary spending (2)

General Concerns (3)

General concern (3)

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

No = 570

No Comment (1128)

No Effect on Use (214)

Don't Notice/Haven't Seen Activity (103)

Don't see it (48)

No activity (33)

No changes noticed (16)

Have not encountered it (6)

Don't Know About it (110)

Unfamiliar - generic (87)

Not aware of it (13)

Didn't know there was drilling here (10)

New to Area/Unable to Assess (7)

First visit (5)

Don't visit often (2)

Pro-Drilling (6)

Economic development (1)

Proponent- generic (4)

Improving the landscape (1)

Not Drilling Here (107)

No activity here (104)

Not drilling directly in park (3)

Not Drilling Here Yet (Implies concern for future) (16)

Not yet (14)

Not yet, could change (2)

General Concerns (7)

Ruining experience (1)

Environmental concern- general (2)

Water concerns (2)

No drilling in parks (2)

APPENDIX D.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

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

Date, Time, & Weather _____ ID NUM _____

State Park # ____ (1 = Hynar 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 <u>primary recreation activity</u> 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!