Penn's Parks FOR ALL

Penn's Parks for All **Draft Report**

Results from the Spring 2018 Telephone Survey and Ethnicity Survey

Andrew J. Mowen

Alan R. Graefe

Samantha L. Powers

J. Tom Mueller

pennsylvania
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
AND NATURAL RESOURCES

PennState

Executive Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes and opinions of Pennsylvania state park visitors and the public regarding key issues for the future of the Pennsylvania state parks to inform the *Penn's Parks for All* strategic plan. This study involved a representative telephone and an online ethnic minority panel survey which were modeled off the 2017 *Penn's Parks for All* in-park and online survey, *State Parks 2000*, and prior RPTM State Park research. These survey questionnaires focused on eight major themes:

- Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in the state parks?
- Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations in our State parks?
- How should we pay for our State parks?
- How can we protect our state parks?
- Should we provide more modern conveniences in the state parks?
- How satisfied are visitors with services and facilities at state parks?
- How appropriate are various activities for state parks?
- What are the constraints that ethnic minorities face to state park visitation?

Methods

Penn State Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management (RPTM) researchers worked in cooperation with Bureau of State Park staff to plan and design these survey efforts. The two surveys presented in this report were developed as a follow-up to the *Penn's Parks for All* questionnaires administered both in-park and online in the summer/fall of 2017. The telephone survey and online ethnicity panel survey were administered in the spring/summer of 2018 and resulted in 1,650 completed telephone surveys and 2,418 completed online ethnicity panel surveys.

Key Findings

- Visitation patterns were generally consistent across age, gender, income, and rural/urban residence. However, a few differences did emerge. For example, White respondents reported more frequent visitation compared to Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents.

- An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that state parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities and that visitors to state parks should expect a quiet, natural, and/or wild experience. There was also majority support across race/ethnicity for offering more active adventure recreation activities.

- While majority support was generally present across race/ethnicity, Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were noticeably more supportive of travel and camping vacation packages and splash playgrounds.

- Within the ethnic minority panel, there was generally majority support for adding more

on-site water, sewer, and electrical hookups for campsites.

- Responses were fairly moderate towards the development of a few more inns, construction of larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families, and central all-purpose social halls, although it should be noted that Black/African and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were generally supportive of these ideas.

- Across all demographic groups, support was high for the allocation of additional funding from the commonwealth to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects.

- Respondents generally disagreed with the institution of new annual/entrance fees, the closing of facilities that are too expensive to operate or maintain, or the leasing of state park facilities to private businesses or non-profit organizations.

- Respondents, on average, agreed that when impacts of over use are evident at a state park, participation should be limited.

- Support for increasing the protection of the state parks by enlarging boundaries, devoting more staff and funding to conserving native habitats and cultural resources, continuing its strategic land acquisition program, and improving the water quality of streams and lakes was high and appeared consistent across all demographic groups.

- In terms of increasing kitchen amenities and offering internet access, Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents were more supportive than other race/ethnicity groups, with majorities agreeing or strongly agreeing that state parks should offer these amenities.

- Majority support was consistent across race/ethnicities for having air conditioning in some modern cabins.

- Overall, respondents were satisfied with the services and facilities at state parks, with no mean response dropping below 'average', and the majority of responses for every item being either 'good' or 'excellent'.

- Overall, special events with greater than 1,000 attendees, trails for motorized use, and resort-style development were viewed as inappropriate in both the telephone survey and ethnic minority panel, although it should be noted than minority respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree with these items than White respondents.

- Respondents of all races generally found traditional ball sports, swimming pools, small special events, single use trail systems, shared use trail systems, increasing number of large picnic areas, and the maintenance of large grassy fields for sports to be appropriate.

- Overall, constraints to state park visitation were low among these samples. However, younger respondents, low-income respondents, and ethnic minorities reported higher constraints, most notably regarding a lack of transportation, lack of public transportation, and the state parks being too far away.

- In regard to place attachment, a majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are attached to and identify strongly with their primary park.

Conclusion

This report presents the results of a representative telephone survey and an online ethnic minority panel survey. On average, responses were highly supportive of increasing state park protection by enlarging boundaries, devoting more staff and funding to conserving native habitat, continuing its strategic land acquisition program, and improving the water quality of streams and lakes. Overall, respondents were satisfied with state park services and facilities and agreed with items reflecting the existing mission of the Pennsylvania Bureau of State Parks**.** This sample viewed resort-style development and large special events with over 1,000 attendees within the state parks as inappropriate. While many items had consistent ratings across demographic groups, some issues were valued differently across ethnic/racial groups.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Telephone Survey Tables:

Section 1: Introduction

This report presents findings from two surveys conducted during the spring/summer of 2018 as a part of the *Penn's Parks for All* strategic planning initiative, a statewide representative telephone survey and an online panel survey targeted at ethnic and racial minorities. The purpose of both surveys was to evaluate the opinions of the public concerning the future of the Pennsylvania State Park system in order to inform the *Penn's Parks for All* strategic planning initiative. There were various themes of this planning initiative which served as a focal point of questioning for the surveys. These themes were:

- *Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in the state parks?*
  This section asked participants from the telephone and ethnic minority panel surveys to identify whether or not we should change recreation opportunities within the state parks. Participants were asked statements regarding healthful outdoor recreation, natural resource impacts from overuse, travel and camping packages, and splash playgrounds.

- *Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations in our state parks?*
  Overnight accommodations at state parks include a range of options. This section attempted to understand how people feel about this wide variety of overnight options. For example, participants were asked questions concerning modern family camping areas, social halls, inns, and quiet and remote camping experiences.

- *How should we pay for our state parks?*
  Survey participants were asked to provide their opinions concerning state park funding. Specifically, participants were asked about the institution of an annual pass/entrance fee, increasing the allocation of state funds to address the maintenance backlog, closing certain state park facilities, and leasing state park facilities to private and/or non-profit organizations.

- *How can we protect our state parks?*
  Consistent with the Bureau of State Parks' mission regarding conservation, participants were asked how state parks and its resources should be protected. Participants were asked questions related to park staffing, cultural resource protection, land acquisition, water resource management, and volunteer programs.

- *Should we provide more modern conveniences in the state parks?*
  Participants were asked how they felt about modern conveniences in the state parks. Participants were asked about internet, air conditioning, kitchen amenities, and campsite hook-ups.

- *Satisfaction with services and facilities at state parks.*
  The survey assessed visitor satisfaction by asking respondents to rate the quality of a variety of state park services and facilities. Items rated included employees/staff, safety, trails, cleanliness, online presence, programming, and the reservation system.

- ***Appropriateness with various activities for state parks.***
  Participants were asked to identify how appropriate they felt a variety of activities are within the state parks. These items included resort-style development, trails for motorized use, large special events, and adventure facilities/challenge courses. The online ethnic minority panel asked participants to identify appropriateness for these additional activities within the parks: traditional ball sports, swimming pools, small special events, single use trail systems, shared use trail systems, large multi-family picnic areas, and the maintenance of large grassy sports fields.

- ***Place attachment***
  Respondents in the telephone survey were asked to identify the state park which they primarily visit. Then, they were asked a series of questions regarding their place attachment to that area. The online ethnic minority panel was not asked these questions.

- ***Constraints to state park visitation***
  Respondents were asked to report the importance of a variety of constraints to state park visitation. These included items such as being too busy with other life priorities, not having transportation, and not being interested in activities offered at state parks.

- ***Additional Questions in the Ethnic Minority Panel***
  Respondents were asked about their perceptions of importance and performance of state park's outreach to ethnically diverse communities as well as their perceptions of welcoming and belonging within state parks.

- ***Open-Ended Questions***
  In addition, participants in the telephone survey were asked two additional open-ended questions. These questions were, "Does your local community benefit from state parks? If yes, what is the benefit?" and "How could your experience at state parks be improved?". Respondents in the ethnic minority panel were asked three additional open-ended questions. These questions were, "What are the benefits that you feel State Parks provide to nearby communities?", What do you feel is most important for Pennsylvania to consider for the future of Pennsylvania State Parks?", and "In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [your selected race/ethnicity]?"

The following report presents the results of both surveys, beginning with the telephone survey, followed by the online ethnic minority panel survey, and ending with a summary of key findings of both surveys. Below is a brief description of the rationale and methods used in both surveys.

Telephone Survey

Background

The telephone survey was used to poll a probability sample of the Pennsylvania population during the summer of 2018. This technique was utilized to ensure a statistically representative sample was collected, to allow generalizability to the general population with regard to the future of Pennsylvania State Parks. This sample allowed for data collection from both users and non-users of State Parks. The survey was developed and modified by the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources - Bureau of State Parks and Penn State's Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management (RPTM). Survey items were principally based upon the 2017 *Penn's Parks for All* in-park and online survey, *State Parks 2000*, and other issues identified through staff meetings and prior state parks research.

Methods

The telephone survey was administered by Left Brain Concepts and utilized random digit dialing to poll a probability sample of the Pennsylvania population. Both landlines and cell phones were called in order to increase the number of responses from younger members of the population, who are less likely to have a land line telephone. The process of data collection was conducted until a total sample of 1650 responses was reached. Of the 4,384 voice-to-voice telephone contacts where survey participation was requested, 1,650 interviews were completed for a response rate of 37.6%.

Via telephone interview, respondents were first asked to report their visitation patterns at the state parks. After that, they were asked questions regarding the major themes of the study. Except in the case of yes/no questions or open-ended questions, each statement was rated on a 1 to 5 scale. For the selected 2017 *Penn's Parks for All* items and the state park attachment items, each statement was rated from 'Strongly Disagree' to Strongly Agree'. For the satisfaction section, each item was rated from 'Poor' to 'Excellent', with an "N/A" or not-applicable option provided. For the appropriateness section, each item was rated from 'Inappropriate' to 'Appropriate'. The items concerning constraints to state park visitation were rated from 'Not at all Important' to 'Extremely important'. At the end of the survey, participants were then asked a group of demographic questions regarding age, gender, income, zip code, and ethnicity/race.

The overall means and frequencies presented for the results of the telephone survey have been proportionally weighted by ethnicity/race and age category. Due to an overrepresentation of older white respondents, a problem common with telephone survey research, researchers used data from the U.S. Census Bureau to weight each case. The ethnic/racial categories used for calculating weights were White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and Mixed race/Other. The age categories used for weighting were 18-24, 25-34, 35-49, 50-64, and 65+. The process of weighting adjusts the impact an individual has on the overall mean and frequency by multiplying their response by a proportion. For example, in this sample the percent of White respondents over the age of 65 was 23.02. In the Pennsylvania population, it is only 19.84. Therefore, each White respondent over the age of 65 has been weighting at a proportion of 0.86 to correct for their overrepresentation. This method is common in survey research and increases the generalizability of this survey's findings. It should be noted that with the exception of comparisons across age and ethnic/racial groups, all other results are weighted. Because data were weighted on those variables it is inappropriate to compare those groups using the weighted data. Therefore, the comparisons of variables across age and race are unweighted.

Ethnicity Panel Online Survey

Background

The percentage of ethnic minorities is growing substantially in Pennsylvania, particularly in the eastern part of the state. It is projected that by 2044, minorities will represent a majority in the country (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). To have a long-term vision for State Parks, it is important to be intentional about reaching out to people from different ethnic background and people of different age groups within these ethnicities.

The purpose of the online ethnic minority panel survey was to examine how Pennsylvanians with different ethnic profiles utilized and perceived their state parks. Similar to the telephone survey, the ethnic minority panel survey was based upon prior studies of state parks in Pennsylvania. The survey sampling involved a stratified quota sample of four different race/ethnicities (White, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/Chicano, and Other Non-White) across four different age groups (18-25, 26-35, 36-50, and 51+). The quota stratification was designed to allow equal comparisons among groups on items within each of the major themes.

Methods

The online ethnicity panel survey was administered by Qualtrics during the summer of 2018. Data was collected from May 18th to June 19th, 2018. The survey was designed to gather data from individuals of a variety of ages, races, and ethnicities. The survey used a quota sampling procedure, where quotas were set for a selected number of respondents from each of the categories listed in the chart below. This technique was used to ensure representation from a variety of populations. The table below reflects the desired sampling quotas. Qualtrics gathered some additional White respondents, so they were included in the analysis as well. A total of 2,837 surveys were started and 2,418 surveys were completed with enough data for analysis.

Total = 1600	White	Black	Latino	Other non-white
51+	100	100	100	100
36-50	100	100	100	100
26-35	100	100	100	100
18-25	100	100	100	100

When completing the survey, respondents were first asked to report their race or ethnic background followed by other demographic characteristics including age and gender. Next, respondents were asked questions regarding the main themes of the study. Except in the case of yes/no questions or open-ended questions, each statement was rated on a 1 to 5 scale. The items concerning constraints to state park visitation were rated from 'Not at all Important' to 'Extremely important'. For the selected 2017 *Penn's Parks for All* items and the state park attachment items, each statement was rated from 'Strongly Disagree' to Strongly Agree'. For the appropriateness section, each item was rated from 'Inappropriate' to 'Appropriate'. The importance of outreach to ethnically diverse communities was measured on a scale from 'Not at all Important' to 'Extremely Important.' The performance measure for outreach to ethnically diverse communities was rated on a scale from 'Not at all effective' to 'extremely effective.' At the end of the survey, participants were then asked a group of demographic questions regarding income, zip code, and employment status.

Comparative Variables

In addition to presenting the descriptive data, comparisons of this data were also made across demographic and visitation characteristics as requested by Pennsylvania State Parks. For demographic comparisons, these included analyses by age, gender, income, race, and rurality. For visitation, these included user, former user, and non-user. Many of the demographic variables were recoded/collapsed into smaller categories to better illustrate differences across the groups, while the visitation variables were corrected for incorrect survey responses. A more detailed discussion of the category comparisons is provided in the following sections.

Demographic Comparisons

Age was asked of respondents in the format of, 'In what year were you born?'. This was recoded into age by subtracting from 2018, and then categorized into five categories: 18-24, 25-34, 35-50, 51-64, 65+ or in some cases, ages 51-64 and 65+ were combined due to little variation or small sample size. Gender was asked as, 'What is your gender?'. The options were Male, Female, and Other; other in this case represents individuals who do not identify as either male or female. Those reporting Other represented 0.1% (n=1) of the overall sample in the telephone survey and 0.4% (n=5) of the overall sample for the online survey. These results were consistent with *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* Given the small nature of this sample size, Other was not reported in the comparisons by gender. Income was asked as, 'Into which annual income group would you place your household?'. Participants were presented with seven options including a 'Don't know' response. For the purposes of comparison this has been reduced to three categories for the telephone survey ($0 - $49,999, $50,000 - $99,999, and $100,000+) and two categories from demographic comparisons within ethnicities in the online ethnic minority panel (below $50,000 and above $50,000). Ethnicity/Race was asked as, 'Which one of the following categories best describes your race and/or ethnic background?'. The options included: White, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Mixed race, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and other. Again, for comparison purposes this variable was recoded into fewer (five) categories: White, African American/Black, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Mixed Race/Other. Mixed Race/Other includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, Mixed Race, and Other.

State parks across Pennsylvania look different in rural versus urban areas. Additionally, residents in urban and rural areas participate in different recreation activities and use parks differently. Rural/Urban residency was determined by using respondents' self-reported zip codes. Following this, the 2016 U.S. Census Gazetteer files were used to determine square mileage for each zip code. The 2012-2016 American Community Survey Zip Code Tabulation Area population estimates were then used to determine the population for each area for 2016. The year of 2016 was used in this instance because it is the latest year for which zip code population estimates were available at time of analysis. Zip code area population was then divided by square mileage to determine population density to arrive at a rural/urban distinction. The Center for Rural Pennsylvania defined areas with less than 284 people per square mile as rural. This report used this same demarcation. Individuals living in an area with 284 people per square mile were coded as urban, and those living in areas with a population density of less than 284 were coded as rural.

Visitation Comparisons

Throughout this report comparisons have been made between users and non-users as well as former users, users, and non-users. For the telephone survey, a user was classified as someone who has visited a state park in the previous year, a former user was someone who has visited a state park in the past but not within the past year, and a non-user was someone who has never visited a state park. For the ethnic minority panel, former users were treated as non-users. Where applicable a correction has been made to place respondents into the correct category. If a respondent stated themselves as a user or former user, but could not name a state park, or only named parks that were not actual state parks then they have been re-coded as non-users. Similarly, if a respondent said they were a non-user but then named a state park they had visited in the past year, they have been recoded as users. Finally, some questions were only asked of respondents who either identified as current, or former users. Where this has occurred, it has been noted. If there is not a note about the question only being asked of a certain group, it was asked of the entire sample.

Report Structure

This report summarizes and discusses the results of the representative telephone survey and the online ethnic minority panel survey and is organized around the themes as stated earlier. The report is divided into two sections beginning with the telephone survey results and followed by the results of the online ethnic minority panel. Sample demographics are reported for the telephone survey to demonstrate similarity to the overall Pennsylvania population. Within each section, responses to the overarching themes are outlined when applicable through a variety of comparisons by demographic characteristics. Within the online ethnic minority panel data, all comparisons are made within the overarching race/ethnicity categories. Due to unequal sample sizes within the race/ethnicity categories, it would be inappropriate to display 'overall' values for the entire sample as this was not the intention of the ethnic minority panel survey.

Statistics Presented

This report presents statistics for each question asked of respondents. The main statistics presented are median, mean, and percent frequency. The median represents the value falling at the middle of the distribution of answers, with half of the responses above it and half below. The mean is the average response of all answers, when the answers have been recoded into numbers. For example, on a scale of agreement from 1 – Strongly Disagree to 5 – Strongly Agree, a mean of 3.9 would represent modest agreement. It is important to note that the words mean and average represent the same statistic and are used interchangeably throughout the report. Finally, throughout the report the percent frequency is presented. In this case it is most often the percent of people who selected either agree or strongly agree – among all who answered the question. The results presented here are descriptive statistics and do not predict any future outcomes, when this report used phrases like 'more likely to agree' or 'agreed more often' it means that within this sample, more people selected whichever option is being discussed – not that people would be likely to select this option in the future.

Section 2: Telephone Survey Results

Respondent Profile and Behaviors
   Sample Demographics
      In total, there were 1,650 completed telephone survey responses. It is important to note that these numbers are the amount of people who responded to at least one survey question. Due to incomplete surveys, many of the responses on individual survey items were less than this figure. The sample closely matched the racial/ethnic diversity of the state of Pennsylvania with 78% of respondents identifying as White. The sample was evenly split by gender and age leaned toward those over 45. Income distribution leaned toward household income of less than 75,000, and the sample was more urban than rural. It is important to remember that all results of the telephone survey were weighted by age and race. Tables 1 to 10 show the sample demographics.

- Because the data was weighted on race, this sample closely matched the racial/ethnic breakdown of PA residents. The sample was slightly less White than the Pennsylvania population, which is 82.1% White (U.S. Census Bureau) and the sample was 78.8% White. Similarly, the sample was 10.2% African American/Black, 6.0% Latino/Hispanic, and 3.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, while the Pennsylvania population is 11.9% African American/Black, 7.3% Hispanic/Latino, and 3.6% Asian.

- The portion of this sample over 65 was 22.5%, whereas the portion of Pennsylvania over the age of 65 is 17.8%.

- This sample was evenly split between Male and Female, which was consistent with the Census reported gender composition of Pennsylvania.

- According the U.S. Census Bureau, 45.7% of Pennsylvanian households made less than $50,000 in 2016. In this sample, 41.8% of respondents reported a household income of less than $50,000.

- This sample was slightly more urban the whole of Pennsylvania. The sample was 75.1% urban and 23.9% rural, while Pennsylvania is 73% urban and 27% rural.

Table 1. Age

	N (1629)	%
18 – 24	189	11.6
25 – 34	271	16.7
35 – 44	225	13.8
45 – 54	275	16.9
55 – 64	303	18.6
65+	366	22.5
Mean	48.57	
Median	49.0	

Table 2. Gender

	N (1650)	%
Male	810	49.1
Female	839	50.8
Other	1	0.1

Table 3. Income

	N (1650)	%[1]
Under $25,000	245	16.3
$25,000 - $49,999	383	25.5
$50,000 - $74,999	356	23.7
$75,000 - $99,999	216	14.4
$100,000 - $149,999	180	12.0
$150,000 or over	123	8.2
Don't know	147	8.9

[1]Income bracket percentages do not include "Don't know" responses.

Table 4. Ethnicity/Race

	N (1650)	%
White	1300	78.8
African American/Black	167	10.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	57	3.5
Hispanic/Chicano/Latino	99	6.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	.1
Mixed Race	11	.7
Other	13	.8

Table 5. Education

	N (1631)	%
Some high school	44	2.7
Graduated high school or GED	463	28.2
Some college	341	20.8
College graduate	439	26.8
Some graduate or professional training	76	4.6
Completed graduate or technical degree	266	16.2
Technical school	12	.7

Table 6. Employment

	N (163)	%
Working (paid employee)	822	50.1
Working (self employed)	139	8.5
Not working (temporary layoff from a job)	15	.9
Not working (looking for a job)	103	6.3
Not working (disabled)	107	6.5
Not working (retired)	356	21.7
Not working (other)	9	.5
Stay at home Mom/Dad	66	4.0
Student	24	1.5

Table 7. Which of the following best describes the area where you live?

	N (1631)	%
Rural	440	27.0
Village or town of under 10,000	232	14.2
Town of 10,000 to 20,000 people	320	19.6
City of 20,000 to 50,000 people	205	12.6
City of 50,000 to 100,000 people	141	8.7
Urban area of 100,000 to 200,000 people	125	7.6
Metropolitan area of more than 250,000 people	150	9.2
Suburbs	18	1.1

Table 8. How many people live your household, including yourself?

Number	N (1325)	%
1	317	19.2
2	574	34.8
3	287	17.4
4	271	16.4
5	112	6.8
6	58	3.5
More than 6	31	1.9
Mean	2.76	
Median	2.00	
Min	1	
Max	10	

Table 9. How many of the people are under 18 [in your household]?

Number	N (1325)	%
0	793	59.5
1	241	18.0
2	194	14.6
3	58	4.3
4	35	2.6
5	5	.4
6	6	.4
More than 6	2	.2
Mean	.76	
Median	.00	
Min	0	
Max	9	

Table 10. Rural/Urban Status [1]

	N (1634)	%
Rural[2]	394	23.9
Urban	1240	75.1

[1]Calculated as described in introduction, using Q5a "What is your zip code?"
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile

Visitation Patterns

The following section explores the state park visitation patterns of telephone survey respondents. A majority of respondents reported they had visited a state park in the past 12 months and a vast majority had visited a state park in Pennsylvania. Tables 11 to 19 present the descriptive results for visitation patterns, while Tables 20 through 29 present demographic comparisons across visitation patterns.

- Those who reported visiting in the past 12 months were considered users (53%), those who had previously visited but not in the past 12 months were considered former users (28%), and those who had never visited were considered non-users (18%).

- On average, survey respondents visited two state parks in the past twelve months. The median number of parks visited was one.

- State park users reported an average of six visits to their primary park. The median of number of visits was three. The maximum number of reported days at their primary park was 365.

- White respondents reported more frequent visitation to their primary park (mean of 6.8 visits per year) compared to Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents (mean of 2.9, 4.2, and 2.1 visits per year respectively).

- Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were less likely to have ever visited a state park or to have visited one in the past 12 months as compared to other respondents of other ethnicities. However, it terms of other public parks, they are visiting at a higher rate.

- Older adults (65+) were less likely to have visited a state park or other public parks over the last 12 months. In comparison to young adults (18-24), older adults were more likely to say they had ever visited a state park.

- A sizeable number of park visitors said they had only one (15%) or no (34%) other places where they could get a similar recreation experience within a reasonable distance from their residence.

- Non-rural respondents said they visited other public parks at a higher rate than the rural respondents.

- Low income respondents (below $50,000) were less likely to have visited a state park in the last 12 months.

Table 11. In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?*

	N (N=1,650)	%
Yes	910	55.1
No	704	42.7
Don't Know	36	2.2

Table 12. Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania?[1]

	N (N=740)	%
Yes	531	71.8
No	209	28.2

[1]Only asked of those who stated they did not visit a Pennsylvania State Park within the last year.

Table 13. Have you visited any other types of public parks in Pennsylvania in the last 12 months?[1]

	N (N=209[2])	%
Yes	86	41.0
No	123	59.0

[1]Only asked of those who said they had never visited a Pennsylvania State Park.
[2]N is greater than the total number who were asked this question due to weighting

Table 14. Corrected frequency of users, former users, and non-users[1]

	N (N=1650)	%
Current User	881	53.4
Former User	468	28.4
Non-user	301	18.2

[1]A number of respondents stated that had, or had not, visited a state park in the past year and then either could not name a state park or name a park other than a state park. In this case the totals were adjusted to create a more accurate total of user, former users, and non-users

Table 15. Which state park(s) have you visited in the last 12 months?[1]

Number of different state parks	N (N=910)	%
None	68	7.5
1	427	46.9
2	198	21.8
3	91	10.0
4	56	6.2
5	27	3.0
6	9	1.0
More than 6	33	3.7
Mean	2.1	
Median	1.0	
Min	0	
Max	20	

[1]Presented here as frequency; Only asked of those who stated they had visited a state park in the past year; None means they only listed parks other than state parks.

Table 16. Which state park(s) have you visited? (For people who did not visit within past 12 months)?[1]

Number of different state parks	N (N=531)	%
None	63	11.9
1	229	43.1
2	100	18.8
3	47	8.9
4	29	5.4
5	27	5.1
6	10	1.8
More than 6	29	5.4
Mean	2.2	
Median	1.0	0
Min	0	0
Max	20	5.0

[1]Presented here as frequency; Only asked of those who said they had ever visited a state park, but not within the past year; None means they only listed parks other than state parks.

Table 17. Which state park did you visit most often in the last 12 months?[1]

State Park	N	%	State Park	N	%	State Park	N	%
							N = 910	
French Creek	39	4.7	Hills Creek	8	1.0	Patterson	2	0.3
Moraine	38	4.6	Tobyhanna	8	1.0	Linn Run	2	0.3
Tyler	35	4.2	Frances Slocum	8	0.9	Cherry Springs	2	0.3
Ridley Creek	33	3.9	Tuscarora	8	0.9	Ryerson Station	2	0.2
Neshaminy	32	3.8	Norristown Farm	7	0.9	Hyner View	2	0.2
Presque Isle	31	3.7	Washington Crossing Historic Park	6	0.7	Kings Gap Environmental Education and Training Center	2	0.2
Ohiopyle	23	2.8	Nolde Forest Environmental Education Center	5	0.6	Elk	2	0.2
Bald Eagle	22	2.7	Laurel Mountain	5	0.6	Laurel Ridge	2	0.2
Marsh Creek	20	2.4	Shikellamy	5	0.6	Evansburg	2	0.2
Nockamixon	20	2.4	Penn-Roosevelt	5	0.6	Colonel Denning	2	0.2
Gifford Pinchot	19	2.3	Yellow Creek	5	0.6	Kettle Creek	2	0.2
Hickory Run	18	2.2	Kinzua Bridge	4	0.5	Little Pine	2	0.2
Pymatuning	18	2.1	Milton	4	0.5	Big Spring State Forest Picnic Area	1	0.1
Point	17	2.1	R.B. Winter	4	0.5	Lyman Run	1	0.1
Lackawanna	17	2.1	Beltzville	4	0.4	Mont Alto	1	0.1
Raccoon Creek	17	2.0	Ralph Stover	4	0.4	Samuel S. Lewis	1	0.1
McConnells Mill	15	1.8	Greenwood Furnace	4	0.4	Sinnemahoning	1	0.1
Allegheny Islands	15	1.8	Laurel Hill	4	0.4	Trough Creek	1	0.1
Jacobsburg Environmental Education Center	15	1.8	Susquehannock	4	0.4	Chapman	1	0.1
Shawnee	15	1.8	Cowans Gap	3	0.4	Kooser	1	0.1
Rickets Glen	15	1.8	Benjamin Rush	3	0.4	Laurel Summit	1	0.1
Fort Washington	15	1.7	Archbald Pothole	3	0.4	Oil Creek	1	0.1
Big Pocono	14	1.7	Nescopeck	3	0.4	Ole Bull	1	0.1
Little Buffalo	14	1.7	Maurice K. Goddard	3	0.4	Prompton	1	0.1
Codorus	14	1.7	Delaware Canal	3	0.4	Swatara	1	0.1
Susquehanna	14	1.6	White Clay Creek Preserve	3	0.4	Boyd Big Tree Preserve Conservation Area	1	0.1
Cook Forest	13	1.6	Mt. Pisgah	3	0.3	Jennings Environmental Education Center	1	0.1
Caledonia	12	1.4	Poe Valley	3	0.3	Ravensburg	1	0.1
Keystone	11	1.3	Buchanan's Birthplace	3	0.3	Clear Creek	1	0.1
Whipple Dam	10	1.3	Parker Dam	3	0.3	Leonard Harrison	1	0.1
Prince Gallitzin	10	1.2	Blue Knob	3	0.3	Memorial Lake	1	0.1
Black Moshannon	9	1.1	Worlds End	3	0.3	Sizerville	1	0.1
Locust Lake	9	1.1	Lehigh Gorge	3	0.3			
Canoe Creek	9	1.0	Gouldsboro	2	0.3			
Pine Grove Furnace	8	1.0	Erie Bluffs	2	0.3			
Promised Land	8	1.0	Salt Springs	2	0.3			

[1]Only asked of those that said they had been to a Pennsylvania State Park in the past year.

Table 18. How many times have you gone to [primary park] in the last 12 months?[1]

Number	N (N=863)	%
1	201	22.3
2	172	19.9
3	136	15.7
4	78	9.0
5	67	7.7
6	59	6.8
More than 6	131	15.2
Mean	6.26	
Median	3.00	
Min	1	
Max	365	

[1]Only asked of those that said they had been to a Pennsylvania State Park in the past year.

Table 19. Considering why you normally visit [primary park] how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?[1]

Number	N (N=716)	%
0	241	33.6
1	107	14.9
2	121	16.8
3	102	14.2
4	35	4.9
5	48	6.6
6	21	3.0
More than 6	41	5.7
Mean	2.56	
Median	2.00	
Min	0	
Max	100	

[1]Only asked of those that said they had been to a Pennsylvania State Park in the past year.

Visitation Comparisons across Demographic Characteristics

Comparison by Age

Table 20. Comparison by Age – Visitation Patterns

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	N[1]	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Have you visited a State Park in the last twelve months? (N=1650)	88	58.3	141	65.0	259	67.1	245	53.8	167	39.8
Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania? (N=729)	29	46.0	54	71.1	94	74.0	159	75.7	205	81.0
Have you visited any other types of public parks in Pennsylvania in the last 12 months? (N=188)	14	41.2	11	50.0	15	45.5	21	41.2	12	25.0

[1]Frequency and percent of those who answered "Yes"; Unweighted

Table 21. Comparison by Age – Visitation Patterns[1]

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
How many times have you gone to [primary park] in the past twelve months?*	7.4	3.0	5.8	3.0	5.9	3.0	5.9	3.0	8.2	3.0
Considering why you normally visit [primary park] how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?*	2.7	2.0	3.1	2.0	1.9	1.0	2.6	2.0	3.3	1.0

[1]Only asked of those who have visited a state park in the past twelve months; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 22. Comparison by Gender – Visitation Patterns

Statement	Male		Female	
	N[1]	%	N	%
Have you visited a State Park in the last twelve months? (N=1650)	443	54.7%	466	55.5%
Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania? (N=741)	256	69.8%	276	74.0%
Have you visited any other types of public parks in Pennsylvania in the last 12 months? (N=210)	41	36.6%	44	45.4%

[1]Frequency and percent of those who answered "Yes"

Table 23. Comparison by Gender – Visitation Patterns[1]

Statement	Male		Female	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
How many times have you gone to [primary park] in the past twelve months?	5.5	3.00	7.0	3.00
Considering why you normally visit [primary park] how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?	2.6	2.00	2.5	1.00

[1]Only asked of those who have visited a state park in the past twelve months

Comparison by Income

Table 24. Comparison by Income – Visitation Patterns

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	N[1]	%	N	%	N	%
Have you visited a State Park in the last twelve months? (N=1486)	303	48.2%	343	60.1%	207	68.1%
Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania? (N=643)	228	70.2%	173	75.5%	77	80.2%
Have you visited any other types of public parks in Pennsylvania in the last 12 months? (N=152)	43	44.3%	17	30.4%	12	63.2%

[1]Frequency and percent of those who answered "Yes"

Table 25. Comparison by Income – Visitation Patterns[1]

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
How many times have you gone to [primary park] in the past twelve months?	6.19	3.00	6.55	3.00	5.96	3.00
Considering why you normally visit [primary park] how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?	1.88	1.00	3.01	2.00	2.39	2.00

[1]Only asked of those who have visited a state park in the past twelve months

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 26. Comparison by Ethnicity/Race – Visitation Patterns

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	N[1]	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose? (N=1650)	796	56.7	37	36.6	18	45.0	14	58.3	45	54.9
Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania? (N=740)[2]	471	77.6	35	54.7	10	45.5	9	90.0	26	70.3
Have you visited any other types of public parks in Pennsylvania in the last 12 months? (N=189)[3]	48	35.3	14	48.3	6	50.0	1	100	5	45.5

[1]Frequency and percent of those who answered "Yes"; Unweighted
[2]Only asked of those who answered "No" to visiting a State Park in the past 12 months
[3]Only asked of those who answered "No" to visiting a PA State Park in the past 12 months and "No" to ever visiting a State Park in PA.
[4]Only asked of those who answered "Yes" to visiting a PA State Park in the past 12 months.

Table 27. Comparisons by Ethnicity/Race – Visitation Patterns[1]

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
How many times have you gone to [primary park] in the past twelve months?	6.8	3.0	2.9	2.0	4.2	4.0	2.1	2.0	4.6	3.0
Considering why you normally visit [primary park] how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?	2.7	2.0	2.2	1.0	2.1	1.5	1.8	0.5	2.0	2.0

[1]Only asked of those who have visited a state park in the past twelve months; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residency

Table 28. Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence – Visitation Patterns

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	N[2]	%	N	%
Have you visited a State Park in the last twelve months? (N=1632)	231	58.6%	674	54.4%
Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania? (N=728)	115	70.6%	405	71.6%
Have you visited any other types of public parks in Pennsylvania in the last 12 months? (N=189)	12	25.5%	73	45.3%

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Frequency and percent of those who answered "Yes"

Table 29. Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence – Visitation Patterns[1]

Statement	Rural[2]		Urban	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
How many times have you gone to [primary park] in the past twelve months?	6.67	3.00	6.11	3.00
Considering why you normally visit [primary park] how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?	2.84	2.00	2.47	2.00

[1]Only asked of those who have visited a state park in the past twelve months
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile

Penn's Parks for All Core Themes

Should We Change the Current Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks?

The survey looked at the current recreational opportunities, as well as whether or not visitors felt that they should change these opportunities in state parks. Overall, respondents overwhelmingly supported the mission of the state parks regarding healthful outdoor recreation activities as well as the importance of managing for a quiet, natural, and wild experience. There was also modest support for the provision of active adventure recreation facilities. Results were consistent with *Penn's Parks for All* 2017 findings. Table 30 presents the descriptive results for outdoor recreation opportunity items, while Tables 31 through 36 present demographic comparisons across recreation opportunity items.

- Almost all respondents (89%) agreed or strongly agreed that state parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities.

- The vast majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed (80%) that visitors to state parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience.

- Counter to what might be expected, both old and young respondents rated active adventure recreation facilities similarly, with all age groups expressing moderate to strong levels of agreement that these types of offerings should be increased. Hispanic/Chicano/Latino and Black/African American respondents were slightly more interested in active adventure recreation facilities than respondents of other ethnicities.

Overall Results for Outdoor Recreation Opportunities

Table 30. Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

Statement	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
		Percent[1]				
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.3	0.9	1.5	9.2	48.7	39.8
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.0	0.8	3.7	15.2	52.3	28.0
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.5	2.1	12.3	31.9	40.6	13.2

[1]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Outdoor Recreation Opportunities – Comparisons by Demographic Characteristics
Comparisons by User, Former User, and Non-user

Table 31. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user – Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

Statement	User		Former User		Non-user	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.1	81.4	4.0	81.0	4.0	76.1
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.5	53.5	3.4	50.0	3.6	60.2
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.3	89.3	4.2	89.2	4.2	84.8

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparisons by Age

Table 32. Comparison by age – Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
Statement	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.8	70.2	4.0	76.0	4.0	78.8	4.1	84.8	4.1	84.0
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.7	62.9	3.7	58.5	3.4	51.8	3.4	49.2	3.4	50.2
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.1	80.8	4.3	85.7	4.2	86.8	4.3	91.9	4.3	93.1

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 33. Comparison by gender - Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

	Male		Female	
Statement	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.0	80.2	4.0	80.5
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.5	52.7	3.5	54.8
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.3	88.1	4.3	88.8

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Income

Table 34. Comparison by income – Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.98	77.5	4.1	82.2	4.1	83.3
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.6	56.3	3.5	52.8	3.4	48.4
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.2	86.5	4.3	89.6	4.3	90.7

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 35. Comparison by ethnicity/race – Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.1	82.2	3.8	67.3	3.9	75.0	4.1	87.5	3.9	73.2
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.4	50.8	3.7	62.4	3.9	75.0	3.7	50.0	3.7	63.4
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.3	89.6	4.2	87.1	4.2	80.0	4.0	87.5	4.2	90.2

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 36. Comparison by rural/urban residence – Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences in state parks?

Statement	Rural[1] Mean	Rural[1] %[2]	Urban Mean	Urban %
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.1	82.4	4.0	79.7
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.5	54.7	3.5	53.3
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.3	91.1	4.2	87.5

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

How Should We Pay for our State Parks?

Participants were asked how they felt about a variety of funding related issues. Across all demographic groups, there was strong support for increasing the allocation of commonwealth funding for the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects. Despite this strong support, support was generally higher among *Penn's Parks for All 2017* samples. Across all groups there was disagreement with the institution of a new annual/entrance fee. Additionally, there was broad disagreement with the leasing of select park areas to private businesses or non-profit organizations. Overall, responses to the telephone survey were generally more moderate than in *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* Table 37 presents the descriptive results for paying for our state parks items, while Tables 38 through 43 present demographic comparisons across paying for our state parks items.

- Across all demographic groups, including non-users, support for the allocation of additional funding from the commonwealth to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects was high, with 64% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement (61% for non-users).

- Fewer respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the addition of new annual/entrance fees (27%), the closing of facilities that are too expensive to operate or maintain (20%), and the leasing of state park facilities to private businesses or non-profit organizations (30%).

- Younger respondents were less likely than older respondents to agree or strongly agree with the addition of new annual/entrance fees.

- Asian/Pacific Islander respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree with the addition of a new annual/entrance fee (50%), the closing of facilities that are too expensive to operate or maintain (38%) and the leasing of state park facilities to private businesses or non-profit organization (46%) than their other ethnicity counterparts.

Overall Results for Paying for our State Parks

Table 37. How should we pay for our state parks?

Statement	Mean	Percent[1]				
		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.7	1.9	6.7	27.2	45.4	18.8
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.7	14.8	28.7	29.6	22.5	4.4
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.6	12.5	36.7	31.2	14.6	5.1
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.8	15.3	26.3	28.7	24.6	5.1

[1]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Paying for Our State Parks – Comparisons by Demographic Characteristics

Comparisons by User, Former User, and Non-user

Table 38. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user – How should we pay for our state parks?

Statement	User		Former User		Non-user	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.8	68.7	3.6	58.0	3.7	60.6
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.6	23.2	2.9	29.3	3.0	33.9
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.6	19.9	2.6	18.5	2.7	20.9
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.7	28.8	2.8	29.7	2.9	32.7

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparisons by Age

Table 39. Comparison by age – How should we pay for our state parks?

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.6	52.3	3.7	64.1	3.8	66.3	3.7	66.8	3.8	67.9
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.6	18.5	2.7	25.3	2.6	23.8	2.7	26.6	2.8	30.7
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.8	19.9	2.8	24.0	2.6	18.9	2.5	16.3	2.6	16.7
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	3.0	31.1	2.9	33.6	2.7	26.2	2.7	29.0	2.6	26.0

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 40. Comparison by gender - How should we pay for our state parks?

	Male		Female	
Statement	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.7	63.3	3.7	65.2
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.8	29.1	2.7	24.8
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.7	23.6	2.6	16.0
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.8	33.0	2.8	26.7

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Income

Table 41. Comparison by income – How should we pay for our state parks?

	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
Statement	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.7	63.0	3.7	64.3	3.9	69.7
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.8	26.0	2.8	29.0	2.7	26.9
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.7	21.4	2.7	20.6	2.5	16.3
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.9	31.8	2.8	29.5	2.7	28.1

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 42. Comparison by ethnicity/race – How should we pay for our state parks?

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.7	65.0	3.8	67.3	3.7	60.0	4.0	66.7	3.7	64.6
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.7	25.4	2.8	29.7	3.1	37.5	3.2	50.0	2.5	20.7
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.6	17.0	3.0	30.7	2.9	22.5	3.1	37.5	2.5	17.1
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.7	27.5	2.9	35.6	3.2	37.5	3.2	45.8	2.6	25.6

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 43. Comparison by rural/urban residence – How should we pay for our state parks?

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	Mean	%[2]	Mean	%
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.7	64.4	3.7	64.1
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.7	28.4	2.7	26.2
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.6	18.7	2.6	20.0
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.8	29.5	2.8	29.8

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

How Can We Protect our State Parks?

All items concerning the protection of state parks were rated favorably in this sample. Respondents were especially supportive of improving water quality in streams and lakes, the continuation of land acquisition, enlarging the boundaries of some State Parks, and devoting more staffing and funding to resource management and protection of cultural resources. These attitudes held across all demographic groups, with Asian and Pacific Islander respondents reporting particularly high support for all items. Overall responses were consistent with *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* Table 44 presents the descriptive results for protecting our state parks items, while Tables 45 through 50 present demographic comparisons across items.

- Support was overwhelmingly high (the following percentages represent those reporting agree or strongly agree) across demographic groups for improving water quality in streams and lakes (74%), devoting more staffing and funding to resource management (72%) and protection of cultural resources (71%).

- A sizable majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the state parks should continue its strategic land acquisition program (68%) and that the boundaries of some state parks should be enlarged (68%). Asian respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree with both of these statements than the overall sample (79% and 83%, respectively).

- There was majority support for limiting participation when impacts of overuse were evident (60% agreed or strongly agreed), and support appeared to increase with age.

Overall Results for Protecting our State Parks

Table 44. How can we protect our state parks?

		Percent[1]				
Statement	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.9	1.4	3.5	20.7	50.5	23.8
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.8	2.3	7.1	22.9	47.0	20.6
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.8	2.3	5.6	24.5	43.9	23.6
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.9	1.4	5.0	21.4	50.8	21.4
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.8	1.9	5.1	21.6	49.8	21.5
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.5	3.1	13.0	24.3	46.9	12.8

[1]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Protecting Our State Parks – Comparisons by Demographic Characteristics

Comparisons by User, Former User, and Non-user

Table 45. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user – How can we protect our state parks?

Statement	User		Former User		Non-user	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	4.0	76.1	3.8	70.4	4.0	75.2
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.8	69.6	3.7	64.1	3.7	67.4
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.8	68.8	3.7	63.6	3.9	70.3
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.9	72.8	3.8	69.6	4.0	74.7
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.9	72.5	3.8	70.4	3.9	69.2
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.5	57.7	3.6	61.9	3.6	61.7

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparisons by Age

Table 46. Comparison by age – How can we protect our state parks?

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.9	73.5	3.9	72.8	3.9	71.8	4.0	74.7	3.9	76.0
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.7	62.9	3.9	70.0	3.8	69.2	3.7	67.5	3.7	67.6
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.8	62.3	3.9	69.1	3.8	67.6	3.8	67.0	3.7	68.8
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.9	72.2	3.9	72.4	3.8	69.4	3.9	74.5	3.8	71.2
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.8	64.9	3.8	67.3	3.8	70.5	3.9	72.1	3.9	74.8
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.4	48.3	3.5	55.3	3.5	58.3	3.6	65.3	3.6	65.7

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 47. Comparison by gender – How can we protect our state parks?

Statement	Male		Female	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.9	75.7	3.9	73.1
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.8	68.2	3.8	67.3
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.8	68.1	3.8	67.2
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.8	70.7	3.9	73.8
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.8	70.3	3.9	72.4
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.6	61.6	3.5	57.8

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Income

Table 48. Comparison by income – How can we protect our state parks?

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.9	74.3	3.9	73.2	3.9	78.5
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.7	66.1	3.8	68.8	3.9	72.7
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.8	66.6	3.8	66.9	4.0	75.0
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.9	72.9	3.9	71.8	3.9	76.5
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.9	71.2	3.9	72.4	3.9	72.9
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.5	56.5	3.6	63.0	3.6	62.8

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 49. Comparison by ethnicity/race – How can we protect our state parks?

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.9	73.4	4.0	75.2	3.9	77.5	4.1	83.3	4.0	79.3
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.8	67.9	3.6	63.4	3.9	67.5	4.0	79.2	3.6	62.2
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.8	67.0	3.8	66.3	4.0	72.5	4.2	83.3	3.6	63.4
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.8	71.7	3.8	69.3	4.0	77.5	4.2	83.3	3.9	73.2
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.8	70.6	3.9	73.3	3.9	77.5	3.9	75.0	3.8	74.4
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.6	61.9	3.3	46.5	3.5	60.0	3.7	62.5	3.5	58.5

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 50. Comparison by rural/urban residence – How can we protect our state parks?

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	Mean	%[2]	Mean	%
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.9	73.7	3.9	74.6
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.7	65.9	3.8	68.3
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.7	64.1	3.8	68.7
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.9	74.6	3.9	71.5
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.8	72.7	3.8	71.0
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.6	61.6	3.5	58.7

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Appropriateness of Activities within State Parks

One issue discussed during the DCNR-state parks staff/manager meetings was the appropriateness of various activities, amenities, and management activities. To address visitor perceptions of these issues, the survey assessed respondents' perceived level of appropriateness for four issues: adventure facilities, large special events, motorized trails, and resort-style development. Overall, respondents felt that trails for motorized use and resort-style development were generally inappropriate for state parks. Responses to the appropriateness of large special events were generally neutral. On the contrary, a majority found adventure facilities/challenge courses to be appropriate for state parks. Support for adventure facilities/challenge course was noticeably higher than in *Penn's Parks for All 2017*. These attitudes varied slightly by demographic groups and these differences are described below. Table 51 presents the descriptive results for the appropriateness items, while Tables 53 through 57 present demographic comparisons across the appropriateness items.

- The item viewed as the most inappropriate was resort-style development, with 55% of respondents rating resort-style development as either somewhat inappropriate or inappropriate.

- Older respondents (ages 51+) viewed all four activities to be less appropriate when compared to younger respondents.

- Respondents, on average, were generally neutral in their perception of special events with greater than 1000 attendees (3.1 on a 5-point scale). A majority of Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents (50%) and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents (58%) found special events with greater than 1000 attendees to be somewhat appropriate or appropriate.

- A majority of respondents found adventure facilities/challenge courses to be somewhat appropriate or appropriate (60%). Hispanic/Chicano/Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents found these facilities to be especially appropriate (68% and 67%, respectively).

- Black/African American respondents and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents were more likely to report that trails for motorized use (44% and 46%, respectively) and resort style development (38% and 42%, respectively) were somewhat appropriate or appropriate than other ethnicity groups.

Overall Results for Appropriateness of Items for State Parks

Table 51. Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	Mean	Inappropriate (1)	Somewhat Inappropriate (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Appropriate (4)	Appropriate (5)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.7	5.9	6.9	27.2	30.7	29.3
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.1	15.9	16.1	29.1	22.6	16.3
Trails for motorized use	2.7	28.6	17.8	22.9	17.7	13.0
Resort-style development	2.4	36.0	18.8	22.6	12.0	10.6

[1]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Comparison by User, Former User, and Non-user

Table 52. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user – Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	User		Former User		Non-user	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.7	60.5	3.7	62.9	3.7	54.0
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.0	39.1	3.1	40.1	3.2	37.1
Trails for motorized use	2.7	32.4	2.7	30.3	2.7	26.4
Resort-style development	2.5	23.8	2.3	20.9	2.5	22.0

[1]Percent who said either 'Somewhat Appropriate' or 'Appropriate'

Comparison by Age

Table 53. Comparison by age – Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.8	64.9	3.9	64.5	3.8	64.2	3.6	57.8	3.5	53.6
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.3	42.4	3.2	41.5	3.2	40.9	2.9	35.4	2.9	34.0
Trails for motorized use	3.0	33.1	3.0	36.4	2.8	33.7	2.4	23.5	2.4	24.0
Resort-style development	2.7	25.2	2.6	28.1	2.5	24.6	2.2	18.2	2.2	16.9

[1]Percent who said either 'Somewhat Appropriate' or 'Appropriate'; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 54. Comparison by gender – Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	Male		Female	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.7	61.0	3.7	59.1
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.1	41.7	3.0	36.5
Trails for motorized use	2.7	32.8	2.6	28.8
Resort-style development	2.4	23.0	2.4	22.3

[1]Percent who said either 'Somewhat Appropriate' or 'Appropriate'

Comparison by Income

Table 55. Comparison by income – Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.7	56.3	3.8	64.0	3.7	63.6
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.1	38.2	3.1	42.9	3.0	38.0
Trails for motorized use	2.8	31.9	2.7	32.8	2.6	28.0
Resort-style development	2.6	23.8	2.5	26.3	2.2	18.6

[1]Percent who said either 'Somewhat Appropriate' or 'Appropriate'

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 56. Comparison by ethnicity/race – Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.7	59.4	3.7	56.4	4.0	67.5	3.8	66.7	3.7	59.8
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.0	36.6	3.3	44.6	3.5	50.0	3.5	58.3	3.0	37.8
Trails for motorized use	2.6	26.9	3.2	43.6	3.2	37.5	3.0	45.8	2.6	26.8
Resort-style development	2.3	19.7	3.0	37.6	2.9	27.5	3.0	41.7	2.2	17.1

[1]Percent who said either 'Somewhat Appropriate' or 'Appropriate'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 57. Comparison by rural/urban residence – Please indicate how appropriate the following items are for state parks

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	Mean	%[2]	Mean	%
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.8	61.1	3.7	59.6
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.0	36.5	3.1	39.6
Trails for motorized use	2.7	30.0	2.7	30.8
Resort-style development	2.5	26.0	2.4	21.5

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Satisfaction/Perceived Quality of State Parks' Services and Facilities

Most respondents were satisfied with every state park service/facility they were asked about. As with previous state park studies, respondents were allowed to select a 'not applicable' option for every satisfaction item. This was performed to prevent respondents from evaluating topics with which they did not have experience. In general, all items were rated as above average. The most highly rated items were the feeling of safety and trail conditions. The items rated as the least satisfying in terms of quality were state park's online presence and level of interaction with park staff. After answering questions about satisfaction, respondents were then asked if there is anything that could be done to improve their experience at state parks. Those who answered 'yes' to this question were prompted with an open ended follow-up about how their experience at state parks could be improved. Table 58 presents the descriptive results for satisfaction/perceived quality items, while Tables 59 through 66 present demographic comparisons across satisfaction/perceived quality items. Please refer to pages 78 through 87 for a detailed summary and results of the open-ended follow-ups. Percentages presented below represent those reporting the services as 'good' or 'excellent'.

- Overall, respondents were satisfied with the services and facilities at state parks, with no mean response dropping below 'average', and the majority of responses for every item being either 'good' or 'excellent'. The items most likely to be rated as good or excellent were the feeling of safety (86%), the trail conditions (82%), and the reservation system (76%).

- While majorities in each race/ethnicity expressed satisfaction with a feeling of safety, Mixed Race/Other and Black/African American respondents reported notably lower satisfaction (73% and 77%, respectively) as compared to Asian/Pacific Islander respondents (93%).

- Although the overall sanitation and cleanliness was rated highly at state parks, with 74% of respondents rating it 'good' or 'excellent', Hispanic/Chicano/Latino (59%) and Asian/Pacific Islanders (57%) respondents rated cleanliness as good or excellent less frequently.

- Mixed Race/Other respondents were notably less satisfied with the responsiveness of employees (51%) than respondents of other ethnicities. They also rated satisfaction with the reservation system (61%) much lower than some other respondent groups.

- Satisfaction with the availability of education programs varied significantly by race/ethnicity. Among those who had opinions about education programs, Black/African American respondents were most satisfied (72%), especially compared to Asian/Pacific Islander respondents (46%) and Mixed Race/Other respondents (41%).

- Respondents were least satisfied with the level of interaction with park staff (M=3.6) and state park's online presence (M=3.6). **Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were less satisfied** (47%) with the level of interaction with park staff than respondents from other ethnicities.

Overall Results for Satisfaction with State Park Services and Facilities

Table 58. Satisfaction with state park services and facilities[1]

Statement	Mean[3]	Percent[2]					Percent
		Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Don't Know
Feeling of safety	4.3	1.0	2.2	11.3	40.6	44.9	1.7
Trail conditions	4.1	1.0	3.7	13.2	48.7	33.4	3.8
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)	4.0	0.7	3.7	19.2	47.0	29.4	22.2
Sanitation and cleanliness	4.0	1.5	5.5	19.1	42.8	31.1	2.3
Responsiveness of employees	3.9	1.2	4.8	22.6	44.9	26.4	15.8
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities	3.9	1.4	6.7	21.1	44.8	25.9	13.2
Availability of education programs	3.7	3.5	9.7	26.1	37.9	22.8	21.5
Level of interaction with park staff	3.6	3.5	9.5	29.8	37.6	19.5	14.2
State Park's online presence	3.6	4.1	9.8	27.0	36.4	22.8	29.1

[1]Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months.
[2]Percent when not including N/A; Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding
[3]Mean with N/A responses excluded

Table 59. Is there anything the state parks could do to improve your experience at the state parks?[1]

	N (N=910)	%
Yes	295	32.4
No	615	67.6

[1]Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months; open-ended response not included here.

Table 60. Net Promoter Score - On a scale of 0 to 10, with zero being not at all likely and 10 being extremely likely, how likely is it that you would recommend the Pennsylvania State Parks to a friend, family member, or colleague?[1]

% Detractors (1-6)	% Passives (7-8)	% Promoters (9-10)	Net Promoter Score[2]
14.5	31.4	54.2	39.7

[1]Asked of those who reported visiting a state park in the past 12 months, or reported having ever visited a state park
[2]Calculated by subtracting the percent of 'Detractors' – ratings from 1-6 from the percent of 'Promoters' – ratings of 9 or 10.

Comparison by User and Non-User

Table 61. Comparison by user and non-user – Satisfaction with the following services and facilities at state parks

Statement	User		Non-user	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
Feeling of safety[2]	4.3	85.4	4.2	87.4
Trail conditions[2]	4.1	82.0	4.1	83.8
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)[2]	4.0	76.5	3.9	74.2
Sanitation and cleanliness[2]	4.0	73.6	3.9	77.6
Responsiveness of employees[2]	3.9	72.1	3.7	61.8
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities[2]	3.9	70.7	3.8	70.9
Availability of education programs[2]	3.7	60.7	3.6	61.1
Level of interaction with park staff[2]	3.6	57.0	3.5	58.9
State Park's online presence[2]	3.7	59.1	3.5	59.2

[1]Percent who said either 'Good' or 'Excellent' with 'Don't know' treated as missing
[2]Asked of those who reported visiting a state park in the past 12 months, or reported having ever visited a state park

Comparison by Age

Table 62. Comparison by age – Satisfaction with the following services and facilities at state parks

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Feeling of safety[2]	4.2	79.3	4.4	85.7	4.3	88.6	4.2	83.8	4.3	87.3
Trail conditions[2]	4.1	77.4	4.2	85.3	4.2	85.8	4.0	79.5	4.1	84.3
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)[2]	4.0	73.2	4.0	74.8	4.1	76.7	3.9	76.0	4.0	77.5
Sanitation and cleanliness[2]	4.0	69.4	3.9	70.3	4.0	78.0	4.0	74.9	4.0	75.4
Responsiveness of employees[2]	3.7	65.4	4.1	73.0	3.9	67.6	3.9	69.9	4.0	76.4
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities[2]	3.7	64.4	3.9	68.5	3.9	72.0	3.8	69.4	4.0	77.0
Availability of education programs[2]	3.6	59.1	3.7	57.3	3.7	60.6	3.6	61.2	3.9	68.5
Level of interaction with park staff[2]	3.2	34.1	3.6	52.5	3.7	62.7	3.6	61.8	3.8	66.7
State Park's online presence[2]	3.2	47.5	3.5	50.5	3.7	61.7	3.6	59.8	3.9	74.2

[1]Percent who said either 'Good' or 'Excellent' with 'Don't know' treated as missing; Unweighted
[2]Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months.

Comparison by Gender

Table 63. Comparison by gender – Satisfaction with the following services and facilities at state parks

Statement	Male		Female	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
Feeling of safety[2]	4.3	86.7	4.3	84.4
Trail conditions[2]	4.1	80.5	4.1	83.7
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)[2]	4.0	75.2	4.0	77.6
Sanitation and cleanliness[2]	4.0	74.5	4.0	73.3
Responsiveness of employees[2]	3.9	71.5	3.9	71.2
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities[2]	3.8	67.1	3.9	74.3
Availability of education programs[2]	3.6	58.7	3.7	63.0
Level of interaction with park staff[2]	3.7	58.7	3.6	55.5
State Park's online presence[2]	3.6	54.9	3.7	67.3

[1]Percent who said either 'Good' or 'Excellent' with 'Don't know' treated as missing.
[2]Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months.

Comparison by Income

Table 64. Comparison by income – Satisfaction with the following services and facilities at state parks

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
Feeling of safety[2]	4.3	86.6	4.3	85.8	4.3	86.4
Trail conditions[2]	4.1	82.5	4.1	82.5	4.1	82.5
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)[2]	4.0	74.1	4.1	77.6	3.9	77.0
Sanitation and cleanliness[2]	4.0	73.0	4.0	75.2	4.0	76.0
Responsiveness of employees[2]	3.9	71.0	3.9	70.9	3.9	74.1
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities[2]	3.8	68.3	4.0	74.6	3.8	68.7
Availability of education programs[2]	3.6	57.5	3.8	64.4	3.6	58.5
Level of interaction with park staff[2]	3.6	54.4	3.7	57.9	3.7	63.9
State Park's online presence[2]	3.7	63.5	3.7	58.1	3.6	56.4

[1]Percent who said either 'Good' or 'Excellent' with 'Don't know' treated as missing.
[2]Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 65. Comparison by ethnicity/race – Satisfaction with the following services and facilities at state parks

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
Feeling of safety[2]	4.3	86.4	4.0	77.1	4.1	83.3	4.3	92.9	4.0	73.3
Trail conditions[2]	4.1	83.6	4.2	82.4	3.7	72.2	4.1	78.6	3.8	72.1
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)[2]	4.0	76.0	4.1	77.4	4.3	86.7	3.8	64.3	3.7	61.3
Sanitation and cleanliness[2]	4.0	75.3	4.2	82.4	3.7	58.8	3.3	57.1	3.8	65.1
Responsiveness of employees[2]	3.9	71.2	3.8	71.9	3.8	68.8	3.8	69.2	3.5	51.4
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities[2]	3.9	71.3	3.7	67.6	3.7	66.7	3.9	69.2	3.6	60.0
Availability of education programs[2]	3.7	62.4	3.8	72.4	3.4	53.3	3.4	46.2	3.2	40.5
Level of interaction with park staff[2]	3.6	59.4	3.6	59.4	3.5	47.1	3.5	61.5	3.2	43.2
State Park's online presence[2]	3.6	59.7	3.9	67.9	3.8	58.3	3.4	57.1	3.1	44.8

[1]Percent who said either 'Good' or 'Excellent' with 'Don't know' treated as missing; Unweighted.
[2]Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months.

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 66. Comparison by rural/urban residence – Satisfaction with the following services and facilities at state parks

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	Mean	%[2]	Mean	%
Feeling of safety[3]	4.3	83.1	4.3	86.3
Trail conditions[3]	4.1	79.8	4.1	83.0
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)[3]	4.0	71.3	4.0	78.3
Sanitation and cleanliness[3]	4.0	72.4	4.0	74.5
Responsiveness of employees[3]	3.9	65.8	3.9	73.4
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities[3]	3.8	66.3	3.9	72.3
Availability of education programs[3]	3.7	60.4	3.7	60.9
Level of interaction with park staff[3]	3.6	55.9	3.6	57.7
State Park's online presence[3]	3.5	51.7	3.7	61.5

[1] Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2] Percent who said either 'Good' or 'Excellent' with 'Don't know' treated as missing.
[3] Only asked of those who reported visiting a state park within the past 12 months.

Benefits for Nearby Communities

State Parks provides opportunities and benefits across Pennsylvania. In particular, parks can be an asset to local communities through tourism, recreation service provision, healthful recreation, etc. Respondents were asked the extent to which they felt state parks provided a benefit for nearby communities. While it is a state park, it may be one of the few outdoor recreation facilities available to residents, particularly in rural areas. Hence, we wanted to look at the extent to which Pennsylvanians across various characteristics felt about the benefits provided by state parks. Results indicated an overwhelming majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that state parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities. After answering this benefits question, respondents who felt that state parks did in fact provide benefits to nearby communities were then asked to describe these benefits in an open-ended follow-up question. Table 67 presents the descriptive results for satisfaction/perceived quality items, while Tables 68 through 72 present demographic comparisons across satisfaction/perceived quality items. Please refer to pages 78 through 87 for a detailed summary and results of the open-ended follow-ups.

- Across demographic comparisons Black/African American respondents were slightly less likely to agree or strongly agree that Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities than White respondents (66% versus 82%, respectively).
- While a majority of non-users agreed or strongly agreed (69%) that state parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities, agreement was lower than that of users (84%) and former users (79%).

Table 67. Benefits - Please rate your level of agreements with the following statement

Statement	Mean	Percent[1]				
		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.07	0.7	2.5	17.0	48.6	31.2

[1]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Comparison by Gender

Table 68. Comparison by gender - Benefits for nearby communities

	Male	Female
Statement	Mean (%[1])	Mean (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.1 (80.2)	4.1 (79.5)

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Age

Table 69. Comparison by age - Benefits for nearby communities

	18-24	25-34	35-50	51-64	65+
Statement	Mean (%[1])	Mean (%)	Mean (%)	Mean (%)	Mean (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	3.9 (71.6)	4.1 (76.4)	4.1 (78.0)	4.2 (85.4)	4.1 (82.0)

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Race/Ethnicity

Table 70. Comparison by race/ethnicity – Benefits for nearby communities

	White	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race/ Other
Statement	Mean (%[1])	Mean (%)	Mean (%)	Mean (%)	Mean (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.1 (81.7)	3.8 (66.2)	3.8 (74.0)	4.0 (85.8)	4.2 (81.9)

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban

Table 71. Comparison by rural/non-rural - Benefits for nearby communities

	Rural[1]	Urban
Statement	Mean (%[2])	Mean (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.1 (81.3)	4.1 (79.4)

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User

Table 72. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user - Benefits for Nearby Communities

	User	Former User	Non-User
Statement	M (%[1])	M (%)	M (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.2 (83.7)	4.00 (79.3)	3.84 (69.0)

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Entrance Fee Question

Respondents were asked to select from five options regarding how much it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park. When asked about how much it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park, just over half of respondents knew that Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter. Notable demographic differences emerged, especially with regard to Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents. Tables 73 presents the breakdown of responses, while tables 74 through 78 present the results of the correct response. 'Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter.'

- Overall, a majority of respondents (57%) knew that Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter.
- Black/African American (39%) and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino (21%) respondents were much less likely to know that state parks are free to enter.
- Respondents below age 35 were also generally less aware of the free entrance to state parks as compared to older adults.
- Users (67%) and former users (50%) were more likely than non-users (36%) to know that state parks had free entry as well.

Table 73. About how much do you think it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park?

Statement	Percent				
	Five dollar per vehicle	Ten dollars per vehicle	Nothing. Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	It depends on the park	I really don't know
About how much do you think it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park?	3.9	4.2	56.6	18.5	16.8

Comparison by Gender

Table 74. Comparison by gender - Nothing, Pennsylvania state parks are free to enter

	Male	Female
Statement	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	56.4	56.8

Comparison by Age

Table 75. Comparison by age - Nothing, Pennsylvania state parks are free to enter

	18-24[1]	25-34	35-50	51-64	65+
Statement	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	40.4	51.0	61.1	62.9	57.1

[1]Unweighted

Comparison by Race/Ethnicity

Table 76. Comparison by race/ethnicity – Nothing, Pennsylvania state parks are free to enter

	Percent				
	White[1]	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race/ Other
Statement	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	61.1	39.2	20.8	69.0	56.0

[1]Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban

Table 77. Comparison by rural/urban - Nothing, Pennsylvania state parks are free to enter

	Rural	Urban
Statement	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	61.4	55.4

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile

Comparison by User/Non-User

Table 78. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user - Nothing, Pennsylvania state parks are free to enter

	User	Former User	Non-User
Statement	%	%	
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	67.2	50.1	35.8

Constraints to Visitation

Factors or circumstances within an individual or society which may limit visitation or participation in an activity. In this case, respondents were asked about the constraints, or barriers, that they faced to state park visitation. Overall constraints to state park visitation were very low among this sample. Respondents rated being too busy with other life priorities, not having enough information on state parks, and a lack of available activities that they like to do in state parks are the highest constraint items. Respondents as a whole were least constrained by a fear of the outdoors and by feeling that state parks are not for people like them. It is not surprising that non-users expressed high constraints in the areas of being too busy with other life priorities and not having enough information on state parks. Constraints to state park visitation appear to be higher among younger respondents and respondents of lower incomes. Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents had more constraints to state park visitation than their race/ethnicity counterparts. Table 79 presents the descriptive results for satisfaction/perceived quality items, while Tables 80 through 85 present demographic comparisons across satisfaction/perceived quality items. Percentages presented below represent those reporting that a barrier/constraint is very important or extremely important in preventing them from visiting Pennsylvania state parks.

- Overall, respondents reported their highest constraints as being too busy with other life priorities (33%), the state parks being too far away (23%), not having enough information on state parks (23%), and the activities they like to do are not available in state parks (21%).
- Non-users reported being too busy with other life priorities (36%) and not having enough information on state parks (31%) as more important than users.
- Constraints to state park visitation were higher among younger respondents (under 35) and respondents of lower incomes. Two of the more notable differences by income were regarding not having transportation to state parks (31% for respondents with income under 50,000 and 16% for respondents with income over 100,000) and a lack of public transportation (32% and 15%, respectively).
- Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents reported higher constraints than their race/ethnicity counterparts in relation to almost all the items, most notably in regard to lack of transportation (32% and 45%, respectively) lack of public transportation (40% and 43%, respectively), fear of crime (39% and 38%, respectively), and the state parks being too far away (39% and 38%, respectively).

Overall Results for Constraints to State Park Visitation

Table 79. Please tell me how important each of the following reasons are in preventing you from visiting the Pennsylvania State Parks

Statement	Mean	Not at all Important Reason (1)	Slightly Important Reason (2)	Moderately Important Reason (3)	Very Important Reason (4)	Extremely Important Reason (5)
		Percent[1]				
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.4	37.1	14.2	26.1	14.2	8.3
Fear of crime	2.3	45.1	14.2	17.0	13.5	10.1
Poor personal health	2.3	46.3	10.7	18.9	13.5	10.6
The State Parks are too far away	2.5	33.7	17.8	25.9	14.7	7.9
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.3	48.4	11.2	17.5	12.8	10.1
Lack of available public transportation	2.3	44.0	13.0	19.6	13.5	9.9
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.9	57.9	13.0	16.3	8.5	4.3
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	2.0	55.2	10.3	17.7	10.6	6.2
Too busy with other life priorities	2.9	20.7	14.7	31.7	20.2	12.7
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.0	52.0	13.7	19.9	8.8	5.6
Fear of the outdoors	1.8	61.4	11.8	15.4	7.4	4.0
Do not have anyone to go with	2.2	43.9	15.3	20.9	12.4	7.5
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.2	42.9	15.7	22.6	12.3	6.4
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.4	37.4	16.3	25.8	14.6	6.0
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.3	46.5	12.0	20.0	13.3	8.2
State Parks have too many rules	2.0	51.0	15.9	21.4	7.7	4.0

[1]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Comparison by User, Former User, and Non-user

Table 80. Comparison by user, former user, and non-user – Constraints to state park visitation

Statement	User		Former User		Non-user	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.3	19.7	2.5	22.3	2.8	31.3
Fear of crime	2.3	24.6	2.2	21.3	2.4	24.8
Poor personal health	2.3	23.9	2.3	23.5	2.4	25.4
The State Parks are too far away	2.4	21.1	2.5	22.7	2.6	26.7
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.2	22.5	2.2	22.0	2.4	25.4
Lack of available public transportation	2.3	22.5	2.3	22.6	2.5	27.2
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.9	14.0	1.9	11.9	1.9	10.6
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	2.1	20.2	1.8	9.7	2.1	18.1
Too busy with other life priorities	2.8	30.5	3.0	35.6	3.0	35.6
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.0	15.8	2.0	11.3	2.2	14.9
Fear of the outdoors	1.8	13.2	1.8	9.0	1.8	10.1
Do not have anyone to go with	2.2	19.0	2.4	21.8	2.2	19.6
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.3	20.7	2.2	16.3	2.2	17.0
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.4	24.0	2.3	15.7	2.3	18.3
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.2	21.1	2.3	24.3	2.2	18.3
State Parks have too many rules	2.0	14.3	1.9	8.1	2.0	9.5

[1]Percent who said either 'Important' or 'Extremely Important'

Comparison by Age

Table 81. Comparison by age – Constraints to state park visitation

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.7	26.5	2.7	30.0	2.3	20.5	2.2	18.7	2.3	20.2
Fear of crime	2.6	28.5	2.6	28.6	2.2	21.2	2.0	15.8	2.2	22.9
Poor personal health	2.7	34.4	2.5	27.2	2.2	18.9	2.1	20.4	2.3	24.0
The State Parks are too far away	2.9	30.5	2.8	28.6	2.4	21.8	2.2	15.8	2.1	18.6
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.7	30.5	2.6	28.1	2.2	23.1	2.0	18.0	2.0	16.4
Lack of available public transportation	2.7	27.8	2.6	30.0	2.1	18.4	2.1	18.9	2.2	21.2
The State Parks are not for people like me	2.1	15.9	2.1	18.4	1.9	13.2	1.6	8.1	1.8	9.0
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	2.5	24.5	2.4	25.3	2.0	15.0	1.8	12.3	1.8	12.1
Too busy with other life priorities	3.2	43.0	3.2	51.0	2.9	32.4	2.8	30.5	2.5	22.4
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.5	23.8	2.4	19.4	2.0	15.5	1.8	9.5	1.8	9.5
Fear of the outdoors	2.1	13.9	2.2	20.3	1.8	10.6	1.6	7.0	1.6	6.9
Do not have anyone to go with	2.8	29.8	2.5	24.0	2.1	17.1	2.0	16.0	2.1	17.4
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.6	26.5	2.4	22.6	2.2	17.9	2.0	13.4	2.1	14.5
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.7	27.8	2.6	25.8	2.4	21.8	2.2	16.5	2.1	14.3
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.6	27.2	2.4	22.6	2.2	21.2	2.0	19.3	2.1	17.9
State Parks have too many rules	2.3	13.9	2.2	18.9	2.0	13.2	1.8	7.7	1.7	7.4

[1]Percent who said either 'Important' or 'Extremely Important'; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 82. Comparison by gender – Constraints to state park visitation

Statement	Male		Female	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.5	23.8	2.4	21.3
Fear of crime	2.2	24.1	2.4	23.3
Poor personal health	2.3	24.2	2.3	24.0
The State Parks are too far away	2.4	22.0	2.5	23.2
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.3	24.5	2.2	21.3
Lack of available public transportation	2.4	23.8	2.3	23.0
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.9	13.9	1.9	11.7
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	2.0	15.7	2.0	17.9
Too busy with other life priorities	2.9	34.9	2.9	31.0
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.0	15.0	2.0	13.8
Fear of the outdoors	1.8	12.1	1.8	10.8
Do not have anyone to go with	2.2	20.3	2.3	19.6
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.3	20.7	2.2	16.9
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.4	23.1	2.3	18.1
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.2	20.9	2.3	22.0
State Parks have too many rules	2.1	13.6	1.9	9.8

[1]Percent who said either 'Important' or 'Extremely Important'

Comparison by Income

Table 83. Comparison by income – Constraints to state park visitation

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.6	26.2	2.4	20.2	2.3	20.2
Fear of crime	2.5	28.8	2.3	24.0	2.0	17.2
Poor personal health	2.6	32.4	2.2	20.3	2.0	17.7
The State Parks are too far away	2.6	27.6	2.4	21.1	2.3	15.7
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.6	31.2	2.1	19.3	1.9	16.2
Lack of available public transportation	2.7	31.8	2.2	19.3	2.0	15.3
The State Parks are not for people like me	2.0	14.6	1.8	11.8	1.7	10.1
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	2.2	19.8	2.0	17.4	1.8	10.9
Too busy with other life priorities	2.8	30.6	2.9	32.4	3.0	35.2
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.3	17.7	2.0	14.3	1.7	10.0
Fear of the outdoors	2.0	13.4	1.8	10.0	1.7	11.1
Do not have anyone to go with	2.5	25.0	2.2	17.9	2.0	14.8
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.4	23.3	2.2	17.4	2.0	12.5
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.5	24.0	2.3	19.1	2.2	18.0
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.5	27.0	2.2	19.9	1.9	14.8
State Parks have too many rules	2.1	12.8	1.9	10.9	1.8	13.2

[1]Percent who said either 'Important' or 'Extremely Important'

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 84. Comparison by ethnicity/race – Constraints to state park visitation

Statement	White Mean	White %[1]	Black/ African American Mean	Black/ African American %	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino Mean	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino %	Asian/Pacific Islander Mean	Asian/Pacific Islander %	Mixed Race/Other Mean	Mixed Race/Other %
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.3	19.6	3.1	38.6	2.7	27.5	2.8	29.2	2.6	31.7
Fear of crime	2.2	20.1	2.9	38.6	2.8	37.5	2.7	33.3	2.1	15.9
Poor personal health	2.2	22.2	2.8	34.7	2.4	27.5	2.5	29.2	2.2	23.2
The State Parks are too far away	2.3	18.9	3.0	38.6	3.2	37.5	2.8	29.2	2.3	22.0
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.1	19.3	2.8	31.7	3.2	45.0	2.6	33.3	2.2	24.4
Lack of available public transportation	2.1	19.2	3.0	39.6	3.1	42.5	2.7	33.3	2.4	28.0
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.8	11.0	2.3	21.8	2.0	15.0	2.3	25.0	1.6	8.5
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.9	14.5	2.7	30.7	2.2	20.0	2.1	12.5	1.8	13.4
Too busy with other life priorities	2.9	30.9	3.0	36.6	2.9	35.0	3.3	58.3	2.7	29.3
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1.9	12.0	2.6	24.8	2.5	20.0	2.3	25.0	2.0	17.1
Fear of the outdoors	1.7	9.3	2.2	16.8	2.1	20.0	2.2	25.0	1.6	9.8
Do not have anyone to go with	2.2	17.6	2.7	34.7	2.2	17.5	2.8	37.5	2.1	19.5
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.1	15.3	2.8	33.7	2.5	25.0	2.6	37.5	2.1	19.5
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.3	18.0	2.8	28.7	2.7	30.0	2.8	33.3	2.2	20.7
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.2	19.5	2.7	31.7	2.2	27.5	2.5	25.0	2.1	19.5
State Parks have too many rules	1.9	10.4	2.5	19.8	2.1	10.0	2.2	16.7	1.8	6.1

[1]Percent who said either 'Important' or 'Extremely Important'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 85. Comparison by rural/urban – Constraints to state park visitation

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	Mean	%[2]	Mean	%
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.3	18.6	2.5	23.9
Fear of crime	2.2	20.3	2.3	24.8
Poor personal health	2.3	23.3	2.3	24.1
The State Parks are too far away	2.2	17.0	2.5	24.2
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.1	22.0	2.3	23.3
Lack of available public transportation	2.2	20.9	2.4	24.0
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.8	8.2	1.9	14.1
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.9	14.9	2.1	17.6
Too busy with other life priorities	2.9	30.9	2.9	33.5
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1.9	12.0	2.1	15.2
Fear of the outdoors	1.7	8.8	1.9	12.3
Do not have anyone to go with	2.1	17.4	2.3	20.7
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.2	18.3	2.3	19.0
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.3	20.0	2.4	21.0
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.2	21.0	2.3	21.5
State Parks have too many rules	1.9	10.7	2.0	12.0

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Important' or 'Extremely Important'

Place Attachment

People that are most attached to a place tend to want to have a voice in its management and be more engaged in decision making. Place attachment can be measured by a series of similar statements; in this study, respondents were asked to respond to nine statements regarding place attachment. First, respondents were asked to identify their most visited park, or primary park, and then were asked a series of statements regarding their place attachment to that area. Overall, respondents reported strong agreement with place attachment items relative to their primary park. Users were much more likely to agree or strongly agree to all items. Table 86 presents the descriptive results for place attachment, while Tables 87 through 92 present demographic comparisons across place attachment items.

- Notable majorities of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their primary park means a lot to them (77%), and that they depend on their primary park to do the type of recreation they want within a reasonable distance to where they live (60%).
- A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are attached to (57%) and identify strongly with their primary park (57%).
- Overwhelming majorities of older adults agreed or strongly agreed that their primary park meant a lot to them.
- Users were much more likely than former users to agree or strongly agree with all of the place attachment items. For example, 69% of users agreed or strongly agreed that they were very attached to their primary park, as compared to 37% of former users.

Overall Results for Place Attachment

Table 86. Place Attachment

Statement	Mean	Percent[2]				
		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	4.0	1.1	3.2	19.1	46.0	30.5
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.7	1.2	11.1	30.4	36.0	21.3
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.6	1.2	10.9	30.9	37.2	19.8
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.5	2.4	15.4	31.9	34.0	16.3
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	1.2	10.0	25.7	42.1	21.0
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.5	1.2	13.7	31.8	37.7	15.5
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.3	2.1	18.2	37.6	31.0	11.2
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.2	2.8	23.5	34.9	28.2	10.7
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.6	2.8	13.5	23.3	45.8	14.6

[1]Asked of those who reported visiting a state park in the past 12 months, or reported having ever visited a state park
[2]Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

Comparison by User and Former User

Table 87. Comparison by user and former user – Place attachment

Statement	User		Former User	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	4.2	83.3	3.7	63.8
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.9	69.2	3.2	37.2
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.9	67.1	3.3	38.1
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.7	61.0	3.1	31.3
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.9	68.7	3.5	51.4
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	57.9	3.3	44.7
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.4	44.4	3.2	36.1
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.3	41.2	3.1	32.6
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	67.3	3.3	49.9

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Age

Table 88. Comparison by age – Place attachment

Statement	18-24		25-34		35-50		51-64		65+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	3.7	63.2	4.0	74.4	4.1	78.8	4.1	80.0	4.1	78.8
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.3	44.4	3.7	52.8	3.8	63.2	3.7	60.6	3.6	57.5
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.2	39.3	3.6	54.9	3.8	61.5	3.7	61.9	3.6	55.9
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.2	42.7	3.6	53.3	3.6	56.4	3.5	51.0	3.3	43.0
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	59.8	3.8	65.6	3.8	66.0	3.7	65.3	3.6	58.1
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.5	52.1	3.6	52.8	3.6	56.7	3.5	51.2	3.4	50.3
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.2	39.3	3.3	40.5	3.4	47.0	3.3	41.6	3.3	40.6
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.3	44.4	3.2	35.9	3.3	40.8	3.2	41.6	3.1	36.3
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.4	47.0	3.5	57.4	3.6	64.0	3.6	64.1	3.5	60.5

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Gender

Table 89. Comparison by gender – Place attachment

Statement	Male		Female	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	4.0	75.2	4.1	77.8
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.6	57.4	3.7	57.2
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.6	57.3	3.6	56.7
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.4	49.3	3.5	51.4
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	61.6	3.8	64.5
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.5	55.3	3.5	51.2
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.3	42.6	3.3	41.8
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.2	40.2	3.2	37.6
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.5	58.9	3.6	61.7

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Income

Table 90. Comparison by income – Place attachment

Statement	$0 - $49,999		$50,000 - $99,999		$100,000+	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	4.0	76.0	4.1	78.1	4.0	77.9
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.7	60.0	3.7	57.1	3.6	54.6
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.7	58.5	3.7	58.2	3.6	56.9
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.5	52.1	3.5	52.2	3.4	47.0
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.8	67.0	3.7	62.2	3.6	62.3
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.6	56.9	3.6	54.3	3.4	47.1
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.4	47.0	3.3	42.1	3.2	36.6
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.3	42.0	3.2	37.8	3.1	36.1
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	64.5	3.5	59.1	3.5	60.4

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 91. Comparison by ethnicity/race – Place attachment

Statement	White		Black/ African American		Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino		Asian/ Pacific Islander		Mixed Race/Other	
	Mean	%[1]	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	4.1	77.6	3.8	66.7	4.0	78.6	3.9	73.9	4.2	85.9
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.7	58.3	3.4	48.6	3.7	60.7	3.5	52.2	3.7	62.0
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.6	57.5	3.5	52.8	3.5	53.6	3.8	60.9	3.7	60.6
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.5	50.3	3.2	41.7	3.5	53.6	3.4	52.2	3.5	52.1
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	63.9	3.5	56.9	3.5	50.0	3.7	65.2	3.7	63.4
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.5	53.4	3.4	50.0	3.4	53.6	3.6	56.5	3.3	43.7
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.3	42.5	3.2	41.7	3.3	46.4	3.3	39.1	3.2	40.8
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.2	39.8	3.0	31.9	3.1	32.1	3.5	47.8	3.3	46.5
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.6	60.9	3.5	54.2	3.6	60.7	3.6	65.2	3.6	66.2

[1]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'; Unweighted

Comparison by Rural/Urban Residence

Table 92. Comparison by rural/urban – Place attachment

Statement	Rural[1]		Urban	
	Mean	%[2]	Mean	%
(NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me	4.1	81.7	4.0	74.9
I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.8	61.7	3.6	56.2
I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.7	62.8	3.6	55.6
I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it	3.6	56.5	3.4	48.7
I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.8	65.6	3.7	62.3
I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.6	55.0	3.5	52.5
Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.4	44.7	3.3	41.3
I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)	3.3	41.4	3.2	38.0
I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live	3.7	65.4	3.5	59.1

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent who said either 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'

Telephone Open-Ended Responses

There were a number of questions asked in the telephone survey that were followed up by open-ended questions. For example, after answering a yes or no question about whether state parks provide benefits to nearby communities, respondents reporting yes were asked what these benefits were. Furthermore, at the end of the satisfaction questions, respondents were asked how their experience at state parks could be improved. Detailed results of these open-ended follow-ups can be found on pages 80 through 87.

Of the 1,650 respondents to receive the open-ended questions, 1,328 respondents answered Question 1 and 281 respondents answered Question 2. Responses were coded into major themes and sub-themes for each question. If necessary, responses were coded into multiple categories. The quotes presented for each theme are instrumental and have been intentionally selected due to their nature as good hallmarks for each sub-theme. For Question 1, only themes with 100 or more mentions are displayed in Table 93 and for question two, only subthemes with nine or more mentions are displayed in Table 94. In general, five to six quotes have been selected for each theme, except in the case of 5 or less responses. Major themes are emphasized in Tables 93 and 94 in **bold**, sub-themes are presented in *italics*. For question two, each major theme also has a *general* category which represent comments which fit the major theme, but did not directly relate to any of the sub-themes. Each quote starts on a new line in *italics*.

Does your local community benefit from state parks? If yes, what is the benefit?

There were nine major themes for Question 1: outdoor recreation/activities, economic benefit, enjoying nature, conservation/preservation, tourism, education, accessibility, and family time (Table 93). The most frequent major theme was outdoor recreation/activities (23%), followed by economic benefit (17%). Examples of a responses to outdoor recreation/activities are, "It gives people a chance to get into an area that is acceptable for them to do all types of different activities like kayaking, fishing, hunting and hiking; Activities that they would otherwise not be able to do; They provide a place for camping, hiking and other outdoor recreation. As well as a quiet and peaceful place to relax." Examples of economic benefits responses are, "Attract people to the community and improve economy and property values; They help our livelihood; Brings people into area helps local businesses

Table 93. Does your local community benefit from state parks? If yes, what is the benefit?

Themes	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Outdoor Rec/Activities	306	23.3%	*They provide a place for camping, hiking and other outdoor recreation. As well as a quiet and peaceful place to relax.*
			Fishing, swimming, hiking and camping areas. Also the availability of picnic areas.
			It gives people a chance to get into an area that is acceptable for them to do all types of different activities like kayaking, fishing, hunting and hiking. Activities that they would otherwise not be able to do.
			The benefits would be outdoor activities like fishing, canoeing, hiking, and horseback riding.
			Some of the benefits are biking, walking, fishing, canoeing, picnicking, and just enjoying the open space.
Economic Benefit	217	16.5%	*Brings people into area helps local businesses.*
			Local businesses benefit from the state parks such as food establishments, tackle shops, gas stations and swimming accessory stores.
			State parks provide outdoor activities, and they bring people in from all over Pennsylvania, and also from other states, which brings in money.
			State parks help the local economy, from the people who visit the parks.
			They help our livelihood.
			Attract people to the community and improve economy and property values.
			State parks provide employment opportunities for people in the communities where they're located. Also, they improve the economy of the neighborhoods that they're in, by bringing in tourism.

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 93. Continued. Does your local community benefit from state parks? If yes, what is the benefit?

Themes	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Enjoying Nature	199	15.1%	*The state parks provide natural surroundings to enjoy and get away from urbanization.* *Allowing for public to explore nature and "get away" from daily life and immerse one's self in nature.* *They provide a natural environment to experience wildlife, natural scenery, hiking, and a place to get away from cities.* *With the constant expansion of building into nature, parks give people a place to be out in nature.* *Place to escape the bustle of life, getting outdoors in a safe place.*
Conservation/ Preservation	136	10.4%	*Parks provide conservation of natural resources, habitat preservation, recreation, beauty and tranquility, and exercise.* *Protected natural habitat and wildlife for people to experience. Taking time to enjoy a park helps to reduce stress and make individuals care more about taking steps to be more environmentally friendly.* *They present untouched beauty to our communities that you don't see anywhere else.* *The prevention of expansion of housing development. It eliminates congestion. A reserve of what was pristine at one time.* *They help to protect the integrity of these public lands which then contributes to the overall state of surrounding land.* *Preserving wildlife and ALL the natural beauty that nature has to offer.*
Tourism	123	9.4%	*They draw tourists into the area and provides more business for the area businesses.* *They attract tourists. These remote areas are not otherwise visited and it brings more people to the area to spend money at the stores.* *Tourism. Getting more money into the community for the businesses and having natural resources for tourists to enjoy.* *State parks bring in tourists, who spend money in the communities where the parks are located.* *It brings more people into the area which can help the area financially.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 93. Continued. Does your local community benefit from state parks? If yes, what is the benefit?

Themes	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Education	111	8.5%	*Some of the state parks have classes on natural habitats and vegetation, which is a benefit.* *They provide educational and cultural learning experiences.* *I think a benefit of state parks to the communities is that state parks provide a means of education about nature.* *The exposure you can give to children in school and the education in general for the public.* *I think state parks provide the local communities a place to learn about nature.* *Places to learn more about communities we live in.*
Accessibility	101	7.7%	*It gives everyone regardless of income a nice place to relax and enjoy nature.* *Some of the state parks are close to where I live. It makes it easier to visit, because I don't have to travel too much.* *A place for people who don't own land, to enjoy land. Some of the benefits when visiting those parks would be things like hiking, biking, and fishing.* *A convenient way to enjoy nature without a lot of cost involved.* *It is a place for people to go to be with nature. It gives people the chance to exercise and go camping in nature when they may not have the opportunity without a state park that is close.*
Family Time	100	7.6%	*A good place for families to go and enjoy the outdoors.* *Bring families to the parks for get together, picnics, and gatherings.* *They offer a family friendly place to do a variety of outdoor recreation activities, like fishing, camping, picnicking and swimming.* *State parks provide inexpensive family entertainment.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

How could your experience at state parks be improved?

There were three major themes for Question 2: infrastructure improvements/maintenance, system wide management, and system wide issues (Table 94). The most frequent theme for Question 2 was infrastructure improvements/maintenance (49%), followed by system wide management (23%). Infrastructure improvements/maintenance had five subthemes including restrooms, cleanliness/waste management, and signage. Examples of responses coded as being related to infrastructure improvements are, "Modernizing the infrastructure. Making it more eco-friendly; They need more camping sites." There were four sub-themes related to system wide management including funding/fees, advertising, education, and more activities. Examples of responses coded as being related to system wide management are, "Give appropriate funding so they can better operate, maintain and expand; The State Parks could do a better job of providing information to people about park activities and what projects they are working on to improve the park; Add additional programs for education and get involved at local schools." There were 14 subthemes related to system wide issues including law enforcement, safety, and staff. Examples of responses coded as being related to system wide issues include, "More staff on duty and patrol off beaten path; Being responsive, and safer for on foot travel; I would like to see more park rangers available, to help people find out what activities or programs are available at the parks."

Table 94. How could your experience at state parks be improved?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Infrastructure Improvements/ Maintenance			
General[2]	38	13.5%	*Modernizing the infrastructure. Making it more eco-friendly.* *They need more camping sites.* *Pave the walkways. It would mean less mud when it rains.* *Fix up areas that have fallen into disrepair.* *More good beaches and boat launches.*
Restrooms	12	4.2%	*I would like to see the state parks having working bathrooms.* *They could add more bathrooms at the state parks.* *They should maintain the bathrooms and keep them clean.* *Make more high tech bathrooms.* *More restroom facilities.*
Cleanliness/Waste Management	31	10.9%	*I think they should put more trash cans out for people so they would utilize them instead of throwing garbage on the ground.* *I wish they had recycling available.* *I would enjoy more cleanliness in my State Park.* *Have community clean ups. Have stricter consequences for littering, and have employees actively looking for people littering.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.
[2]A general category is shown for each major theme to represent quotes which did not categorize into specific sub-codes.

Table 94. Continued. How could your experience at state parks be improved?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Trails	13	4.6%	*They need to do more trail maintenance.* *I would like to see the nature trails better maintained.* *A bit more trail maintenance. I know this year is an exception with the winter storm damage, but in general.* *Keep overgrown trails trimmed back.* *I believe they need to put money into improving the trails.*
Signage	8	2.8%	*Mark trails more clearly and look at trails more closely to make hikers aware of any new dangers.* *Better signage. When new, had difficulty finding areas/things I wanted to do. First time I went couldn't find access to walking trails, water features.* *I think they need to identify the state parks better with signs and information so I can identify them.* *Make signs easily visible from trails or roads so you can give other people easy directions to also join us there.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 94. Continued. How could your experience at state parks be improved?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
System Wide Management			
General[2]	3	1.1%	*Do not get Wi-Fi hotspots; I am in nature to enjoy nature, not post to Facebook.* *I'd like to see more state parks in general.*
Funding/Fees	17	5.9%	*Give appropriate funding so they can better operate, maintain and expand.* *Devote more resources and money to them each year.* *Make all the activities free.* *I think people from out-of-state should be charged a fee for using our State parks.*
Advertising	11	3.9%	*The State Parks could do a better job of providing information to people about park activities and what projects they are working on to improve the park.* *I would like to receive mailings from state parks as to what they offer. I do not do the internet.* *I would like to see more promotions and advertisements, for the parks.* *Communicate to people better, about what park activities are available.*
Education/ Interpretation	19	6.8%	*Implement more education opportunities that focus on conservation and sustainability of the local resources, habitat, and wildlife.* *Add additional programs for education and get involved at local schools.* *Have more educational programs about local history and wildlife.* *I think we need to target our youth to get them interested in the parks by providing more active and educational programs.* *Scenic overlooks should have maps in Plexiglas showing how many miles away you can see based on some landmark within your view.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

[2]A general category is shown for each major theme to represent quotes which did not categorize into specific sub-codes.

Table 94. Continued. How could your experience at state parks be improved?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
More Activities	29	10.1%	*Add more recreational activities, also casual dining.* *Offer more things to do.* *They could build more recreational things like, baseball fields, playgrounds for kids, and bicycle trails.* *Make an effort to make it more of an experience to be there.* *More guided tours.* *They should still provide free water experiences for canoes and kayaks.*
System Wide Issues			
General[2]	6	2.1%	*The parks just need to be managed better.* *Reserve more of the natural habitat for people to enjoy under specific rules, instead of making man made places inside the park.* *Ban smoking.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

[2]A general category is shown for each major theme to represent quotes which did not categorize into specific sub-codes.

Table 94. Continued. How could your experience at state parks be improved?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Law Enforcement/Safety	24	8.5%	*The state parks need to crack down on drug and alcohol use.* *More staff on duty and patrol off beaten path.* *More security against people causing trouble and drinking.* *I haven't been camping at state parks in a while, but at the time we did go, a lack of late night security was an issue. I'm assuming it has been fixed by now, but I'm not sure.*
Staff	28	9.8%	*I think the state parks should provide more funding so they can employ more park rangers.* *We need to hire more people to keep up with the maintaining of our state parks.* *I would like to see more park rangers available, to help people find out what activities or programs are available at the parks.* *They need more full time employees. I was a ranger there and they need more employees. Their employees are spread too thin when the campgrounds are really full, especially on holidays. They need more maintenance, Park rangers, seasonal employees. They need to keep the seasonal workers after they are trained.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

This concludes section 2, results of the telephone survey. In the following pages, results of the online ethnic minority panel will be presented. While the telephone survey was designed to be representative of the Pennsylvania population, the ethnic minority panel was designed to get input from specific populations throughout the state. Throughout the following section, results of each theme are presented within the race/ethnicity stratification.

Section 3: Ethnic Minority Panel Online Survey Results

Should We Change the Current Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks?

The ethnic minority panel survey looked at the current recreational opportunities, as well as whether or not visitors felt that they should change these opportunities in state parks. Overall, ethnic minority panel respondents overwhelmingly support the mission of the state parks regarding healthful outdoor recreation activities, as well as the importance of managing for a quiet, natural, and wild experience. There additionally was majority support for vacation packages and splash playgrounds. Tables 95 through 99 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- With regard to the ethnicity panel, people of all races support an emphasis on healthful recreation and the desire to experience a quiet and natural environment.
- Support for experiencing a quiet and natural environment was highest among older adults.
- Among all races and ages, there was consistent majority support for adventure recreation activities. Below age 50, an overwhelming majority expressed support for adventure recreation activities.
- There was intermittent majority support for "non-traditional" state park opportunities including travel and vacation packages and splash playgrounds; Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents of all ages displayed stronger interest in these activities. With the exception of Mixed Race/Other respondents, support was typically higher among females as compared to males.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 95. Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.11 (81.0)	3.81 (66.0)	4.03 (76.3)	3.89 (70.1)	3.81 (67.7)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.99 (75.4)	3.69 (59.0)	3.81 (65.5)	3.94 (74.5)	3.74 (65.8)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities[3]	3.67 (60.7)	3.77 (63.2)	3.86 (68.6)	3.78 (64.8)	3.55 (50.5)
Travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	3.53 (55.2)	3.74 (60.5)	3.77 (64.7)	3.65 (56.3)	3.44 (48.7)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.39 (48.1)	3.52 (52.7)	3.69 (64.1)	3.53 (52.4)	3.42 (46.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'
[3]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

One of the aims of this study was to understand how minorities of different age groups feel about a variety of topics. So, age group comparisons were conducted within race and race comparisons within age groups. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above. A complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B. A complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 96. Comparison by gender - Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=273	Female N=986	Male N=301	Female N=101	Male N=51	Female N=33	Male N=67	Female N=24	Male N=114	Female N=37
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.03 (78.0)	4.14 (81.9)	3.76 (63.8)	3.97 (73.3)	3.96 (73.2)	4.13 (80.8)	3.84 (67.0)	4.13 (80.0)	3.76 (67.1)	3.80 (66.1)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.09 (80.2)	3.98 (74.3)	3.65 (58.2)	3.80 (60.8)	3.78 (65.3)	3.86 (66.5)	3.87 (71.3)	4.27 (86.7)	3.75 (66.7)	3.71 (64.3)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities[3]	3.66 (56.8)	3.68 (62.3)	3.73 (61.8)	3.87 (68.0)	3.84 (67.9)	3.89 (69.6)	3.71 (62.4)	3.97 (70.0)	3.46 (48.0)	3.63 (53.6)
Travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	3.40 (49.5)	3.57 (57.1)	3.70 (59.0)	3.88 (64.4)	3.69 (61.8)	3.87 (68.0)	3.60 (55.4)	3.93 (69.0)	3.34 (43.0)	3.54 (50.0)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.24 (40.3)	3.44 (50.5)	3.47 (50.3)	3.69 (60.2)	3.59 (59.4)	3.80 (69.4)	3.44 (46.5)	3.90 (73.3)	3.45 (48.8)	3.30 (39.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'
[3]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 97. Comparison by income - Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=571	High N=624	Low N=232	High N=151	Low N=177	High N=152	Low N-47	High N=75	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.10 (77.9)	4.14 (84.5)	3.77 (65.1)	3.93 (71.5)	3.95 (71.8)	4.14 (82.2)	3.87 (68.1)	3.92 (69.3)	3.70 (65.8)	3.92 (72.6)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.99 (74.3)	4.03 (77.8)	3.65 (57.3)	3.79 (64.3)	3.73 (63.4)	3.92 (71.0)	4.00 (78.7)	3.91 (69.7)	3.61 (62.0)	3.92 (72.6)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities[4]	3.67 (60.5)	3.68 (62.3)	3.68 (59.4)	3.92 (71.1)	3.80 (67.0)	3.88 (69.3)	3.89 (72.3)	3.70 (59.2)	3.48 (51.7)	3.52 (47.1)
Travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	3.53 (54.8)	3.55 (57.0)	3.71 (59.6)	3.81 (64.2)	3.69 (60.8)	3.83 (69.5)	3.77 (61.7)	3.60 (54.7)	3.41 (46.3)	3.54 (52.9)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.44 (47.9)	3.39 (49.9)	3.48 (51.9)	3.58 (54.9)	3.63 (62.9)	3.75 (64.9)	3.68 (55.3)	3.46 (51.3)	3.37 (46.3)	3.48 (48.2)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'
[4]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 98. Comparison by rural/urban - Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=343	Urban N=909	Rural N=12	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=322	Rural N=8	Urban N=121	Rural N=30	Urban N=195
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.17 (83.7)	4.09 (80.1)	3.75 (66.7)	3.82 (66.1)	4.23 (85.7)	4.02 (75.5)	3.25 (50.0)	3.96 (71.9)	3.73 (63.3)	3.80 (68.2)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.08 (78.7)	3.97 (74.5)	3.69 (53.8)	3.70 (59.3)	4.21 (76.5)	3.77 (64.5)	2.75 (37.5)	4.05 (77.9)	3.73 (63.3)	3.74 (66.7)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities[4]	3.69 (63.2)	3.66 (60.0)	3.62 (61.5)	3.77 (63.4)	4.00 (74.3)	3.84 (67.6)	3.63 (62.5)	3.80 (64.8)	3.30 (40.0)	3.53 (50.3)
Travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	3.49 (53.2)	3.54 (56.2)	3.83 (66.7)	3.74 (60.4)	3.85 (64.7)	3.76 (64.5)	3.38 (50.0)	3.70 (59.5)	3.20 (36.7)	3.41 (45.4)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.46 (51.2)	3.37 (47.1)	3.25 (50.0)	3.53 (52.7)	3.97 (71.4)	3.66 (63.4)	2.88 (37.5)	3.58 (54.1)	3.33 (33.3)	3.41 (47.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'
[4]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

Comparison by User/Non User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 99. Comparison by user/non-user - Should we change the current outdoor recreation opportunities in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=579	Non N=685	User N=82	Non N=321	User N=113	Non N=251	User N=42	Non N=89	User N=80	Non N=151
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.21 (85.7)	4.04 (77.1)	4.06 (75.6)	3.75 (63.6)	4.19 (80.5)	3.97 (74.9)	3.86 (66.7)	3.94 (71.9)	3.99 (73.8)	3.68 (63.6)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.07 (79.5)	3.93 (72.0)	3.98 (74.7)	3.62 (54.9)	4.06 (75.0)	3.71 (61.7)	4.10 (78.6)	3.90 (73.3)	3.91 (73.8)	3.64 (61.8)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities[4]	3.75 (66.6)	3.60 (56.1)	4.05 (79.0)	3.69 (59.3)	3.98 (75.0)	3.80 (65.7)	3.83 (69.0)	3.76 (62.2)	3.64 (56.3)	3.43 (45.4)
Travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	3.58 (58.1)	3.49 (53.2)	4.11 (78.0)	3.65 (56.0)	3.97 (73.5)	3.67 (60.7)	3.76 (61.9)	3.63 (56.2)	3.54 (53.1)	3.32 (40.1)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.42 (51.1)	3.37 (45.7)	3.77 (64.6)	3.46 (49.7)	3.85 (69.0)	3.62 (61.8)	3.69 (61.9)	3.48 (48.9)	3.44 (45.7)	3.38 (45.4)

[1] Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2] For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3] Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'
[4] Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

Should We Enhance Existing Overnight Accommodations?

The ethnicity panel looked at the existing overnight accommodations as well as whether or not visitors felt that they should enhance these accommodations in state parks. Tables 100 through 104 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- With a few exceptions, there was generally majority support across demographics for adding more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites.
- Among respondents over age 25 of all races/ethnicities, there was majority support for the development of a few more inns in carefully selected locations.
- Respondents as a whole were less interested in larger multi-family cabins, although majority support was seen among Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents ages 25-34 (55% and 50% agreed or strongly agreed, respectively).
- Inclusion of a central all-purpose social hall was particularly popular among young Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents, with majorities in each of these groups reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'. Overall, Whites and Mixed Race/Other appeared less interested in a social hall than other race/ethnicity groups.
- Within all races, users were slightly more interested in enhancing all existing overnight accommodations than non-users.
- Overall, White and Mixed Race/Other respondents were generally less supportive of enhancing existing overnight accommodations than Black/African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents, who were more interested in the development of inns in selected locations, large, multi-family cabins, and central social halls.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 100. Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.52 (52.0)	3.62 (56.4)	3.64 (56.2)	3.70 (60.0)	3.31 (44.4)
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.38 (47.6)	3.55 (51.6)	3.60 (56.1)	3.53 (52.4)	3.35 (44.9)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.27 (42.1)	3.45 (48.6)	3.43 (50.1)	3.37 (42.8)	3.20 (37.8)
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.25 (39.5)	3.48 (48.8)	3.47 (48.5)	3.52 (52.1)	3.26 (37.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

As previously mentioned, a complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B and a complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 101. Comparison by gender - Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=300	Female N=103	Male N=192	Female N=173	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=170	Female N=56
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.49 (50.0)	3.53 (52.7)	3.56 (53.0)	3.80 (67.0)	3.61 (55.2)	3.68 (57.8)	3.71 (61.4)	3.77 (60.0)	3.29 (41.2)	3.41 (51.8)
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.36 (48.7)	3.39 (47.7)	3.46 (48.5)	3.80 (60.2)	3.60 (57.1)	3.61 (54.9)	3.46 (51.5)	3.87 (60.0)	3.28 (40.4)	3.39 (46.4)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.09 (36.5)	3.32 (43.8)	3.34 (44.7)	3.76 (60.8)	3.38 (48.2)	3.50 (52.6)	3.31 (37.6)	3.40 (46.7)	3.10 (34.5)	3.43 (48.2)
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.25 (38.7)	3.26 (39.7)	3.46 (47.4)	3.53 (52.4)	3.50 (51.3)	3.45 (45.7)	3.44 (46.5)	3.83 (69.0)	3.27 (39.1)	3.20 (32.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 102. Comparison by income - Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=568	High N=623	Low N=235	High N=151	Low N=177	High N=155	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=121	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.53 (53.3)	3.53 (52.3)	3.60 (56.2)	3.65 (58.3)	3.59 (55.9)	3.63 (54.8)	3.70 (59.6)	3.72 (61.8)	3.20 (39.7)	3.50 (48.8)
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.37 (46.5)	3.41 (50.2)	3.53 (51.1)	3.62 (55.9)	3.57 (52.3)	3.55 (56.8)	3.51 (53.2)	3.54 (51.3)	3.20 (40.0)	3.51 (49.4)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.31 (44.4)	3.24 (40.7)	3.36 (47.0)	3.58 (52.6)	3.35 (46.6)	3.52 (54.2)	3.36 (42.6)	3.33 (39.5)	3.01 (30.5)	3.39 (46.4)
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.28 (40.5)	3.24 (40.4)	3.39 (43.8)	3.65 (58.2)	3.47 (48.3)	3.43 (48.4)	3.49 (51.1)	3.50 (50.0)	3.21 (38.0)	3.23 (32.9)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 103. Comparison by rural/urban - Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=343	Urban N=905	Rural N=12	Urban N=385	Rural N=35	Urban N=325	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=195
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.53 (53.6)	3.52 (51.3)	3.92 (66.7)	3.60 (55.8)	3.83 (62.9)	3.63 (56.0)	3.13 (37.5)	3.77 (63.1)	3.27 (40.0)	3.32 (43.6)
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.34 (45.9)	3.39 (48.6)	3.31 (46.2)	3.56 (51.9)	3.71 (60.0)	3.58 (55.2)	2.63 (12.5)	3.61 (56.6)	2.77 (16.7)	3.38 (46.2)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.39 (49.4)	3.22 (39.6)	3.33 (41.7)	3.45 (48.7)	3.46 (51.4)	3.44 (50.3)	3.00 (25.0)	3.37 (41.8)	3.07 (33.3)	3.20 (38.5)
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.23 (37.7)	3.26 (40.2)	3.38 (46.2)	3.49 (49.0)	3.49 (40.0)	3.47 (49.7)	3.43 (57.1)	3.54 (51.6)	3.21 (34.5)	3.25 (37.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 104. Comparison by user/non-user - Should we enhance existing overnight accommodations?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=579	Non N=685	User N=82	Non N=321	User N=113	Non N=251	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=151
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.53 (53.6)	3.51 (50.8)	4.02 (76.5)	3.52 (51.4)	3.73 (58.4)	3.60 (55.5)	3.88 (73.8)	3.66 (55.6)	3.39 (45.0)	3.28 (42.4)
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.34 (47.9)	3.41 (47.7)	3.80 (67.1)	3.48 (47.7)	3.61 (61.9)	3.59 (53.4)	3.60 (54.8)	3.53 (53.3)	3.26 (45.0)	3.33 (40.8)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.30 (44.9)	3.24 (39.9)	3.63 (62.2)	3.40 (45.2)	3.41 (50.4)	3.45 (50.2)	3.31 (45.2)	3.36 (37.8)	3.21 (42.9)	3.16 (34.9)
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.25 (41.0)	3.25 (38.3)	3.53 (53.0)	3.47 (47.7)	3.58 (47.8)	3.43 (49.0)	3.67 (59.5)	3.46 (48.3)	3.33 (40.0)	3.21 (35.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

How Should We Pay for Our Parks?

Participants were asked how they felt about a variety of funding related issues. Across all demographic groups, there was support for increasing the allocation of commonwealth funding for the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects. Across all groups there was less agreement with the institution of a new annual/entrance fee. Additionally, there was broad disagreement with the leasing of select park areas to private businesses or non-profit organizations. Tables 105 through 109 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- Across race/ethnicity, there was majority support for the allocation of additional funding from the commonwealth to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects. Among respondents of all races, support appeared to increase with age with overwhelming majorities reporting agree or strongly agree. Asian/Pacific Islander respondents from rural communities were the exception to this trend, as only 25% agreed or strongly agreed that the commonwealth should allocate additional funding.
- Moreover, support for additional commonwealth funding was higher among users than non-users.
- Fewer respondents expressed agreement with the institution of new annual/entrance fees, closing facilities that are expensive to operate or maintain, and the leasing of state park facilities to private businesses or non-profit organizations. Disagreement to these funding strategies was strongest among White and Mixed Race/Other respondents. Female Asian/Pacific Islander respondents did express majority agreement with these actions.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 105. How should we pay for our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.64 (55.0)	3.59 (53.8)	3.58 (52.3)	3.70 (60.7)	3.55 (52.8)
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.78 (27.0)	3.05 (33.1)	2.96 (33.2)	3.02 (34.5)	2.65 (24.0)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.86 (22.8)	3.06 (31.0)	2.99 (28.5)	3.23 (42.8)	2.82 (23.1)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.80 (27.0)	3.09 (34.6)	3.02 (31.9)	3.23 (42.4)	2.81 (27.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

As previously mentioned, a complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B and a complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 106. Comparison by gender - How should we pay for our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=982	Male N=301	Female N=103	Male N=192	Female N=172	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=170	Female N=56
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.63 (54.4)	3.65 (55.4)	3.56 (54.2)	3.67 (53.4)	3.63 (55.7)	3.52 (48.3)	3.64 (56.4)	3.97 (80.0)	3.55 (52.4)	3.42 (43.6)
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.93 (32.8)	2.73 (25.3)	2.98 (31.4)	3.24 (38.5)	3.00 (35.6)	2.93 (30.5)	2.99 (30.7)	3.27 (53.3)	2.67 (23.7)	2.70 (25.0)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	3.10 (32.0)	2.79 (20.5)	3.02 (30.0)	3.16 (33.0)	3.07 (35.6)	2.90 (20.8)	3.23 (43.6)	3.50 (53.3)	2.80 (22.2)	2.83 (20.4)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.77 (27.0)	2.82 (27.1)	3.03 (32.7)	3.29 (40.4)	3.01 (31.8)	3.03 (32.4)	3.15 (38.0)	3.60 (60.0)	2.80 (26.9)	2.84 (26.8)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 107. Comparison by income - How should we pay for our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=569	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=176	High N=156	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.66 (55.4)	3.66 (57.3)	3.55 (54.5)	3.67 (55.3)	3.50 (49.4)	3.67 (57.1)	3.74 (63.8)	3.74 (61.8)	3.41 (50.0)	3.75 (56.0)
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.77 (25.9)	2.80 (29.5)	3.00 (31.5)	3.15 (37.3)	2.81 (29.5)	3.03 (35.9)	2.98 (34.0)	3.11 (36.8)	2.60 (22.3)	2.80 (26.5)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.83 (20.7)	2.90 (25.8)	2.99 (28.5)	3.19 (37.5)	2.90 (23.9)	3.01 (31.0)	3.11 (38.3)	3.39 (51.3)	2.80 (21.5)	2.76 (20.2)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.79 (27.4)	2.82 (27.6)	2.06 (31.4)	3.16 (42.5)	2.98 (31.1)	2.98 (31.6)	3.11 (41.3)	3.37 (46.1)	2.74 (24.8)	2.93 (33.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 108. Comparison by rural/urban - How should we pay for our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=341	Urban N=908	Rural N=12	Urban N=386	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.59 (51.9)	3.67 (56.4)	3.25 (50.0)	3.60 (54.1)	3.74 (54.3)	3.56 (52.2)	2.88 (25.0)	3.78 (64.8)	3.53 (53.3)	3.54 (50.5)
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.75 (25.8)	2.79 (27.2)	3.17 (41.7)	3.05 (32.9)	2.71 (20.0)	2.99 (34.5)	2.88 (37.5)	3.08 (36.1)	2.37 (23.3)	2.71 (24.7)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.88 (23.7)	2.85 (22.6)	3.42 (50.0)	3.05 (30.7)	3.00 (22.9)	2.99 (29.3)	3.38 (50.0)	3.29 (45.9)	2.90 (20.0)	2.78 (22.2)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.74 (25.5)	2.83 (27.6)	3.31 (46.2)	3.10 (34.8)	2.77 (25.7)	3.04 (32.3)	3.29 (28.6)	3.26 (44.3)	2.50 (23.3)	2.85 (27.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 109. Comparison by user/non-user - How should we pay for our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=576	Non N=685	User N=80	Non N=325	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=151
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	3.68 (58.5)	3.61 (52.3)	3.78 (68.8)	3.54 (50.2)	3.80 (60.2)	3.48 (48.6)	3.79 (69.0)	3.69 (58.9)	3.73 (60.0)	3.43 (46.0)
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.62 (26.1)	2.91 (27.6)	3.08 (38.6)	3.04 (31.7)	2.99 (38.1)	2.95 (31.1)	3.14 (40.5)	3.01 (33.3)	2.66 (24.1)	2.67 (23.8)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.81 (23.2)	2.90 (22.7)	2.98 (34.1)	3.08 (30.2)	2.87 (25.7)	3.05 (30.0)	3.33 (54.8)	3.27 (41.1)	2.78 (23.5)	2.82 (20.8)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.71 (25.1)	2.88 (28.7)	3.10 (37.3)	3.09 (33.8)	3.01 (38.1)	3.02 (29.5)	3.29 (46.3)	3.22 (41.1)	2.79 (28.7)	2.80 (25.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

How Should We Protect Our Parks?

Respondents were asked about a variety of strategies to protect state parks. All items concerning the protection of state parks were rated favorably among the ethnic minority panel. Tables 110 through 114 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- Support for management actions relative to protecting state parks was overwhelmingly strong and support generally appeared to increase with age.
- In general, respondents were especially supportive of improving water quality in streams and lakes, the continuation of land acquisition, enlarging the boundaries of some state parks, and devoting more staffing and funding to resource management and protection of cultural resources.
- Fewer respondents agreed with the statement, "there is no need to acquire more land for the state park system." However, among female Asian/Pacific Islander respondents, there was majority agreement (57% agreed or strongly agreed) to this statement.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 110. How should we protect our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.82 (67.6)	3.78 (65.3)	3.88 (70.3)	3.88 (70.1)	3.74 (61.7)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.77 (63.8)	3.66 (60.5)	3.74 (64.0)	3.77 (66.2)	3.59 (58.4)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.69 (58.2)	3.63 (57.4)	3.73 (62.3)	3.74 (65.3)	3.58 (55.4)
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks[2]	3.75 (61.6)	3.51 (50.9)	3.75 (61.4)	3.66 (62.8)	3.65 (54.6)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.75 (63.7)	3.67 (59.3)	3.78 (66.9)	3.77 (64.8)	3.60 (56.9)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.54 (54.5)	3.43 (47.0)	3.48 (50.8)	3.62 (59.0)	3.44 (49.0)
There is no need to acquire more land for the state park system	2.63 (19.4)	3.03 (30.5)	2.81 (24.9)	2.96 (25.7)	2.66 (21.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Was "Parks should continue its strategic land acquisition program" in 2017 in-park and online survey.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

As previously mentioned, a complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B and a complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 111. Comparison by gender - How should we protect our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=273	Female N=981	Male N=302	Female N=103	Male N=192	Female N=173	Male N=101	Female N=29	Male N=171	Female N=56
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.73 (61.9)	3.85 (69.5)	3.75 (63.9)	3.86 (68.9)	3.85 (70.8)	3.94 (70.5)	3.79 (66.3)	4.24 (86.2)	3.71 (61.4)	3.71 (57.1)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.62 (54.6)	3.82 (66.5)	3.60 (58.1)	3.85 (67.0)	3.67 (62.6)	3.84 (66.3)	3.69 (64.4)	4.00 (66.7)	3.59 (58.7)	3.55 (55.4)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.65 (55.5)	3.71 (59.5)	3.60 (57.0)	3.73 (59.2)	3.70 (59.9)	3.80 (66.5)	3.69 (62.0)	3.90 (76.7)	3.53 (54.7)	3.56 (47.3)
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks[2]	3.65 (57.5)	3.78 (63.1)	3.45 (49.5)	3.69 (55.4)	3.71 (60.4)	3.81 (63.0)	3.62 (62.4)	3.80 (63.3)	3.61 (54.4)	3.61 (53.6)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.64 (57.7)	3.78 (65.5)	3.62 (58.2)	3.82 (63.4)	3.68 (62.3)	3.91 (72.3)	3.68 (60.4)	4.03 (76.7)	3.55 (54.4)	3.71 (62.5)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.63 (57.3)	3.52 (53.9)	3.42 (47.2)	3.47 (47.1)	3.53 (55.6)	3.46 (46.8)	3.55 (57.0)	3.87 (66.7)	3.42 (49.1)	3.45 (50.0)
There is no need to acquire more land for the state park system	2.75 (27.7)	2.59 (17.0)	3.00 (29.4)	3.10 (34.0)	2.89 (28.6)	2.73 (21.5)	3.89 (20.0)	3.53 (56.7)	2.69 (20.6)	2.66 (21.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 112. Comparison by income - How should we protect our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=568	High N=622	Low N=236	High N=151	Low N=177	High N=155	Low N=47	High N=75	Low N=120	High N=85
M=Mean	M (%[4])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.82 (66.9)	3.83 (69.0)	3.74 (64.4)	3.88 (69.5)	3.87 (70.6)	3.86 (69.7)	3.91 (74.5)	3.85 (66.7)	3.63 (56.7)	3.89 (69.4)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.79 (64.5)	3.77 (63.8)	3.67 (60.1)	3.71 (64.1)	3.70 (62.6)	3.73 (61.9)	3.81 (63.8)	3.72 (64.5)	3.53 (62.0)	3.69 (56.5)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.70 (59.5)	3.67 (57.2)	3.54 (54.2)	3.80 (64.7)	3.69 (61.6)	3.72 (61.0)	3.80 (71.7)	3.71 (61.8)	3.46 (49.2)	3.71 (60.7)
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks[3]	3.76 (61.3)	3.76 (63.0)	3.44 (48.7)	3.65 (56.6)	3.69 (59.9)	3.86 (65.8)	3.74 (68.1)	3.58 (57.9)	3.48 (51.2)	3.90 (60.7)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.79 (64.7)	3.75 (64.1)	3.59 (57.9)	3.80 (63.4)	3.76 (64.4)	3.79 (69.5)	3.91 (70.2)	3.67 (60.5)	3.53 (55.0)	3.76 (61.9)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.55 (53.2)	3.56 (57.0)	3.39 (46.6)	3.54 (51.0)	3.41 (47.5)	3.57 (55.0)	3.55 (57.4)	3.68 (61.3)	3.38 (49.6)	3.64 (52.4)
There is no need to acquire more land for the state park system	2.61 (19.3)	2.65 (20.5)	2.99 (30.3)	3.07 (32.2)	2.82 (26.1)	2.66 (20.0)	3.13 (31.9)	2.97 (25.3)	2.64 (21.7)	2.60 (17.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey
[4]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 113. Comparison by rural/urban - How should we protect our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[3] N=341	Urban N=906	Rural N=13	Urban N=386	Rural N=35	Urban N=325	Rural N=8	Urban N=121	Rural N=30	Urban N=195
M=Mean	M (%[4])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.83 (66.3)	3.82 (68.2)	3.69 (69.2)	3.79 (65.3)	3.80 (71.4)	3.90 (70.5)	2.88 (37.5)	3.96 (73.6)	3.80 (63.3)	3.71 (60.5)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.76 (64.2)	3.78 (63.7)	3.42 (58.3)	3.67 (60.6)	3.97 (74.3)	3.72 (63.0)	3.00 (50.0)	3.82 (66.4)	3.60 (53.3)	3.59 (59.2)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.65 (54.8)	3.71 (59.9)	3.54 (69.2)	3.63 (57.0)	3.77 (62.9)	3.74 (62.7)	3.14 (42.9)	3.78 (67.2)	3.59 (51.7)	3.54 (53.4)
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks[3]	3.72 (61.2)	3.76 (61.9)	3.50 (58.3)	3.52 (51.0)	3.91 (65.7)	3.75 (61.8)	3.63 (62.5)	3.66 (63.1)	3.77 (60.0)	3.60 (54.4)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.75 (62.9)	3.76 (64.3)	4.08 (83.3)	3.66 (58.6)	4.00 (77.1)	3.76 (65.7)	3.00 (37.5)	3.82 (66.4)	3.47 (50.0)	3.63 (58.0)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.54 (55.3)	3.55 (54.4)	3.67 (66.7)	3.43 (46.6)	3.86 (62.9)	3.44 (49.5)	2.25 (25.0)	3.71 (61.2)	3.17 (33.3)	3.45 (50.8)
There is no need to acquire more land for the state park system	2.63 (18.7)	2.62 (19.6)	3.15 (53.8)	3.02 (29.7)	2.83 (25.7)	2.80 (25.0)	3.13 (37.5)	3.04 (28.1)	2.31 (13.8)	2.69 (20.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey
[4]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 114. Comparison by user/non-user - How should we protect our parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=325	User N=113	Non N=254	User N=42	Non N=89	User N=80	Non N=152
M=Mean	M (%[4])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	3.88 (71.8)	3.78 (64.3)	4.15 (81.5)	3.69 (61.2)	4.07 (77.0)	3.81 (67.7)	3.93 (71.4)	3.88 (70.8)	3.90 (67.5)	3.63 (57.2)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.83 (66.1)	3.73 (62.0)	3.92 (78.3)	3.60 (55.9)	3.79 (66.4)	3.73 (63.3)	3.79 (66.7)	3.77 (64.4)	3.75 (67.9)	3.51 (53.3)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.73 (61.5)	3.65 (55.7)	3.94 (73.8)	3.56 (53.4)	3.94 (72.6)	3.65 (58.5)	3.85 (70.7)	3.69 (63.3)	3.86 (66.7)	3.38 (45.7)
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks[3]	3.82 (66.8)	3.69 (57.4)	3.95 (70.7)	3.39 (45.8)	3.98 (74.3)	3.65 (55.9)	3.69 (61.9)	3.66 (63.3)	3.95 (68.8)	3.45 (46.7)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.82 (67.7)	3.70 (60.6)	3.91 (70.7)	3.60 (56.4)	3.87 (70.8)	3.74 (65.2)	3.88 (69.0)	3.71 (62.2)	3.82 (64.6)	3.48 (52.3)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.55 (56.5)	3.54 (52.9)	3.63 (56.1)	3.38 (44.7)	3.76 (64.0)	3.37 (45.6)	3.74 (69.0)	3.56 (53.9)	3.60 (57.5)	3.32 (44.1)
There is no need to acquire more land for the state park system	2.55 (18.7)	2.69 (20.0)	3.15 (36.6)	3.00 (28.9)	2.63 (24.1)	2.89 (25.6)	3.14 (31.0)	2.99 (27.0)	2.63 (23.8)	2.70 (18.5)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.

[3]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

[4]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Should We Provide More Modern Conveniences in State Parks?

Respondents were asked about their interest in a variety of modern conveniences in state parks. Overall, ethnic minority groups appeared more interested in modern conveniences. Tables 115 through 119 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- In general, Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents were more interested than White and Mixed Race/Other respondents in more modern conveniences in State Park (enhancement of kitchen amenities, air conditioning in modern cabins, and internet access).
- Among all race/ethnicity groups, there was majority support for having air conditioning in some modern cabins.
- Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents all displayed majority support for enhancing kitchen amenities, having air conditioning in some modern cabins, and state parks offering internet access to visitors.
- Across race/ethnicity groups, users were generally more interested in modern conveniences than non-users.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 115. Should we provide more modern conveniences in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.34 (42.4)	3.63 (54.5)	3.56 (55.6)	3.54 (54.5)	3.17 (35.6)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.46 (54.2)	3.62 (57.6)	3.68 (58.0)	3.66 (58.6)	3.43 (51.3)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.17 (43.1)	3.62 (57.2)	3.43 (53.1)	3.66 (61.4)	3.21 (44.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

As previously mentioned, a complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B and a complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 116. Comparison by gender - Should we provide more modern conveniences in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.28 (41.6)	3.37 (43.0)	3.58 (53.5)	3.76 (57.8)	3.52 (53.4)	3.61 (58.5)	3.53 (55.4)	3.60 (53.3)	3.16 (32.7)	3.20 (42.6)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.40 (50.4)	3.49 (55.5)	3.62 (57.2)	3.64 (59.2)	3.59 (55.7)	3.79 (61.0)	3.63 (54.5)	3.80 (70.0)	3.33 (48.8)	3.64 (53.6)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.17 (43.8)	3.18 (43.1)	3.53 (54.5)	3.88 (65.0)	3.46 (56.0)	3.42 (50.9)	3.59 (60.4)	4.03 (70.0)	3.18 (42.7)	3.18 (41.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 117. Comparison by income - Should we provide more modern conveniences in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.31 (39.7)	3.37 (44.8)	3.55 (51.9)	3.77 (60.5)	3.55 (57.1)	3.51 (51.3)	3.43 (44.7)	3.59 (60.5)	2.98 (30.8)	3.48 (42.9)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.42 (52.6)	3.51 (55.9)	3.56 (54.5)	3.71 (62.7)	3.66 (58.0)	3.65 (56.8)	3.57 (46.8)	3.68 (61.8)	3.19 (43.0)	3.62 (56.5)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.09 (39.4)	3.21 (44.9)	3.66 (57.4)	3.62 (59.2)	3.42 (51.4)	3.40 (53.9)	3.72 (63.8)	3.64 (60.5)	3.07 (38.0)	3.27 (47.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 118. Comparison by rural/urban - Should we provide more modern conveniences in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.34 (42.6)	3.35 (42.4)	3.85 (61.5)	3.62 (54.2)	3.63 (57.1)	3.56 (55.9)	3.00 (37.5)	3.58 (55.7)	3.10 (30.0)	3.18 (35.6)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.40 (50.6)	3.49 (55.9)	3.25 (58.3)	3.63 (57.6)	3.86 (65.7)	3.66 (57.1)	3.50 (62.5)	3.70 (59.0)	3.13 (36.7)	3.41 (50.5)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.07 (39.3)	3.21 (44.4)	3.92 (61.5)	3.61 (57.1)	3.47 (55.9)	3.44 (53.6)	2.63 (25.0)	3.77 (65.6)	3.03 (43.3)	3.18 (41.5)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 119. Comparisons by user/non-user - Should we provide more modern conveniences in state parks?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.30 (43.9)	3.39 (41.6)	3.83 (63.0)	3.58 (52.3)	3.58 (56.6)	3.56 (55.3)	3.69 (69.0)	3.48 (47.8)	3.25 (38.8)	3.12 (32.7)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.44 (55.0)	3.49 (54.0)	3.83 (67.5)	3.57 (55.1)	3.81 (62.8)	3.62 (56.1)	3.64 (54.8)	3.69 (60.0)	3.42 (51.9)	3.36 (47.4)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.10 (41.5)	3.24 (44.7)	3.81 (67.9)	3.58 (54.6)	3.51 (54.0)	3.40 (53.4)	3.88 (73.8)	3.61 (57.8)	3.34 (48.8)	3.07 (38.2)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

State Park Visitation

Respondents were asked about their state park visitation. Tables 120 through 123 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- Among youngest respondents (under age 25), state park visitation was lowest among Asian/Pacific Islander and Mixed Race/Other respondents, with just over 40% of respondents in each of these categories reporting they had visited a state park in the last 12 months as compared to 66% of White respondents.
- Among respondents above age 35, Black/African American respondents appear to have lower visitation (44%) than Whites (68%).

Comparison Ethnicity/Race

Table 120. Ethnicity panel state park visitation - Ethnic distribution by use of a state park in the past 12 months (corrected)

In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?					
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Mixed Race/Other
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Yes	819 (64.3)	197 (47.7)	212 (56.7)	92 (62.6)	115 (58.7)
No	455 (35.7)	216 (52.3)	162 (43.3)	55 (37.4)	81 (41.3)

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

As previously mentioned, a complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B and a complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 121. Comparison by gender - In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?

	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)	Male N (%)	Female N (%)
Yes	169 (61.7)	644 (65.2)	147 (47.7)	49 (47.1)	108 (55.4)	104 (59.8)	65 (63.1)	19 (63.3)	95 (55.6)	33 (58.9)
No	105 (38.3)	344 (34.8)	161 (52.3)	55 (52.9)	87 (44.6)	70 (40.2)	38 (36.9)	11 (36.7)	76 (44.4)	23 (41.1)

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 122. Comparison by income - In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?

	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[1] N (%)	High N (%)	Low N (%)	High N (%)	Low N (%)	High N (%)	Low N (%)	High N (%)	Low N (%)	High N (%)
Yes	348 (60.8)	432 (69.0)	104 (43.7)	87 (56.5)	102 (56.7)	100 (64.1)	29 (60.4)	53 (68.8)	67 (55.4)	54 (64.3)
No	224 (39.2)	194 (31.0)	134 (56.3)	67 (43.5)	78 (43.3)	56 (35.9)	19 (39.6)	24 (31.2)	54 (44.6)	30 (35.7)

[1]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 123. Comparison by rural/urban - In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[1] N (%)	Urban N (%)	Rural N (%)	Urban N (%)	Rural N (%)	Urban N (%)	Rural N (%)	Urban N (%)	Rural N (%)	Urban N (%)
Yes	238 (69.4)	569 (62.4)	6 (46.2)	189 (48.1)	24 (68.6)	184 (55.9)	4 (50.0)	78 (62.9)	21 (70.0)	108 (55.4)
No	105 (30.6)	343 (37.6)	7 (53.8)	204 (51.9)	11 (31.4)	145 (44.1)	4 (50.0)	46 (37.1)	9 (30.0)	87 (44.6)

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile

Appropriateness of Activities in State Parks

Respondents were asked to rate the appropriateness of several activities within state parks. Respondents of all races generally found adventure facilities/challenge courses, traditional ball sports, swimming pools, small special events, single use trail systems, shared use trail systems, increasing the number of large picnic areas, and the maintenance of large grassy fields for sports to be appropriate. On the contrary, trails for motorized use, large special events, and resort style development were largely seen as inappropriate. Tables 124 through 128 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- Broadly speaking, respondents across races identified consistent high support for the appropriateness of traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball. However, among those age 50 and above, support appeared to decline among all race/ethnicity groups except Latino respondents.
- Respondents generally found special events with less than 1,000 attendees to be appropriate. However, among White and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents, support appeared to decline with age.
- Respondents expressed particularly high appropriateness of adventure/challenge courses, increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings, the maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities, and the development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails). Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents identified especially high support for the maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities as compared to other race/ethnicity groups.

Comparison by Ethnicity/Race

Table 124. Appropriateness of activities in state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.74 (62.0)	3.93 (62.7)	3.86 (62.9)	3.75 (63.9)	3.64 (52.6)
Trails for motorized use	2.87 (32.5)	3.44 (45.6)	3.22 (40.7)	3.07 (32.7)	3.13 (36.1)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.91 (29.3)	3.47 (47.2)	3.20 (38.4)	3.12 (40.8)	3.07 (30.3)
Resort-style Development	2.62 (25.2)	3.33 (41.7)	3.10 (36.2)	3.01 (32.9)	2.65 (24.9)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.58 (55.0)	3.80 (58.5)	3.84 (62.7)	3.46 (50.3)	3.59 (52.6)
Swimming pools	3.53 (53.1)	3.81 (59.5)	3.66 (56.1)	3.41 (45.9)	3.48 (49.7)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.54 (51.2)	3.70 (55.0)	3.58 (50.3)	3.56 (53.7)	3.53 (47.4)
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	3.84 (66.1)	3.75 (55.7)	3.85 (61.9)	3.62 (53.4)	3.64 (54.4)
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	3.75 (63.5)	3.72 (55.7)	3.71 (56.1)	3.59 (53.4)	3.57 (53.8)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.00 (73.5)	4.01 (65.8)	4.00 (70.5)	3.90 (67.3)	3.72 (59.8)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.73 (62.9)	3.90 (63.1)	3.92 (66.4)	3.69 (60.7)	3.66 (57.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.
[2]Percent reporting 'somewhat appropriate' or 'appropriate'

Comparison by Age Within Ethnicity/Race

As previously mentioned, a complete breakdown of age groups compared across race can be found in Appendix B and a complete breakdown of race across age groups can be found in Appendix C. Key findings from these comparisons are mentioned in the summary section above.

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 125. Comparison by gender - Appropriateness of activities in state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.56 (53.3)	3.79 (64.4)	3.87 (60.5)	4.08 (68.9)	3.82 (63.5)	3.92 (63.4)	3.72 (63.1)	3.70 (60.0)	3.61 (53.6)	3.76 (55.6)
Trails for motorized use	2.95 (33.7)	2.90 (32.3)	3.44 (43.3)	3.55 (52.9)	3.25 (43.0)	3.17 (39.3)	3.16 (29.1)	3.03 (36.7)	3.10 (39.1)	2.95 (23.2)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.87 (30.7)	2.87 (28.9)	3.40 (46.4)	3.58 (49.0)	3.28 (41.0)	3.18 (36.6)	3.02 (41.7)	3.07 (33.3)	3.17 (31.2)	2.84 (25.0)
Resort-style Development	2.75 (28.9)	2.58 (24.2)	3.28 (41.2)	3.45 (42.7)	3.20 (40.0)	3.03 (32.9)	3.05 (36.3)	2.97 (30.0)	2.71 (26.6)	2.48 (14.8)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.51 (53.1)	3.60 (55.7)	3.78 (57.0)	3.88 (62.5)	3.76 (59.6)	3.95 (66.9)	3.36 (47.6)	3.67 (50.0)	3.57 (54.2)	3.63 (51.8)
Swimming pools	3.41 (48.5)	3.56 (54.6)	3.80 (57.9)	3.86 (63.7)	3.65 (54.9)	3.71 (58.6)	3.38 (45.1)	3.47 (46.7)	3.42 (47.3)	3.52 (51.8)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.50 (48.3)	3.54 (52.0)	3.64 (52.0)	3.87 (63.5)	3.56 (50.5)	3.63 (50.9)	3.60 (54.4)	3.43 (50.0)	3.49 (48.8)	3.50 (41.1)
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	3.68 (60.6)	3.89 (68.1)	3.70 (53.8)	3.90 (61.2)	3.84 (62.6)	3.90 (62.4)	3.64 (52.9)	3.47 (50.0)	3.58 (52.9)	3.77 (58.9)
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	3.67 (60.7)	3.78 (64.5)	3.69 (55.3)	3.81 (56.7)	3.69 (56.2)	3.77 (57.0)	3.58 (51.5)	3.48 (51.7)	3.54 (52.1)	3.55 (53.6)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	3.77 (64.1)	4.06 (76.3)	3.99 (64.0)	4.10 (71.8)	3.91 (68.2)	4.14 (74.0)	3.88 (68.0)	3.70 (56.7)	3.63 (55.6)	3.98 (67.9)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.65 (58.4)	3.76 (64.4)	3.89 (61.6)	3.94 (67.0)	3.94 (67.4)	3.94 (66.7)	3.72 (62.7)	3.63 (50.0)	3.60 (54.8)	3.77 (64.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

[2]Percent reporting 'somewhat appropriate' or 'appropriate'

126

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 126. Comparison by income - Appropriateness of activities in state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.73 (59.6)	3.77 (65.7)	3.89 (60.9)	4.00 (67.5)	3.84 (60.9)	3.89 (68.0)	3.88 (68.8)	3.61 (58.4)	3.64 (51.7)	3.64 (58.0)
Trails for motorized use	2.94 (33.7)	2.93 (33.1)	3.46 (42.1)	3.49 (51.3)	3.25 (37.9)	3.15 (44.2)	3.29 (29.2)	3.09 (33.8)	2.98 (38.7)	3.08 (31.0)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.92 (28.5)	2.85 (31.9)	3.37 (46.6)	3.55 (49.4)	3.23 (39.3)	3.19 (40.4)	3.15 (45.8)	2.99 (39.0)	3.22 (25.8)	2.96 (33.3)
Resort-style Development	2.58 (23.2)	2.67 (28.4)	3.26 (38.5)	3.42 (46.4)	3.17 (38.0)	3.01 (35.3)	3.11 (36.2)	2.97 (35.1)	2.61 (21.8)	2.58 (22.9)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.54 (52.3)	3.63 (58.1)	3.77 (55.7)	3.83 (63.6)	3.82 (61.2)	3.87 (66.2)	3.48 (50.0)	3.39 (48.1)	3.52 (52.5)	3.63 (50.6)
Swimming pools	3.52 (51.1)	3.56 (56.4)	3.77 (57.3)	3.88 (63.8)	3.65 (55.0)	3.70 (60.3)	3.49 (51.1)	3.34 (42.9)	3.41 (48.3)	3.55 (51.2)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.51 (48.2)	3.59 (55.6)	3.66 (52.8)	3.73 (59.1)	3.52 (44.4)	3.72 (62.2)	3.67 (56.3)	3.51 (51.9)	3.47 (46.7)	3.59 (49.4)
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	3.80 (62.8)	3.90 (70.7)	3.71 (52.3)	3.81 (61.4)	3.91 (63.9)	3.85 (64.5)	3.63 (52.1)	3.62 (53.9)	3.58 (52.5)	3.74 (57.1)
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	3.77 (63.7)	3.77 (64.3)	3.66 (51.1)	3.82 (64.1)	3.65 (52.8)	3.82 (62.2)	3.65 (56.3)	3.57 (50.0)	3.43 (48.3)	3.88 (65.5)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	3.98 (69.6)	4.04 (78.2)	3.98 (65.7)	4.05 (66.0)	4.00 (69.9)	4.02 (73.7)	3.85 (68.8)	3.86 (64.9)	3.69 (61.7)	3.87 (61.9)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.70 (61.3)	3.77 (65.2)	3.88 (61.5)	3.95 (67.5)	3.93 (65.4)	3.90 (69.2)	3.85 (68.1)	3.62 (57.1)	3.59 (52.1)	3.67 (60.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'somewhat appropriate' or 'appropriate'

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 127. Comparison by rural/urban - Appropriateness of activities in state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.73 (61.6)	3.74 (62.1)	3.77 (53.8)	3.92 (62.7)	4.21 (76.5)	3.82 (61.8)	3.88 (62.5)	3.72 (62.9)	3.60 (50.0)	3.65 (54.2)
Trails for motorized use	2.91 (33.7)	2.91 (32.3)	3.69 (30.8)	3.45 (45.8)	2.97 (44.1)	3.22 (40.7)	3.00 (50.0)	3.13 (29.8)	2.87 (36.7)	3.10 (35.6)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.91 (29.6)	2.86 (29.0)	3.38 (53.8)	3.44 (46.4)	3.18 (38.2)	3.23 (38.4)	3.38 (25.0)	3.01 (40.3)	2.93 (30.0)	3.10 (30.8)
Resort-style Development	2.57 (24.0)	2.64 (25.9)	3.69 (46.2)	3.32 (41.3)	2.79 (26.5)	3.15 (37.7)	3.13 (25.0)	3.03 (35.8)	2.23 (16.7)	2.70 (24.9)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.65 (56.6)	3.55 (54.5)	3.77 (46.2)	3.79 (58.3)	4.06 (68.6)	3.82 (62.2)	3.50 (37.5)	3.42 (49.2)	3.55 (55.2)	3.57 (51.8)
Swimming pools	3.56 (52.6)	3.52 (53.5)	4.00 (53.8)	3.80 (59.3)	3.63 (51.4)	3.69 (57.4)	3.75 (50.0)	3.37 (45.5)	3.20 (40.0)	3.48 (50.3)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.59 (51.5)	3.52 (51.4)	3.62 (46.2)	3.70 (55.1)	3.34 (34.3)	3.61 (52.6)	3.50 (50.0)	3.58 (54.0)	3.57 (53.3)	3.46 (44.8)
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	3.89 (68.1)	3.82 (65.5)	3.38 (46.2)	3.75 (55.6)	4.03 (74.3)	3.85 (61.6)	3.13 (25.0)	3.63 (54.5)	3.57 (53.3)	3.61 (53.3)
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	3.77 (65.8)	3.75 (62.8)	3.23 (30.8)	3.72 (55.9)	3.57 (51.4)	3.73 (57.1)	4.00 (62.5)	3.53 (51.2)	3.80 (63.3)	3.50 (50.3)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.05 (75.7)	3.98 (72.8)	4.00 (69.2)	4.00 (65.2)	4.32 (91.2)	3.97 (68.1)	3.63 (37.5)	3.86 (67.7)	3.67 (50.0)	3.70 (59.8)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.78 (63.2)	3.72 (63.1)	3.77 (53.8)	3.89 (62.8)	3.94 (68.6)	3.95 (67.6)	3.50 (50.0)	3.72 (61.0)	3.83 (63.3)	3.58 (54.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'somewhat appropriate' or 'appropriate'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 128. Comparison by user/non-user - Appropriateness of activities in state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.81 (65.5)	3.68 (59.1)	4.36 (80.7)	3.81 (58.1)	3.93 (68.1)	3.83 (60.9)	3.72 (65.1)	3.73 (61.5)	3.78 (63.7)	3.56 (47.6)
Trails for motorized use	2.87 (35.4)	2.95 (30.5)	3.65 (51.8)	3.43 (44.0)	3.19 (43.4)	3.21 (40.0)	3.14 (30.2)	3.13 (30.8)	2.85 (37.0)	3.19 (34.2)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.89 (28.5)	2.86 (29.9)	3.70 (56.6)	3.38 (44.8)	3.10 (45.1)	3.28 (35.9)	3.02 (44.2)	3.03 (38.5)	3.04 (25.9)	3.11 (32.7)
Resort-style Development	2.49 (23.2)	2.72 (27.0)	3.43 (48.8)	3.30 (39.9)	2.94 (34.5)	3.19 (37.4)	3.09 (44.2)	3.00 (30.0)	2.34 (18.8)	2.82 (26.4)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.63 (58.0)	3.54 (52.5)	4.20 (74.7)	3.70 (54.4)	3.87 (67.5)	3.83 (60.9)	3.58 (60.5)	3.36 (42.9)	3.72 (56.8)	3.50 (50.7)
Swimming pools	3.54 (55.0)	3.52 (51.6)	3.96 (65.4)	3.78 (58.0)	3.78 (64.0)	3.62 (53.3)	3.42 (51.2)	3.40 (43.3)	3.63 (53.8)	3.35 (45.9)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.64 (55.8)	3.45 (47.4)	3.80 (61.4)	3.68 (53.4)	3.75 (57.9)	3.51 (47.5)	3.63 (60.5)	3.54 (50.5)	3.59 (51.9)	3.42 (43.2)
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	3.89 (69.6)	3.79 (63.5)	3.99 (65.1)	3.69 (53.4)	4.04 (72.8)	3.79 (57.8)	3.90 (66.7)	3.46 (46.2)	3.68 (60.5)	3.56 (49.3)
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	3.87 (68.2)	3.66 (59.7)	4.01 (68.7)	3.65 (52.5)	3.78 (59.6)	3.70 (55.1)	3.70 (55.8)	3.50 (50.0)	3.77 (60.5)	3.43 (47.7)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.07 (77.3)	3.94 (70.6)	4.32 (80.5)	3.94 (62.2)	4.06 (77.9)	3.99 (67.7)	3.5 (69.8)	3.80 (63.7)	3.84 (66.7)	3.64 (54.4)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.80 (66.1)	3.67 (60.4)	4.22 (75.9)	3.82 (59.8)	3.98 (71.9)	3.91 (64.7)	3.91 (74.4)	3.61 (53.3)	3.77 (60.5)	3.54 (53.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'somewhat appropriate' or 'appropriate'

Constraints to State Park Visitation

In addition to understanding constraints, or barriers, to state park visitation among a representative sample of Pennsylvania, it is also important to consider barriers among specific ethnicity groups within the state. Overall constraints to state park visitation were similar to those among the representative telephone survey in that very few populations reported constraints as being higher than 3.0 on a 1 to 5 scale. In general, ethnic minority groups reported higher constraints than White and Mixed Race/Other respondents. Tables 129 through 133 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories.

- As a whole, respondents reported minimal constraints to state park visitation with most overall means being below 3.0 on 1-5 scale.
- For Black/African American respondents, the 'very important' or 'extremely important' constraints appear to be a lack of transportation (42%) and a lack of public transportation (41%). Among female Black/African American respondents, these constraints were even higher (52% and 53% reported these as very important or extremely important, respectively). Concern about a lack of transportation was high among both urban and rural (42% and 50% reported these as very important or extremely important, respectively) Black/African American respondents as compared to respondents of other race/ethnicity groups.
- Respondents of all race/ethnicity groups reported consistent importance of being too busy with other life priorities.
- Respondents from ethnic minority groups appeared to experience higher constraints than White and Mixed Race/Other respondents.

Table 129. Constraints to state park visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Too busy with other life priorities	2.83 (30.0)	2.89 (32.3)	2.80 (31.4)	3.07 (39.6)	2.73 (29.7)
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.41 (21.3)	2.75 (32.4)	2.88 (32.5)	2.66 (27.5)	2.37 (22.1)
The State Parks are too far away	2.45 (22.6)	2.78 (30.8)	2.77 (30.8)	2.79 (30.6)	2.49 (22.5)
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.13 (14.1)	2.65 (26.6)	2.41 (21.0)	2.61 (24.2)	2.33 (18.8)
Poor personal health	2.02 (16.9)	2.61 (30.9)	2.39 (24.7)	2.29 (19.5)	2.30 (23.5)
Lack of available public transportation	2.07 (17.7)	3.00 (41.3)	2.60 (29.7)	2.73 (30.1)	2.48 (24.5)
Fear of crime	2.03 (16.7)	2.50 (27.9)	2.52 (27.3)	2.51 (27.6)	2.10 (18.0)
Do not have anyone to go with	2.34 (21.6)	2.67 (29.7)	2.57 (27.6)	2.66 (28.4)	2.44 (24.8)
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	1.98 (16.0)	2.40 (24.3)	2.31 (21.9)	2.46 (23.1)	2.09 (16.0)
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.03 (13.4)	2.34 (20.1)	2.38 (20.3)	2.39 (20.6)	2.15 (13.7)
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.14 (20.9)	2.96 (41.6)	2.72 (31.6)	2.55 (31.6)	2.55 (27.9)
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1.90 (10.6)	2.40 (21.7)	2.41 (21.4)	2.26 (16.4)	2.11 (14.0)
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.79 (11.1)	2.40 (21.7)	2.14 (16.8)	2.21 (18.8)	2.00 (15.1)
State Parks have too many rules	1.82 (8.2)	2.27 (16.5)	2.17 (14.4)	2.21 (15.3)	1.93 (10.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.

[2]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Table 129. Continued. Constraints to state park visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.70 (8.4)	2.22 (16.1)	2.01 (13.7)	2.05 (14.9)	1.88 (11.8)
Fear of the outdoors	1.65 (8.6)	2.16 (17.3)	2.01 (15.4)	1.99 (15.7)	1.77 (11.3)
Nature is 'not my thing'	1.83 (12.3)	2.37 (21.1)	2.30 (18.7)	2.09 (17.2)	2.05 (17.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 130. Comparison by gender - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Too busy with other life priorities	2.63 (25.9)	2.88 (31.0)	2.87 (30.8)	2.95 (35.9)	2.59 (24.7)	3.03 (38.7)	3.17 (40.8)	2.80 (36.7)	2.72 (29.2)	2.79 (33.9)
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.34 (20.6)	2.43 (21.5)	2.72 (31.1)	2.88 (36.6)	2.78 (29.3)	2.99 (35.9)	2.68 (26.5)	2.61 (32.1)	2.38 (22.9)	2.36 (21.4)
The State Parks are too far away	2.31 (21.6)	2.49 (23.0)	2.71 (28.1)	3.00 (39.2)	2.66 (26.4)	2.88 (35.5)	2.82 (30.1)	2.67 (30.0)	2.41 (21.2)	2.73 (28.6)
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.12 (12.9)	2.13 (14.4)	2.54 (23.9)	3.01 (35.4)	2.45 (23.3)	2.37 (18.7)	2.60 (23.8)	2.67 (26.7)	2.37 (19.0)	2.16 (16.1)
Poor personal health	1.91 (15.7)	2.05 (17.2)	2.56 (28.3)	2.79 (38.8)	2.34 (24.6)	2.45 (24.6)	2.24 (18.6)	2.37 (20.0)	2.18 (20.6)	2.62 (32.7)
Lack of available public transportation	2.11 (19.5)	2.05 (17.0)	2.90 (37.6)	3.30 (53.0)	2.56 (27.4)	2.65 (32.0)	2.80 (34.0)	2.48 (17.2)	2.37 (20.2)	2.68 (32.1)
Fear of crime	1.88 (15.0)	2.08 (17.2)	2.37 (23.6)	2.87 (39.8)	2.37 (24.4)	2.67 (30.2)	2.49 (27.2)	2.57 (30.0)	2.10 (18.6)	2.00 (14.3)
Do not have anyone to go with	2.14 (15.8)	2.39 (23.1)	2.56 (25.1)	3.00 (43.6)	2.53 (25.7)	2.61 (29.5)	2.75 (28.2)	2.40 (30.0)	2.38 (23.1)	2.66 (32.1)
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	1.90 (14.3)	2.00 (16.4)	2.37 (24.0)	2.49 (25.2)	2.20 (18.8)	2.42 (25.0)	2.47 (23.3)	2.40 (23.3)	2.02 (14.1)	2.18 (19.6)
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.00 (13.5)	2.04 (13.3)	2.34 (20.1)	2.35 (20.4)	2.46 (24.1)	2.30 (16.4)	2.36 (18.8)	2.48 (27.6)	2.16 (13.9)	2.07 (12.5)
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.09 (19.3)	2.15 (21.2)	2.87 (38.3)	3.25 (52.0)	2.73 (31.8)	2.71 (31.2)	2.64 (33.0)	2.21 (27.6)	2.44 (25.9)	2.76 (31.5)
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1.90 (9.2)	1.90 (10.9)	2.31 (18.2)	2.66 (31.4)	2.34 (20.4)	2.48 (22.2)	2.26 (16.5)	2.23 (16.7)	2.04 (14.8)	2.24 (10.9)
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.71 (10.6)	1.81 (11.1)	2.33 (19.5)	2.57 (28.4)	2.10 (15.3)	2.18 (18.1)	2.12 (15.7)	2.53 (30.0)	1.93 (13.9)	2.13 (18.2)
State Parks have too many rules	1.91 (9.9)	1.80 (7.6)	2.25 (15.6)	2.32 (18.4)	2.24 (15.6)	2.10 (13.3)	2.21 (15.8)	2.28 (13.8)	1.90 (7.7)	1.98 (16.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.

[2]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Table 130. Continued. Comparison by gender - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.70 (9.5)	1.69 (8.0)	2.18 (14.3)	2.35 (21.4)	2.05 (16.6)	1.97 (10.5)	2.11 (14.6)	1.90 (16.7)	1.92 (12.6)	1.70 (8.9)
Fear of the outdoors	1.62 (8.1)	1.65 (8.8)	2.08 (14.9)	2.38 (24.8)	2.03 (16.7)	1.98 (13.6)	2.01 (15.5)	1.93 (16.7)	1.69 (10.1)	1.91 (16.1)
Nature is 'not my thing'	1.85 (11.7)	1.83 (12.5)	2.29 (19.1)	2.61 (27.2)	2.32 (18.5)	2.30 (19.2)	2.13 (17.5)	1.97 (16.7)	2.08 (18.1)	1.86 (14.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 131. Comparison by income - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Too busy with other life priorities	2.74 (27.7)	2.92 (32.0)	2.73 (28.1)	3.09 (37.1)	2.78 (31.8)	2.78 (29.0)	3.15 (45.8)	3.13 (39.0)	2.53 (24.4)	2.96 (35.7)
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.47 (22.8)	2.37 (20.0)	2.67 (30.3)	2.87 (34.2)	2.87 (30.8)	2.86 (33.3)	2.69 (24.4)	2.62 (29.9)	2.34 (25.2)	2.48 (22.4)
The State Parks are too far away	2.54 (25.9)	2.36 (19.4)	2.76 (29.6)	2.80 (33.6)	2.80 (30.5)	2.66 (27.1)	3.04 (41.7)	2.64 (23.4)	2.40 (20.0)	2.66 (25.9)
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.14 (14.8)	2.13 (14.2)	2.59 (24.6)	2.69 (28.1)	2.43 (21.5)	2.32 (18.7)	2.72 (36.2)	2.63 (18.4)	2.33 (17.8)	2.41 (21.2)
Poor personal health	2.26 (23.1)	1.83 (12.0)	2.73 (34.3)	2.50 (27.3)	2.51 (26.3)	2.23 (23.4)	2.48 (25.0)	2.18 (15.8)	2.42 (24.6)	2.22 (24.7)
Lack of available public transportation	2.32 (22.6)	1.85 (13.5)	3.10 (45.5)	2.81 (35.1)	2.69 (32.6)	2.47 (26.0)	2.85 (35.4)	2.61 (27.3)	2.65 (30.3)	2.18 (15.5)
Fear of crime	2.07 (17.5)	2.01 (16.1)	2.55 (29.6)	2.46 (26.5)	2.57 (27.8)	2.41 (25.8)	2.63 (31.3)	2.47 (27.3)	2.15 (19.3)	2.02 (17.1)
Do not have anyone to go with	2.56 (28.1)	2.14 (15.6)	2.67 (28.9)	2.75 (32.9)	2.68 (29.5)	2.41 (25.2)	2.71 (31.3)	2.60 (24.7)	2.43 (25.8)	2.40 (22.6)
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.16 (18.6)	1.85 (14.6)	2.40 (22.2)	2.42 (28.1)	2.38 (23.7)	2.19 (18.8)	2.52 (27.1)	2.47 (22.1)	2.09 (15.8)	2.13 (17.6)
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.05 (14.9)	2.02 (12.0)	2.27 (16.7)	2.47 (24.7)	2.44 (21.3)	2.24 (17.4)	2.46 (19.6)	2.32 (21.1)	2.13 (12.7)	2.27 (15.7)
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.43 (27.5)	1.85 (14.2)	3.06 (44.8)	2.81 (37.7)	2.89 (37.3)	2.57 (26.5)	3.04 (45.8)	2.24 (22.4)	2.74 (32.8)	2.20 (19.0)
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.02 (13.2)	1.79 (8.3)	2.40 (21.6)	2.31 (19.6)	2.43 (23.6)	2.23 (15.8)	2.44 (18.8)	2.21 (16.9)	2.25 (14.4)	1.89 (14.1)
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.89 (12.9)	1.70 (9.6)	2.39 (22.0)	2.43 (22.4)	2.15 (18.3)	2.05 (14.3)	2.29 (20.8)	2.24 (19.7)	2.12 (19.0)	1.93 (13.3)
State Parks have too many rules	1.85 (9.3)	1.81 (7.5)	2.22 (15.5)	2.38 (19.1)	2.21 (14.1)	2.05 (11.6)	2.30 (12.8)	2.20 (17.3)	1.92 (9.3)	1.99 (11.9)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Table 131. Continued. Comparison by income - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.73 (9.3)	1.69 (8.3)	2.19 (14.6)	2.29 (18.7)	2.02 (13.0)	1.93 (12.3)	2.04 (14.6)	2.17 (16.9)	1.86 (12.6)	1.98 (14.5)
Fear of the outdoors	1.68 (9.3)	1.63 (8.7)	2.17 (16.5)	2.16 (19.6)	1.95 (13.1)	1.95 (15.8)	1.75 (8.3)	2.17 (20.8)	1.79 (10.9)	1.80 (14.1)
Nature is 'not my thing'	1.84 (12.9)	1.85 (12.5)	2.28 (16.2)	2.51 (28.3)	2.32 (19.0)	2.22 (17.4)	2.15 (18.8)	2.10 (18.2)	2.08 (18.6)	2.01 (18.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.

[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.

[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Comparison by Urban/Rural Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 132. Comparison by rural/urban - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Too busy with other life priorities	2.78 (28.4)	2.85 (30.4)	3.08 (33.3)	2.90 (32.3)	2.80 (34.3)	2.80 (31.2)	2.13 (12.5)	3.13 (41.1)	2.57 (26.7)	2.75 (29.9)
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.35 (21.1)	2.39 (21.4)	3.00 (41.7)	2.75 (32.2)	2.53 (26.5)	2.91 (32.9)	2.63 (12.5)	2.67 (28.9)	1.93 (16.7)	2.46 (23.7)
The State Parks are too far away	2.39 (22.5)	2.48 (22.7)	2.45 (18.2)	2.80 (31.4)	2.46 (25.7)	2.79 (30.8)	2.00 (12.5)	2.83 (31.5)	1.86 (10.3)	2.58 (24.1)
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.16 (15.8)	2.12 (13.5)	2.83 (25.0)	2.64 (26.1)	1.97 (11.4)	2.47 (22.2)	2.00 (0.0)	2.63 (25.4)	1.90 (10.0)	2.58 (20.2)
Poor personal health	2.14 (21.8)	1.98 (15.1)	2.83 (33.3)	2.62 (30.8)	1.86 (14.3)	2.46 (26.1)	1.63 (0.0)	2.31 (20.3)	1.83 (13.3)	2.37 (25.4)
Lack of available public transportation	2.01 (17.3)	2.09 (17.7)	2.83 (33.3)	2.99 (41.3)	2.49 (25.7)	2.62 (30.1)	1.71 (0.0)	2.77 (31.5)	2.10 (17.2)	2.55 (25.8)
Fear of crime	2.04 (16.1)	2.04 (17.1)	3.00 (41.7)	2.99 (27.9)	2.38 (23.5)	2.53 (27.4)	1.63 (12.5)	2.56 (29.0)	1.90 (20.7)	2.12 (17.2)
Do not have anyone to go with	2.38 (23.5)	2.32 (20.7)	2.36 (9.1)	2.69 (30.5)	2.37 (22.9)	2.60 (28.4)	2.38 (37.5)	2.66 (27.4)	1.97 (23.3)	2.51 (25.3)
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.09 (17.6)	1.94 (15.4)	2.91 (27.3)	2.39 (24.4)	1.74 (8.6)	2.37 (23.1)	1.75 (0.0)	2.48 (24.2)	1.63 (10.0)	2.13 (16.9)
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.02 (13.8)	2.04 (13.3)	2.75 (16.7)	2.34 (20.3)	1.94 (8.6)	2.44 (21.7)	2.50 (25.0)	2.37 (20.7)	1.90 (10.0)	2.20 (14.1)
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.15 (21.2)	2.14 (20.8)	3.25 (50.0)	2.96 (41.5)	2.54 (28.6)	2.75 (32.0)	1.88 (12.5)	2.59 (33.3)	2.07 (20.7)	2.60 (28.4)
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1.94 (11.7)	1.89 (10.2)	2.17 (8.3)	2.43 (22.5)	2.00 (11.8)	2.44 (22.0)	1.50 (0.0)	2.30 (17.7)	1.62 (3.4)	2.16 (15.5)
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.86 (14.1)	1.76 (9.9)	2.50 (16.7)	2.41 (22.3)	1.51 (5.7)	2.20 (18.0)	2.00 (12.5)	2.21 (19.5)	1.60 (13.3)	2.06 (15.8)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Table 132. Continued. Comparison by rural/urban - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks have too many rules	1.93 (11.1)	1.78 (6.9)	2.58 (16.7)	2.28 (16.8)	1.83 (8.6)	2.21 (14.8)	1.63 (0.0)	2.25 (16.5)	1.60 (3.3)	1.97 (11.4)
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.65 (9.1)	1.72 (8.0)	2.92 (41.7)	2.22 (15.3)	1.60 (5.7)	2.07 (14.8)	1.13 (0.0)	2.11 (16.1)	1.37 (3.3)	1.95 (13.0)
Fear of the outdoors	1.65 (10.6)	1.65 (7.9)	2.42 (16.7)	2.16 (17.7)	1.76 (11.8)	2.04 (15.8)	1.00 (0.0)	2.05 (16.9)	1.43 (6.7)	1.80 (11.3)
Nature is 'not my thing'	1.73 (11.2)	1.87 (12.6)	2.77 (30.8)	2.35 (20.4)	2.00 (14.3)	2.34 (19.0)	1.13 (0.0)	2.15 (18.5)	1.77 (13.3)	2.08 (17.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 133. Comparison by user/non-user - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Too busy with other life priorities	2.72 (25.9)	2.92 (33.5)	2.71 (28.0)	2.94 (33.3)	2.71 (30.1)	2.84 (32.0)	3.26 (46.5)	2.99 (36.3)	2.64 (27.5)	2.78 (30.9)
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.29 (18.3)	2.52 (23.8)	2.46 (25.6)	2.83 (34.2)	2.66 (27.5)	2.98 (34.7)	2.55 (31.0)	2.71 (25.8)	2.12 (14.8)	2.51 (26.0)
The State Parks are too far away	2.38 (21.7)	2.52 (23.5)	2.60 (30.1)	2.83 (31.0)	2.70 (28.6)	2.80 (31.8)	2.65 (27.9)	2.86 (31.9)	2.31 (18.5)	2.59 (24.7)
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.07 (12.8)	2.19 (15.1)	2.64 (26.5)	2.66 (26.6)	2.23 (18.8)	2.49 (22.0)	2.70 (23.3)	2.56 (24.7)	2.29 (18.8)	2.36 (18.8)
Poor personal health	1.93 (13.8)	2.10 (19.6)	2.55 (31.7)	2.63 (30.7)	2.27 (21.2)	2.44 (26.3)	2.45 (21.4)	2.21 (18.7)	2.32 (25.9)	2.28 (22.1)
Lack of available public transportation	2.03 (16.8)	2.11 (18.4)	2.93 (40.7)	3.02 (41.5)	2.45 (24.1)	2.67 (32.1)	2.98 (34.9)	2.61 (27.8)	2.26 (18.8)	2.60 (27.5)
Fear of crime	1.99 (17.0)	2.07 (16.5)	2.40 (30.5)	2.53 (27.2)	2.48 (27.7)	2.53 (27.2)	2.56 (27.9)	2.48 (27.5)	2.01 (17.9)	2.14 (18.0)
Do not have anyone to go with	2.28 (19.5)	2.39 (23.3)	2.33 (23.5)	2.75 (31.3)	2.62 (29.5)	2.55 (26.8)	2.79 (30.2)	2.59 (27.5)	2.29 (22.5)	2.52 (26.0)
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	1.92 (13.2)	2.04 (18.4)	2.16 (19.5)	2.46 (25.5)	2.17 (16.8)	2.37 (24.1)	2.53 (25.6)	2.42 (22.0)	2.04 (17.3)	2.11 (15.3)
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	1.94 (11.8)	2.11 (14.8)	2.20 (19.5)	2.38 (20.2)	2.23 (15.5)	2.45 (22.4)	2.42 (20.9)	2.38 (20.5)	2.29 (15.0)	2.08 (12.9)
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.09 (19.9)	2.18 (21.7)	2.78 (39.8)	3.01 (42.1)	2.54 (29.5)	2.81 (32.5)	2.81 (37.2)	2.42 (28.9)	2.30 (21.5)	2.67 (31.3)
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1.76 (8.6)	2.01 (12.2)	2.07 (14.5)	2.48 (23.6)	2.24 (19.8)	2.48 (22.1)	2.40 (25.6)	2.20 (12.1)	1.99 (12.5)	2.17 (14.8)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Table 133 Continued. Comparison by user/non-user - Constraints to visitation

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	1.76 (11.2)	1.82 (11.0)	2.42 (25.9)	2.39 (20.7)	2.10 (17.0)	2.16 (16.7)	2.33 (25.6)	2.16 (15.6)	2.05 (17.5)	1.98 (13.8)
State Parks have too many rules	1.82 (8.1)	1.83 (8.2)	1.98 (14.6)	2.35 (17.0)	2.14 (13.3)	2.19 (15.0)	2.36 (16.7)	2.15 (14.6)	1.86 (8.6)	1.97 (10.9)
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.54 (6.6)	1.83 (10.0)	2.01 (12.3)	2.28 (17.0)	1.86 (8.1)	2.07 (16.1)	2.07 (18.6)	2.04 (13.2)	1.74 (11.1)	1.96 (12.2)
Fear of the outdoors	1.60 (7.8)	1.68 (9.2)	1.98 (16.3)	2.20 (17.6)	2.04 (17.9)	2.00 (14.3)	2.23 (18.6)	1.88 (14.3)	1.68 (8.6)	1.81 (12.8)
Nature is 'not my thing'	1.69 (9.7)	1.95 (14.5)	2.04 (15.9)	2.45 (22.5)	2.15 (17.1)	2.37 (19.4)	2.14 (20.9)	2.07 (15.4)	1.84 (15.0)	2.16 (19.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important'

Community Benefits of State Parks

State Parks provides opportunities and benefits across Pennsylvania. In particular, parks can be an asset to local communities through tourism, recreation service provision, healthful recreation, etc. Respondents were asked the extent to which they felt state parks provided a benefit for nearby communities. While it is a state park, it may be one of the few outdoor recreation facilities available to residents, particularly in rural areas. Hence, we wanted to look at the extent to which Pennsylvanians of various ethnicities and ages felt about the benefits provided by state parks. Overall perceptions of the community benefits of state parks were high among the ethnic minority panel respondents. After answering this benefits question, respondents who felt that state parks did in fact provide benefits to nearby communities were then asked to describe these benefits in an open-ended follow-up question. Tables 134 through 138 present demographic comparisons within race/ethnicity categories. Please refer to pages 153 through 166 for a detailed summary and results of the open-ended follow-up.

- White respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree that Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities as compared to respondents from other races/ethnicities.
- Across race/ethnicity, users were more likely than non-users to agree or strongly agree that state parks benefit nearby communities.

Table 134. Community benefits

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano /Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	3.99 (75.9)	3.57 (52.9)	3.71 (59.2)	3.79 (61.9)	3.69 (62.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]Percent reporting 'strongly agree' or 'agree'

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 135. Comparison by gender- Community benefits

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	3.98 (77.6)	3.99 (75.3)	3.54 (50.6)	3.67 (57.7)	3.66 (55.3)	3.77 (63.4)	3.72 (57.3)	4.00 (77.1)	3.68 (61.9)	3.78 (65.2)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 136. Comparison by income- Community benefits

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	3.95 (73.2)	4.06 (79.5)	3.51 (49.6)	3.70 (59.7)	3.64 (56.6)	3.78 (62.8)	3.68 (58.5)	3.86 (63.5)	3.60 (58.2)	3.91 (70.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Rural/Urban Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 137. Comparison by rural/urban- Community benefits

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.00 (76.6)	3.99 (75.4)	3.54 (46.2)	3.58 (52.9)	3.71 (57.1)	3.70 (59.3)	3.25 (50.0)	3.82 (62.8)	4.04 (76.0)	3.63 (59.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 138. Comparison by user/non-user- Community benefits

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities	4.14 (83.2)	3.86 (69.5)	3.95 (74.7)	3.48 (47.0)	3.97 (65.8)	3.59 (56.2)	3.81 (66.0)	3.78 (60.0)	3.96 (74.6)	3.54 (54.8)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Entrance Fee Question

Respondents were asked to select from five options regarding how much it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park. Overall, respondents were not that aware that PA State Parks are free to enter. Moreover, respondents of ethnic minorities were less likely to know that PA State Parks are free. Tables 139 to 143 presents results of the entrance fee question by race/ethnicity.

- Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were less likely to know that Pennsylvania State Parks are free than respondents from other races/ethnicities.
- Across race/ethnicity, users were more likely than non-users to know about state parks' free entry.

Table 139. About how much do you think it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park?

	Percent				
	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
Statement	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	44.9	27.3	27.5	39.5	40.3
It depends on the park	25.5	22.9	30.5	28.6	28.1
$5 per vehicle	6.4	11.4	8.6	9.5	6.1
$10 per vehicle	6.0	12.4	8.6	11.6	4.1
I really don't know	17.1	26.0	24.9	10.9	21.4

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 140. Comparison by gender - Knowledge of free entrance to state parks in Pennsylvania

Statement	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
	%[1]	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	48.8	44.0	27.5	26.9	25.9	29.7	36.4	51.4	37.0	47.8

[1]Percent reporting 'Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 141. Comparison by income - Knowledge of free entrance to state parks in Pennsylvania

Statement	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[1] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
	%[2]	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	42.5	47.7	28.0	28.6	28.0	30.1	37.7	44.7	42.7	41.8

[1]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[2]Percent reporting 'Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter'

Comparison by Rural/Urban Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 142. Comparison by rural/urban - Knowledge of free entrance to state parks in Pennsylvania

Statement	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[1] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
	%[2]	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	48.8	43.9	23.1	27.8	31.4	27.4	25.0	40.1	44.0	39.8

[1]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[2]Percent reporting 'Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 143. Comparison by user/non-user – Knowledge of free entrance to state parks in Pennsylvania

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[1] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
	%[2]	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter	56.0	35.6	34.9	25.3	36.0	23.8	46.8	36.0	47.9	36.0

[1]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[2]Percent reporting 'Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter'

Sense of Welcome and Belonging

Sense of welcome and belonging is important when considering visitation to state parks in Pennsylvania, especially among people of ethnic minorities. Respondents in the ethnic minority panel were asked additional questions regarding their feelings of welcome and belonging at state parks. These individual items (5) were merged together to create an overall index of sense of welcome and belonging at Pennsylvania state parks. Tables 144 to 148 show the demographic breakdowns within race/ethnicity categories.

- White respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree that they feel welcome in state parks than respondents of all other race/ethnicity groups.
- Across race/ethnicity, users were more likely to agree or strongly agree that they feel welcome than non-users.

Table 144. Belonging at state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Belonging at State Parks	3.92 (78.2)	3.55 (52.1)	3.70 (63.2)	3.75 (69.0)	3.67 (58.9)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]Percent reporting 'strongly agree' or 'agree'

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 145. Comparison by gender – Belonging at state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Belonging at State Parks	3.86 (73.3)	3.93 (79.8)	3.53 (50.8)	3.60 (55.2)	3.71 (62.1)	3.70 (65.1)	3.74 (68.3)	3.78 (71.4)	3.63 (55.7)	3.82 (72.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 146. Comparison by income- Belonging at state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[2] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Belonging at State Parks	3.92 (76.5)	3.93 (81.8)	3.59 (52.6)	3.53 (53.3)	3.63 (57.1)	3.79 (70.0)	3.75 (71.9)	3.75 (66.7)	3.66 (57.4)	3.74 (61.8)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

147

Comparison by Rural/Urban Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 147. Comparison by rural/urban- Belonging at state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[2] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Belonging at State Parks	4.05 (86.3)	3.86 (75.0)	3.68 (62.5)	3.54 (51.4)	3.73 (66.7)	3.70 (62.2)	3.65 (62.5)	3.76 (70.7)	3.97 (50.0)	3.62 (33.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 148. Comparison by user/non-user- Belonging at state parks

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[2] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Belonging at State Parks	4.14 (65.0)	3.73 (42.3)	4.06 (62.7)	3.41 (26.8)	4.02 (60.2)	3.56 (32.9)	3.98 (47.8)	3.64 (37.1)	3.94 (50.0)	3.51 (27.8)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Percent reporting 'agree' or 'strongly agree'

State Parks Engagement and Outreach with Ethnically Diverse Communities

Respondents in the ethnic minority panel were asked additional questions regarding state parks level of engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities. While there were no significant differences by race/ethnicity in terms of effectiveness of engagement and outreach, respondents from ethnically diverse groups rated the importance of engagement and outreach as higher than White respondents. Tables 149 to 153 show the demographic breakdowns with race/ethnicity categories.

- Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino (65% and 63% reported as important or extremely important, respectively) respondents rated increasing engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities to be especially important.
- Across race/ethnicity, respondents rated effectiveness much lower than importance.
- Across ethnicities, with only one exception, users rated increasing engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities as both more important and more effective than non-users.

Table 149. Engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/Lati no (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
M=Mean	M (%[2])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
How important do you think it is for State Parks to increase their engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities?[1]	3.33 (47.7)	3.81 (65.0)	3.77 (63.1)	3.63 (56.0)	3.37 (48.3)
How effective do you feel current Pennsylvania State Park engagement and outreach efforts have been with ethnically diverse communities?[2]	3.04 (27.2)	2.90 (33.3)	2.98 (27.7)	2.96 (30.5)	2.92 (26.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important
[2]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all effective to 5=extremely effective
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important' or 'effective' or 'extremely effective'

Comparison by Gender Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 150. Comparison by gender - Engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Male N=274	Female N=980	Male N=301	Female N=102	Male N=193	Female N=171	Male N=101	Female N=30	Male N=171	Female N=54
M=Mean	M (%[3])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
How important do you think it is for State Parks to increase their engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities?[1]	3.05 (43.2)	3.40 (48.7)	3.75 (63.5)	3.98 (69.2)	3.69 (61.7)	3.83 (63.8)	3.61 (54.5)	3.66 (57.1)	3.40 (49.0)	3.65 (54.3)
How effective do you feel current Pennsylvania State Park engagement and outreach efforts have been with ethnically diverse communities?[2]	3.10 (32.0)	3.02 (25.8)	2.84 (32.4)	3.05 (35.4)	3.07 (31.2)	2.90 (23.6)	2.91 (26.4)	3.07 (37.0)	2.97 (30.0)	2.65 (16.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important
[2]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all effective to 5=extremely effective
[3]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important' or 'effective' or 'extremely effective'

Comparison by Income Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 151. Comparison by income- Engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Low[3] N=567	High N=623	Low N=233	High N=152	Low N=177	High N=154	Low N=47	High N=76	Low N=120	High N=84
M=Mean	M (%[4])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
How important do you think it is for State Parks to increase their engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities?[1]	3.42 (49.2)	3.26 (52.9)	3.80 (65.3)	3.86 (66.7)	3.64 (57.8)	3.88 (68.6)	3.54 (53.8)	3.64 (52.9)	3.48 (51.4)	3.57 (57.4)
How effective do you feel current Pennsylvania State Park engagement and outreach efforts have been with ethnically diverse communities?[2]	3.06 (28.4)	3.02 (27.0)	2.85 (30.7)	3.01 (39.2)	2.95 (25.2)	3.04 (31.8)	3.09 (38.6)	2.85 (22.7)	2.88 (25.6)	2.98 (33.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important
[2]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all effective to 5=extremely effective
[3]For the purposes of this table, low income represents individuals below $50,000. High income represents those above $50,000.
[4]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important' or 'effective' or 'extremely effective'

Comparison by Rural/Urban Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 152. Comparison by rural/urban- Engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	Rural[3] N=340	Urban N=907	Rural N=13	Urban N=384	Rural N=35	Urban N=324	Rural N=8	Urban N=122	Rural N=30	Urban N=194
M=Mean	M (%[4])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
How important do you think it is for State Parks to increase their engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities?[1]	3.28 (45.2)	3.34 (48.4)	3.69 (69.2)	3.81 (64.6)	3.89 (62.9)	3.75 (62.8)	3.50 (50.0)	3.62 (55.9)	2.92 (33.3)	3.53 (52.7)
How effective do you feel current Pennsylvania State Park engagement and outreach efforts have been with ethnically diverse communities?[2]	3.12 (27.9)	3.01 (27.3)	3.27 (45.5)	2.90 (33.1)	3.15 (40.7)	2.95 (26.0)	2.75 (25.0)	2.97 (30.5)	2.75 (33.3)	2.90 (26.2)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important
[2]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all effective to 5=extremely effective
[3]Rural is defined as a population density of less than 284 per sq. mile
[4]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important' or 'effective' or 'extremely effective'

Comparison by User/Non-User Within Ethnicity/Race

Table 153. Comparison by user/non-user- Engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities

Statement[1]	White (N=1274, 52.7%)		Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)		Hispanic/ Chicano/Latino (N=374, 15.5%)		Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)		Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)	
	User[3] N=578	Non N=681	User N=81	Non N=323	User N=113	Non N=253	User N=42	Non N=90	User N=80	Non N=150
M=Mean	M (%[4])	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
How important do you think it is for State Parks to increase their engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities?[1]	3.29 (48.4)	3.35 (46.7)	4.20 (80.7)	3.71 (61.0)	3.90 (70.8)	3.69 (59.1)	3.68 (59.6)	3.60 (53.5)	3.62 (56.3)	3.36 (47.6)
How effective do you feel current Pennsylvania State Park engagement and outreach efforts have been with ethnically diverse communities?[2]	3.13 (31.2)	2.95 (23.5)	3.20 (46.4)	2.82 (29.9)	2.95 (28.7)	2.99 (26.8)	3.25 (37.5)	2.80 (25.3)	2.88 (26.5)	2.92 (27.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important
[2]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all effective to 5=extremely effective
[3]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[4]Percent reporting 'important' or 'extremely important' or 'effective' or 'extremely effective'

Ethnic Minority Panel Open-Ended Responses

There were a number of questions asked in the online ethnic minority panel that were followed up by open-ended questions. For example, after answering a question about the extent to which state parks provide benefits to nearby communities, respondents who agreed or strongly disagreed that state parks provided benefits to nearby communities were then asked what these benefits were. Furthermore, respondents were asked what they felt is most important for Pennsylvania to consider for the future of Pennsylvania State Parks. Respondents who identified as members of ethnic minority groups were asked what Pennsylvania could do to accommodate the needs and interests of their selected ethnicity group. White respondents were asked what Pennsylvania State Parks could do to accommodate their recreation needs and interests. Detailed results of these open-ended follow-ups can be found on pages 155 through 166.

Due to the oversampling of White respondents, the research team made the decision to code only every third open-ended comment from the White respondents so as not to heavily influence the frequencies with comments from non-ethnic minorities. Originally responses from White respondents totaled 840 for Question 1, 1,086 for Question 2, and 947 for Question 3. Responses were selected from unsorted data and every third response entered was coded with the ethnic minority comments. When combined with comments from the ethnic minority respondents, this resulted in a total of 791 responses to Question 1, 1,258 responses for Question 2, and 1,152 responses to Question 3. White and ethnic minority respondents were asked slightly different versions of Question 3. Because of this, responses were coded separately and are presented independent from each other. Moreover, themes among White and non-White respondents were very different. Ethnic minority respondents frequently cited the importance of outreach, advertising, various forms of multilingual communication, and the incorporation of culture into events at state parks. On the other hand, White respondents focused more on infrastructure, specifically trails and other facilities, general management, and activity specific requests. Responses were coded into major themes and sub-themes for each question. If necessary, responses were coded into multiple categories. The quotes presented for each theme are instrumental and have been intentionally selected due to their nature as good hallmarks for each sub-theme.

Major themes are presented in **bold** and subthemes are presented in *italics.* Each quote starts on a new line in *italics.* In general, four or fix quotes have been selected for each theme. Some major themes also have a *general* category which represent comments which fit the major theme, but did not directly relate to any of the sub-themes.

What are the benefits that you feel State Parks provide to nearby communities?

There were eight major themes for Question 1: place to go to experience nature/get outdoors, economic benefit, family, environmental benefit, recreation/activities, relaxation, and tourism/visitors (Table 154). The most frequent major theme was a place to go to experience nature/get outdoors (22%), followed by economic benefit (10.1%). Examples of responses to experiencing nature/getting outdoors are: "It allows citizens to observe and be a part of nature. Not everyone is able to enjoy nature in large cities so we should take advantage of our parks and wildlife" and "Ability to enjoy nature, a place to get out and exercise, a place to spend time with family and friends at little or no cost, and opportunities to train our children in outdoor activities." Examples of responses to economic benefit are "State parks bring in revenue, add jobs, and boost morale of their nearby communities" and "Jobs and the building of the economy through visitor spending in the community and its outlying neighborhoods."

Table 154. What are the benefits that you feel State Parks provide to nearby communities?

Themes	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Place to Go to Experience Nature/Be Outdoors	283	22%	*Some benefits that I feel State Parks provide to nearby communities is a chance to experience nature in its most natural state. It also gives us the opportunity to step away from technology for a while and just generally enjoy what nature has to offer us. Fishing, swimming, hiking and camping areas. Also the availability of picnic areas.* *Ability to enjoy nature, a place to get out and exercise, a place to spend time with family and friends at little or no cost, and opportunities to train our children in outdoor activities.* *It allows citizens to observe and be a part of nature. Not everyone is able to enjoy nature in large cities so we should take advantage of our parks and wildlife.* *The ability to experience nature and have a relaxing getaway available relatively close by while also being educated on nature and basic survival while camping.* *It provides an outlet for families to get together for brief or extended periods of time. It allows children to get out in nature and provides a local outdoor experience.* *People who live in apartments can enjoy the outdoors even though they don't have yards. Everyone can enjoy things they can't do in their own back yards--fishing, boating, enjoying lakes and streams, walking paths, picnic areas, etc.*
Economic Benefit	130	10.1%	*State parks bring in revenue, add jobs, and boost morale of their nearby communities.* *People visiting the parks will be buying food and outdoor accessories in those communities. Also, buying fuel for their cars, campfire wood, bait etc.* *Jobs and the building of the economy through visitor spending in the community and it's outlying neighborhoods.* *Helps to boost the economy.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 154 Continued. What are the benefits that you feel State Parks provide to nearby communities?

Themes	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Family	88	6.8%	*The State Parks are also a very good place for friends and families to gather and spend time together. Making happy memories is what life's about.* *A place to have family gatherings, quiet walks, beautiful scenery.* *State parks have the ability to let family members bond with one another while having fun.* *I think they provide a nice outdoor area for families to enjoy time together. Especially picnicking together.*
Environment Benefit	84	6.5%	*Most of them have a lot of wildlife in them and also a lot of trees and it can add to the community visually.* *Habitat for animals, corridor for animals, natural erosion prevention, natural buffer between communities, scenery which can be relaxing and calming, natural water filtration and runoff management, biodiversity.* *A place where nature and wildlife can be preserved so its beauty can be viewed and shared by all.* *Keeps open space promoting a cleaner environment. Saves land from over development.*
Recreation/Activities	74	5.7%	*Beautiful places to hike, bike, swim and spend time with family/friends.* *It provides an activity for the community to do/go to as well as gives an opportunity to enjoy nature.* *Activities encourage people to get out more.* *Camping, fishing, hiking, etc.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 154 Continued. What are the benefits that you feel State Parks provide to nearby communities?

Themes	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Relaxation	63	4.9%	*Relaxation. Best Cure for stress.* *I think they give people the meditation that they need to get through their daily struggle.* *They allow people to step away from the constant "go" of life and relax. Taking a leisurely hike through nature can help people unwind and forget their daily troubles.* *Place for people to relax and de-stress.*
Tourism/Visitors	52	4.0%	*Local tourism for community.* *More visitors to the area.* *Bring in more people to the area.* *It brings tourists to the area which can improve the area's reputation.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

What do you feel is most important for Pennsylvania to consider for the future of Pennsylvania State Parks?

The most frequent themes for Question 2 were environment (17.5%) followed by maintenance/infrastructure (12.9%), and management (12.7%). Within these themes, there were eight subthemes: preservation, conservation, general environment, cleanliness, maintenance, facilities, safety, and general management (Table 155). Examples of quotes within the environment theme include: "Preserve the land and keep it under the control of the state. Do not sell off or outsource" and Conservation and progress used in the right context that satisfies everyone." Examples of quotes within the maintenance/infrastructure theme include: "Maintaining them for future generations" and" I think there should be more attraction at each state park, spice it up." Lastly, examples of quotes within the management theme include: "The safety of anyone who decides to go to a park and enjoy nature" and "Keeping the park and everyone that's in it safe."

Table 155. What do you feel is most important for Pennsylvania to consider for the future of Pennsylvania State Parks?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Environment	234	17.5%	
Preservation	118	8.8%	*Preserve the land and keep it under the control of the state. Do not sell off or outsource.* *Preserving nature. Limit motorized rec vehicles, and fumes and unnatural sounds/noise.* *Preservation of the land/history.* *Preserving the beautiful wildlands and wildlife in the state.*
General Environment	60	4.5%	*Make them more about environment protection, less about people amenities.* *The impact of our carbon footprint.* *Ensure humans aren't impacting nature negatively.* *More environment protection.*
Conservation	56	4.2%	*Conserving the nature and not taking too much of it away for building purposes.* *Conservation of natural resources.* *Conservation and progress used in the right context that satisfies everyone.* *Wildlife conservation.*
Maintenance/Infrastructure	173	12.9%	
Cleanliness	91	6.8%	*Proper disposal of trash otherwise it can do serious damage to wildlife & the areas around it.* *Everything is 100% clean and sanitize and quiet.* *To make them cleaner, keep the garbage in the trash can.* *Add trash cans as some people are too lazy to take their garbage with them. I almost always end up cleaning someone else's trash.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 155 Continued. What do you feel is most important for Pennsylvania to consider for the future of Pennsylvania State Parks?

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Maintenance	58	4.3%	*Maintaining them for future generations.* *Just keep them up to date and not let them deteriorate.* *Maintain the parks is good conditions.* *Maintenance of existing facilities.*
Facilities	24	1.8%	*I think there should be more attraction at each state park, spice it up.* *More camping spots.* *Carnival rides.* *Make more picnic spots.*
Management	169	12.7%	
Safety	104	7.8%	*Make it safer for all races.* *The safety of anyone who decides to go to a park and enjoy nature.* *Keeping the park and everyone that's in it safe.* *Always be alert for weapons and always have life guards.*
Service	65	4.9%	*For every person to enjoy visiting the park.* *How to keep them operating at a high level.* *Keeping up with the times.* *Make it more people friendly.* *The individual experience.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [Selected race/ethnicity]? (Asked of ethnic minority respondents)

Among ethnic minority respondents, there were four most frequent major themes for Question 3: general management (14.9%), communication (12.2%), events and activities (11.2%), and incorporating culture (4.7%). Within general management, subthemes include equality, welcoming atmosphere, cost, diverse/multilingual staffing, and safety/security (Table 156). Within communication, subthemes include general advertising, multilingual advertising, outreach, and multilingual information and signage. Within events and activities, subthemes include cultural events, activities, and general events. Within incorporating culture, subthemes include food and history. Examples of quotes within general management include: "Just realize that everyone is different and someone's race may not define them," "Having a diverse staff. Helps people feel comfortable and more welcome- they don't feel out of place," and "Ensure our safety from those who don't welcome us." Within communication, quotes include: "Include us in advertising and advertise on Spanish TV," "Increase outreach efforts to get Black/African Americans involved. Develop youth programs to coordinate with to do so," and "All parks should have sighs, pamphlets, and other information in multiple languages. They don't all need to be listed in the same area, to prevent excessive walls of text." Examples of quotes within the events and activities theme include: "Hold more events that celebrate us but make it public so everyone can enjoy and see other cultures," "Ethnic specific events held at the local state park could attract that demographic," and "Probably throw more concerts or events." Lastly, within the incorporating culture themes, quotes include items such as: "Ethnics food dishes should be made available," "Have programs to help benefit and teach others about the Native Americans and how at one time these state parks all belonged to the native people and how parks can help the native people," and "Incorporate programs about African American history."

Table 156. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [Selected race/ethnicity]? (Responses ethnic minority respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Communication	108	12.2%	
General Advertising	50	5.6%	*Advertise to the communities by letting them know about things that they can do at a state park.*
			Develop PSA's that show African Americans enjoying the parks with their families.
			Maybe market to that specific group. Am Hispanic myself and I love nature, but others might not be aware of all of its beauty and benefits. So targeting them might be a good idea.
			I think more advertising, and awareness that there are other things to do besides just things in the city, would go a long way.
			Advertising and employment of Black folks.
			Include more representation in advertising, brochures, education, and staffing.
Multilingual Advertising	8	1%	*Local TV commercials in Spanish advertising the parks or the idea of going to a local state park.*
			Include us in advertising and advertise on Spanish TV.
			Advertise in Spanish.
Outreach	25	2.8%	*Increase outreach efforts to get Black/African Americans involved. Develop youth programs to coordinate with to do so.*
			By reaching out more to Hispanic inner city communities.
			Reach out to the communities and see what would bring them out.
			Continue to reach out to different communities off of programs and activities for all and make offers to bring communities together.
			More outreach with Asian communities.

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 156 Continued. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [Selected race/ethnicity]? (Responses ethnic minority respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Multilingual Info & Signage	25	2.8%	*All parks should have signs, pamphlets, and other information in multiple languages. They don't all need to be listed in the same area, to prevent excessive walls of text.* *Provide information to visit and for activities in Spanish language and in areas/ community centers where they attend.* *Offer maps and park informational pages in other languages at the park office.* *Make signs bilingual.* *Signage in various languages in areas.*
Events & Activities	100	11.2%	
Cultural Events	42	4.7%	*Have more cultural events based on the life of African Americans in America.* *Bring some culture into the park.* *Hold more events that celebrate us but make it public so everyone can enjoy and see other cultures.* *Tie programming to significant cultural events.* *Ethnic specific events held at the local state park could attract that demographic.* *Offer Hispanic pride night or Hispanic monthly celebrations.*
Activities	31	3.5%	*More activities for African Americans.* *More diverse activities.* *More activities for seniors.* *Provide activities that everyone could participate in.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 156 Continued. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [Selected race/ethnicity]? (Responses ethnic minority respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
General Events	27	3.0%	*They can host events, educational things, speakers of the community.* *Create events that would benefit all races, African Americans included.* *Have comedian's, rib cook-off's etc.* *Have dance parties.* *Probably throw more concerts or events.*
Incorporating Culture	42	4.7%	
Food	22	2.5%	*Maybe have a day where they offer free food or refreshments and some music. Make it a community day or something.* *Ethnics food dishes should be made available.* *Maybe sell Hispanic item such as drinks and snacks at concession stands.* *Cultural food.* *Have kosher facilities.*
History	20	2.2%	*Incorporate programs about African American history.* *History lesson about the roles Black/African Americans in the park/area.* *Share historical figures who had a vested interest in nature/wildlife who were of Hispanic ethnicity.* *Teach people of the natives who once lived in that area.* *Have programs to help benefit and teach others about the Native Americans and how at one time these state parks all belonged to the native people. And how parks can help the native people.* *Historical information regarding local tribes.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 156 Continued. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [Selected race/ethnicity]? (Responses ethnic minority respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
General Management	133	14.9%	
Equality	53	5.9%	*To be treated as an equal, not to over react when an issue occurs and not make assumptions without all the facts.* *Provide us the same fair accommodations.* *Better Treatment For The Black Community.* *By giving them a fair shot at attending these parks without feeling like they did something wrong.* *Treat everyone the same no matter what race.* *We love the same things as other cultures do. Stop stereotyping us.* *Just realize that everyone is different and someone's race may not define them.*
Welcoming Atmosphere	28	3.1%	*Make them feel more welcome.* *Keep being welcoming to all humans.* *Just making everyone feel like they belong.. because they do. When we no longer have to ask these questions... then we finally have done it.* *Make everyone welcome.*
Cost	15	1.7%	*Make them affordable and available.* *Free admission and no charge for camping space.* *Decrease the price.* *Keep them public with fair admittance charges.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 156 Continued. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania do to accommodate the needs and interests of [Selected race/ethnicity]? (Responses ethnic minority respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Diverse/Multilingual Staffing	22	2.5%	*Personnel that speak their language.* *Have bilingual people work there.* *Hire more diverse ethnicity.* *Employ quality Hispanic officers or employees.* *Diversity in workforce at parks.* *Having a diverse staff. Helps people feel comfortable and more welcome- they don't feel out of place.*
Safety/Security	15	1.7%	*Ensure our safety from those who don't welcome us.* *Provide safety and security.* *Make sure we are safe.* *Security and equality.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania State Parks do to accommodate your recreation needs and interests? (Asked of White respondents)

Among White respondents, there were three major themes for Question 3: infrastructure (16.1%), general management (10.5), and activities (7.1%). Infrastructure included subthemes of trails, general facilities, cleanliness, and picnic areas (Table 157). General management included subthemes of advertising, cost, and information. Examples of quotes relating to infrastructure include "Develop more walking and hiking trails as well as rest area, etc." and "Clean facilities and well maintained public trails and fields." In terms of general management, quotes included responses such as: "Advertising so we know what is there that we can't do at home" and "provide more information regarding various events." Examples of quotes relating to activities include "I want better activities to play when I travel there" and "Offer more group activities."

Table 157. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania State Parks do to accommodate your recreation needs and interests? (Responses from White respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Infrastructure	64	19.1%	
Trails	24	7.1%	*More running trails or races that can be hosted in the parks.*
			Develop more walking and hiking trails as well as rest area, etc.
			Trail maintenance, remove large rocks and make sure roots are not tripping hazards.
			Some trails aren't as kept up as they should be.
Facilities	20	6.0%	*Have bathroom facilities and modern cabins.*
			Add more restrooms, sprinklers for kids, splash playground.
			Improve recreation areas, tennis courts, play grounds, restrooms, picnic areas.
			More facilities near areas of interest.
Cleanliness	10	3.0%	*Clean facilities and well maintained public trails and fields.*
			Cleaner bathrooms.
			They could keep the grounds clean.
			Keep the parks clean.

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Table 157 Continued. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania State Parks do to accommodate your recreation needs and interests? (Responses from White respondents)

Themes (*Subthemes*)	Frequency	Percent[1]	Example Quotes
Picnic Areas	10	3.0%	*More picnic areas.* *Build nicer picnic and play areas for kids.* *More eating areas.*
General Management	35	10.5%	
Advertising	15	4.5%	*Advertising so we know what is there that we can't do at home.* *Somehow get info out about the parks and activities being offered.* *Better advertising. I need reminders on how much I enjoy visiting a State Park.* *Advertise activities more.*
Cost	10	3.0%	*Lower price of boat rentals.* *Lower prices.* *Free.* *Charge a small fee to keep all parks clean.*
Information	10	3.0%	*Provide more information regarding various events.* *Make more information available about facilities and points of interest in parks.* *Have more information about water sports readily available.* *Let me know what's available.*
Activities	24	7.1%	*More activities for kids and families.* *Offer more group activities.* *I want better activities to play when I travel there.* *Have more affordable activities.*

[1]Only the most frequent open-ended codes are displayed in this table and therefore, percentages will not total 100%.

Section 4: Summary and Conclusion

This study assessed attitudes of the Pennsylvania population and an ethnic minority panel towards core themes from *Penn's Parks for All* relevant to the future of state parks. As the population of ethnic minorities in Pennsylvania continues to grow, it is increasingly important to assess the attitudes of these populations, especially with regard to long-term planning for state parks. With both a telephone survey representative of the PA population and an ethnic minority panel survey, this study gives the Bureau of State Parks important insights for their future, as well as the future of the *Penn's Parks for All* strategic planning initiative. This section will provide an overall summary/interpretation of survey findings.

Within the both the telephone survey and ethnic minority panel, visitation patterns were generally varied across demographics. For example, in the telephone survey, White respondents reported more frequent visitation to their primary park compared to Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents. Moreover, low income respondents were less likely to have visited a state park in the last 12 months as compared to their higher income counterparts. The ethnic minority panel revealed further differences in state park visitation by race/ethnicity. Among youngest respondents (under age 25), state park visitation was much lower among Asian/Pacific Islander and Mixed Race/Other respondents as compared to White respondents. Among respondents above age 35, Black/African American respondents appeared to have significantly lower visitation that White respondents.

Respondents from both the telephone survey and the ethnic minority panel viewed state parks as primarily locations for healthful outdoor recreation activities. Additionally, the vast majority of respondents from both surveys agreed or strongly agreed that visitors to state parks should expect a quiet, natural, and/or wild experience. There was also support across race/ethnicity for offering more active adventure recreation activities. Respondents in the ethnic minority panel were additionally asked about travel and camping vacation packages and splash playgrounds. While responses were somewhat moderate across ethnicities, Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were noticeably more supportive of both of these items. While overall means for support on these two items were higher than in *Penn's Parks for All 2017,* trends by race/ethnicity remained consistent.

The ethnic minority panel was more supportive of all of the items than *Penn's Parks for All 2017*. There was generally majority support for adding more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hookups for campsites. Responses were fairly moderate towards the development of a few more inns, construction of larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families, and central all-purpose social halls, although it should be noted that Black/African and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents were generally supportive of these ideas.

When it comes to park funding, there was moderate to strong agreement for the allocation of additional funding from the commonwealth to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects; while majority support was seen across groups, support was generally higher among *Penn's Parks for All 2017* samples. Respondents to both surveys did not want to see fees implemented or increased, and believed that funding for state park rehabilitation projects should

come from the commonwealth. There was consistent disagreement across most sub-groups of both the telephone and ethnic minority panel with instituting a new annual/entrance fee, closing facilities that were too expensive to maintain, and leasing of state park facilities to private or non-profit companies. Responses from the telephone survey and ethnic minority panel were generally more moderate than those from *Penn's Parks for All 2017,* where overall responses suggested stronger disagreement to these items.

There was strong support among both samples for items regarding the protection of state parks. Overwhelming majorities in the telephone and ethnic minority surveys agreed or strongly agreed that state parks should improve water quality in streams and lakes, continue strategic land acquisition, enlarge boundaries of some state parks, and devote more staff and funding to conserving quality native habitats and protecting cultural resources. Respondents in both surveys were generally supportive of limiting participation when impacts of overuse are evident. The majority of both samples disagreed with the notion that there is no need to acquire additional state park land. These results from both the telephone survey and the ethnic minority panel are consistent with responses from *Penn's Parks for All 2017.*

There were notable differences between ethnicity/race in the ethnic minority panel when considering whether or not state parks should provide more modern conveniences. Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree with enhancing kitchen amenities and offering internet access for visitors. It should be noted that although the levels of agreement were higher among Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents, the percentage of these two groups agreeing or strongly agreeing were all around 50-60%. Majority support was consistent across race/ethnicities for having air conditioning in some modern cabins. Overall, the ethnic minority panel was much more supportive of modern conveniences than respondents from *Penn's Parks for All 2017.*

Satisfaction with state park services and facilities was above average for all items. Respondents from the telephone survey were least satisfied with the level of interaction with park staff and state park's online presence. There were some differences in satisfaction across demographic groups, for example, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander responses rating overall sanitation and cleanliness as good or excellent less frequently than other race/ethnicity groups.

When considering the appropriateness of various activities within state parks, special events with greater than 1,000 attendees, trails for motorized use, and resort-style development were all viewed as inappropriate in both the telephone survey and the ethnic minority panel. Although it should be noted than minority respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree with these items than White respondents. Support was generally high in both samples for adventure facilities/challenge courses and was noticeably higher than in *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* The ethnic minority panel included seven additional items which were not part of the telephone survey or *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* Respondents of all races generally found traditional ball sports, swimming pools, small special events, single use trail systems, shared use trail systems, increasing number of large picnic areas, and the maintenance of large grassy fields for sports to be appropriate. Black/African American and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino respondents

identified especially high support for the maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities as compared to other race/ethnicity groups. While respondents generally found special events with less than 1,000 attendees to be appropriate, support appeared to decline with age among White and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents.

Respondents reported minimal constraints, or barriers, to state park visitation. Among telephone survey respondents, constraints were very low. While constraints were higher among the ethnic minority panel sample, there were few means above 3.0 on a 1-5 scale. Respondents in both surveys rated being too busy with other life priorities as one of the highest constraint items. Black/African American, Hispanic/Chicano/Latino, lower income, and younger respondents appear to have more constraints to state park visitation than their respective counterparts in both the telephone survey and ethnic minority panel, most notably in regards to lack of transportation, lack of public transportation, fear of crime, and the state parks being too far away.

When considering place attachment among telephone survey respondents, respondents reported strong agreement with place attachment items relative to their primary park. Users were much more likely to agree or strongly agree to all items. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are attached to and identify strongly with their primary park.

White respondents were more likely to feel a sense of welcome and belonging in state parks than respondents of all other race/ethnicity groups. Additionally, while there were no significant differences by race/ethnicity in terms of effectiveness of engagement and outreach, respondents from ethnically diverse groups rated the importance of engagement and outreach as higher than White respondents.

There are a number of notable differences between the results of these studies and those from *Penn's Parks for All 2017*. Respondents in the telephone survey and ethnic minority panel seem to be more supportive of non-traditional state park activities, for example travel and camping vacation packages, splash playgrounds, and adventure facilities/challenge courses. Additionally, respondents in these surveys were more supportive of enhancing existing overnight accommodations and providing more modern conveniences in state parks. While majorities in both the telephone and ethnic minority panel agreed or strongly agreed that the commonwealth should allocate additional funding to state parks, agreement was significantly lower than that of *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* Similar trends persisted in terms of the Protecting Our Parks items, with responses from the telephone survey and ethnic minority panel being more moderate than Penn's Parks for All 2017. Disagreement toward other sources of funding such as instituting fees or leasing park facilities was also less strong compared to *Penn's Parks for All 2017.* These differences likely stem from the fact that much of the Penn's Parks for All 2017 sample consisted of in-park surveys and therefore respondents were often park users.

With regard to the open-ended questions from the telephone survey, it appears that respondents generally perceived the benefits of state parks to relate to outdoor recreation activities, the economy, and the enjoyment of nature. These themes were the most common for the first question: Does your local community benefit from state parks? If yes, what is the benefit? In terms of improving the state park experience, respondents noted issues of infrastructure improvement/maintenance, system wide management, and system wide issues.

From the ethnic minority panel, open-ended responses also provided interesting results. Respondents generally perceived benefits of state parks to relate to opportunities to experience nature or get outdoors, the economy, and recreational activities. In terms of what state parks should consider for the future, respondents most frequently made suggestions related to the following themes: environmental protection, maintenance and infrastructure, and general management. When asked about how state parks could best accommodate the needs of an individual's minority group, respondents identified the importance of improvements in communication, events and activities, incorporating culture, and general management such as staffing and overall atmosphere.

In conclusion, this report presents the results from a representative telephone survey and a demographically stratified ethnic minority panel online survey. It appears that Pennsylvanians of still support the mission of the Bureau of State Parks, are less supportive of fees, and are more supportive of public efforts to address the maintenance backlog. However, attitudes toward a number of possibly contentious issues differ noticeably across ethnic/racial groups. Varying attitudes in the activities and amenities that people wish to see in state parks should be taken into account for the remainder of the *Penn's Parks for All Strategic Planning Initiative.*

Section 5: Appendices

Appendix A: Telephone Survey Instrument
Appendix B: Ethnic Minority Panel Online Survey Instrument
Appendix C: Age Comparisons Within Race
Appendix D: Race Comparisons Within Age Groups
Appendix E: State Park Visitation, Age by Race Comparisons
Appendix F: State Park Visitation, Race by Age Comparisons
Appendix G: Appropriateness of Activities, Age by Race Comparisons
Appendix H: Appropriateness of Activities, Race by Age Comparisons
Appendix I: Topline Comparisons of PPFA 2017, Telephone Survey, and Ethnic Minority Panel Online Survey

Appendix A: Telephone Survey Instrument

Intro and Prompt

[Introduction] Hello, this is _____ from _____. The Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources is conducting a survey of Pennsylvania residents looking for ways to make Pennsylvania State Parks better. This survey is being conducted to inform the next 25-year strategic plan for Pennsylvania State Parks, called *Penn's Parks for All*. State parks wants your input on how the parks are being managed and how they should manage the parks into the future.

You've been selected as part of a random sample of residents to participate in this survey and your responses are confidential. Even if you haven't visited a state park in a while your opinions are still important. Could you take a few minutes to answer some questions?

First, are you 18 years or older? [IF NOT, ASK FOR SOMEONE WHO IS. IF NO ONE THEN CODE AS NOT 18]

[Only statistical totals will ever be published. This survey is anonymous and your name will never be placed on the questionnaire or reported in any way. The survey is completely voluntary and there is no obligation for you to participate. This interview will take 10-15 minutes. The Bureau of State parks is grateful for your help.]

Section A. Screening Questions Concerning State Park Use

A1. In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?
[IF YES RESPONDENT = "USER", GO TO A2] [IF NO GO TO A9]

A2. Which state park(s) have you visited in the last 12 months?
[LIST ALL, THEN GO TO A3. IF A2=ONLY ONE PARK - ANSWER IS "PRIMARY PARK", GO TO A4]

A3. Which state park did you visit most often in the last 12 months? [ANSWER IS "PRIMARY PARK"]

A4. How many times have you gone to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) in the last 12 months?

A5. Considering why you normally visit (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK), how many other places could you visit for the same type of experience within a reasonable distance to where you live?

A6. If you wanted to go to the next closest location that offers a similar quality of experience to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) would you have to travel farther? [IF YES GO TO A7] [IF NO GO TO A8]

A7. About how much further would you have had to travel to that location compared to visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)

A8. About how much closer would that location be compared to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)

[IF PARK USER go to A13]

A9. Have you ever visited a state park in Pennsylvania?
[IF YES, RESPONDENT = "FORMER USER", GO TO A10] [IF NO, RESPONDENT = "NON-USER", GO TO A11]

A10. Which state park(s) have you visited?
[LIST ALL, THEN GO TO A13]

A11. Have you visited any <u>other</u> types of public parks in Pennsylvania within the last 12 months?
Yes [GO TO A12] or No [CONTINUE TO A13]

A12. Which public park(s) have you visited in the last 12 months?
[LIST ALL, THEN GO TO A13]

A13. About how much do you think it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park? – Choose from one of the following five options.
   A. Five dollars per vehicle
   B. Ten dollars per vehicle
   C. Nothing Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter
   D. It depends on the park
   E. I really don't know

Section 1a. Selected Items from the Penn's Parks for All Visitor Survey

I would like to read you some statements about the state parks, and for each of the following, please tell me the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements. Your response choices are strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

1=SD 2=D 3=NEITHER 4=A 5=SA

The first item is (READ EACH ITEM, ROTATE START, REPEAT CHOICES AS NEEDED)

1a.1. Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience

1a.2. State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities

1a.3. State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities

1a.4. When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited

1a.5. Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed

1a.6. Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats

1a.7. Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)

1a.8. The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences

1a.9. Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks

1a.10. Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes

1a.11 Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system

1a.12. The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects

1a.13. The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs

1a.14. Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities

1a.14b. [If respondent indicates a "4" or "5" on this item, follow-up with the question: "What are those benefits?" and probe for up to 3 responses]

[IF "USER" OR "FORMER USER" GO TO SECTION 1b] [IF "NON-VISITOR" GO TO SECTION 3b]

Section 1b. Place Attachment to Primary Park

Pennsylvania State Parks are interested in your feelings about your primary State Park, (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK), please tell me the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements. Your response choices are strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree.   1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree 3=Neither agree nor disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1b.1. (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) means a lot to me

1b.2. I am very attached to (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)

1b.3. I identify strongly with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)

1b.4. I have a special connection with (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) and the people who visit it

1b.5. I enjoy visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) more than any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live

1b.6. I get more satisfaction out of visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) than from visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live

1b.7. Visiting (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) is more important than visiting any other similar area within a reasonable distance to where I live

1b.8. I wouldn't substitute any other place within a reasonable distance to where I live for (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK)

1b.9. I depend on (NAME OF PRIMARY PARK) to do the type of recreation I want within a reasonable distance to where I live

[IF "USER" GO TO SECTION 2] [IF "FORMER-USER" GO TO SECTION 3a]

Section 2. Satisfaction with Pennsylvania State Parks

Next, I would like to ask you about your level of satisfaction with various attributes of Pennsylvania State Parks, please rate the following items from 1 to 5 with 1 being "Poor," 2 being "fair," 3 being "Average," 4 being "Good," and 5 being "Excellent."

[IF RESPONDENT IS UNSURE OR DOESN'T KNOW, MARK 6 - DON'T KNOW]

2a. Responsiveness of employees

2b. Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)

2c. Feeling of safety

2d. Trail conditions

2e. Level of interaction with park staff

2f. Sanitation and cleanliness

2g. State Park's online presence

2h. Availability of outdoor recreation program activities

2i. Availability of education programs

2j. Is there anything the State Parks could do to improve your experience at the State Parks?
[IF YES GO TO 2k] [IF NO GO TO Section 3a]

2k. What could the State Parks do to improve your experience? _____

Section 3a. Net Promoter Score

3a.1. On a Scale of 0 to 10, with zero being not at all likely and 10 being extremely likely, how likely is it that you would recommend the Pennsylvania State Parks to a friend, family member, or colleague?

Section 3b. Appropriateness of Various Park Uses

Pennsylvania State Parks are interested in what you think is an appropriate use of a State Park. Please rate the following items from 1 being "inappropriate," 2 being "somewhat inappropriate," 3 being "neutral," 4 being 'somewhat appropriate," to 5 being "appropriate"

3b.1. Resort-style development

3b.2. Special events with greater than 1,000 attendees

3b.3. Trails for motorized use

3b.4. Adventure facilities/challenge courses

Sections 4. Constraints to Visiting State Parks

4a.1. I'd like to read you some reasons why people do not visit Pennsylvania State Parks or don't visit as often as they would like. Please tell me how important each of the following reasons are in preventing you from visiting the Pennsylvania State Parks.

Rate each item from 1 being "extremely unimportant," 2 being " somewhat unimportant," 3 being "neutral," 4 being "somewhat important," to 5 "extremely important" reason that prevents you from visiting or visiting as often as you would like.

4a.2. I do not have enough information on State Parks

4a.3. Fear of crime

4a.4. Poor personal health

4a.5. The State Parks are too far away

4a.6. Do not have transportation to the State Parks

4a.7. Lack of available public transportation

4a.8. The State Parks are not for people like me

4a.9. Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks

4a.10. Too busy with other life priorities

4a.11. Visiting State Parks costs too much

4a.12. Fear of the outdoors

4a.13. Do not have anyone to go with

4a.14. My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks

4a.15. Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks

4a.16. A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks

4a.17. State Parks have too many rules.

Section 5. Demographics-Information about Yourself and Your Household

Finally, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself. Please remember that your responses will be kept confidential and used only for statistical purposes.

5a. What is your zipcode?

5b. What is the highest grade in school you've completed? [DO NOT READ UNLESS NEEDED]
Some high school
Graduated high school or GED

Some college
College Graduate
Some graduate or professional training
Completed graduate or professional degree
Other (specify_____)

5c. In what year were you born?

5d. How many people live in your household, including yourself? [CAN CODE UP TO 10]

5e. [IF APPLICABLE] How many of the people are under the age of 18?

5f. Please stop me when I read the category that best represents your approximate gross total household income for 2016? [READ LIST]
1=Under $25,000   6= Over $150,000
2=$25,00 to $49,999 7= Don't know
3=$50,000 to $74,999
4=$75,000 to $99,999
5=$100,000 to $149,999

5h. Which of the following categories best describes your race and/or ethnic background? [READ OPTIONS]
1=White   5=American Indian or Alaskan Native
2=African American/Black   6=Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
3=Asian/Pacific Islander   7=Mixed race
4=Hispanic/Chicano/Latino 8=Other [GO TO 22a]

5i. How would you describe your ethnic background? [OPEN END]

5j.What is your gender?

1=Male 2=Female 3=Other [ANY ANSWER OTHER THAN MALE OR FEMALE CODE AS OTHER]

5k. Are you currently employed?

5l. Which of the following best describes the area where you live?
1= Rural
2= Village or town of under 10,000 people
3= Town of 10,000 to 20,000 people
4= City of 20,000 to 50,000 people
5= City of 50,00 to 100,000 people
6= Urban area of 100,000-250,000
7= Metropolitan area of more than 250,000 people
8= Other (please specify)

Section 6. Closing Statement and Thank You

We'd like to thank you for helping us with this survey. To learn more about Pennsylvania State Parks recreation opportunities please call their toll-free number 1-888-PA-PARKS (1-888-727-2757) or visit their website at **www.dcnr.pa.gov**. **Have a great day!**

[ONLY IF ASKED: RESPONDENT MAY CALL PA PARKS NUMBER TO GET COPY OF REPORT; REPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN APPROXIMATELY 1 YEAR]

Appendix B: Ethnic Minority Panel Online Survey Instrument

Your responses are confidential as the survey does not ask for any information that would identify who the responses belong to. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from this survey, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name is in no way linked to your responses.

Demographic Screen Out Questions – Before the Survey Begins

S1. Which one of the following categories best describes your race and/or ethnic background?
 __White
 __American Indian or Alaskan Native
 __Asian
 __Black or African American
 __Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 __Mixed Race
 __Hispanic/Chicano/Latino
 __Other (please specify) _____

S2. What is your age? (numbers only) _____

S3. What is your gender?
 __Male
 __Female
 __Other

S4. Do you live in Pennsylvania?
 __ Yes
 __ No

This survey is meant to generate an understanding about your attitudes and perceptions about Pennsylvania State Parks and your outdoor recreation behaviors.

The Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources is looking for ways to make the Pennsylvania State Parks better and is conducting a statewide survey of Pennsylvania residents of diverse ethnicities. This survey is being

conducted to inform the next 25-year strategic plan for Pennsylvania State parks, called Penn's Parks for All. We would like your input on how the parks are being managed and how they should be managed in the future.

Section 1. This section is interested in your use of the Pennsylvania State Parks. Please answer the following questions while considering the Pennsylvania State Park system.

1. In the last 12 months, have you visited a State Park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?

    __Yes

    __No

[If YES go to 2] [If NO go to 3]

2. Which State Park did you visit most often in the last 12 months? _____

[Go to 4]

3. Have you ever visited a State Park in Pennsylvania?

    __Yes

    __No

[If YES go to 4] [If NO go to 5]

4. Which State Parks have you visited? (Select all that apply)

    [All parks will be listed in columns in internet version]

5. Listed below are reasons why people do not visit Pennsylvania State parks, or do not visit as often as they would like. Please rate each item from 'Not at all important' to 'Extremely important' in preventing you from visiting the Pennsylvania State Parks as often as you would like.

Statement	Not at all important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
I do not have enough information about State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Fear of crime	1	2	3	4	5
Poor personal health	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks are too far away	1	2	3	4	5
Do not have transportation to State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of available public transportation	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks are not for people like me	1	2	3	4	5
Feel uneasy or not welcome at State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Too busy with other life priorities	1	2	3	4	5
Visiting State Parks costs too much	1	2	3	4	5
Fear of the outdoors	1	2	3	4	5
Do not have anyone to go with	1	2	3	4	5
Not interested in State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
My friends and family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Activities that I like to do are not available in State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Not aware of the recreational opportunities in State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit the State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks have too many rules	1	2	3	4	5
Nature is 'not my thing'	1	2	3	4	5

6. Is there anything else that prevents you from visiting State Parks in Pennsylvania, or from visiting as often as you would like?

_____

7. Pennsylvania State Parks are interested in what they could do to get you to visit or to increase your visitation of the state parks. Please rate how helpful the following strategies would be in increasing your State Park visitation, please rate each strategy from 'Not at all helpful' to 'Extremely helpful' in increasing your visitation of the State Parks.

Statement	Not at all Helpful	Slightly Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful
Provide more information about State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more organized activities	1	2	3	4	5
Reduce overcrowding in State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Provide public transportation to State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
Provide travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences	1	2	3	4	5
Make the State Parks safer	1	2	3	4	5
Increase the recreation opportunities offered	1	2	3	4	5
Increase staff availability and patrolling	1	2	3	4	5
Improve the facilities to a higher standard (e.g. restrooms and picnic shelters)	1	2	3	4	5
Increase amenities in cabin colonies and campgrounds	1	2	3	4	5

8. In there anything else State Parks could do to increase your visitation in the future? If so, what would that be?

_____

9. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Pennsylvania State Parks from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	1	2	3	4	5
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	1	2	3	4	5
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	1	2	3	4	5
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	1	2	3	4	5
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	1	2	3	4	5
The operation of select State Park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	1	2	3	4	5

Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should develop additional "splash playgrounds" in some parks in place of swimming pools	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer and electrical hook-ups for campsites	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	1	2	3	4	5
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	1	2	3	4	5
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	1	2	3	4	5

10A. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: Pennsylvania State Parks provide significant benefits for nearby communities (IF 4 or 5 Go to 9A)
     1. Strongly disagree
     2. Disagree
     3. Neither agree nor disagree
     4. Agree
     5. Strongly agree

10B. What are the benefits that you feel State Parks provide to nearby communities? _____

10. Please rate how appropriate you feel the following uses are for State Parks in Pennsylvania.

Statement	Inappropriate	Somewhat Inappropriate	Neutral	Somewhat Appropriate	Appropriate
Resort-style development	1	2	3	4	5
Special events with greater than 1,000 attendees	1	2	3	4	5
Trails for motorized use	1	2	3	4	5
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	1	2	3	4	5
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	1	2	3	4	5
Swimming pools	1	2	3	4	5
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	1	2	3	4	5
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	1	2	3	4	5
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	1	2	3	4	5
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	1	2	3	4	5
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	1	2	3	4	5

11. About how much do you think it costs to enter a Pennsylvania State Park? Choose one of the following five options.
      A. Five dollars per vehicle
      B. Ten dollars per vehicle
      C. Nothing, Pennsylvania State Parks are free to enter
      D. It depends on the park
      E. I really don't know

12. What do you feel is most important for Pennsylvania to consider for the future of Pennsylvania State Parks?

_____

13. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Pennsylvania State Parks from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
State Parks are for people like me	1	2	3	4	5
I feel welcome at State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
I feel like I belong at State Parks	1	2	3	4	5
State Parks are a comfortable place for people like me to hang out	1	2	3	4	5
At State Parks, I feel like I matter	1	2	3	4	5

14. How important do you think it is for State Parks to increase their engagement and outreach with ethnically diverse communities?
   1. Not at all important
   2. Slightly important
   3. Moderately important
   4. Very important
   5. Extremely important

15. How effective do you feel current Pennsylvania State Park engagement and outreach efforts have been with ethnically diverse communities?
   1. Not at all effective
   2. Slightly effective
   3. Moderately effective
   4. Very effective
   5. Extremely effective
   6. I don't know

16. In your opinion, what could Pennsylvania State Parks do to accommodate the recreation needs and interests of [Insert stated ethnicity] s? (For White respondents, "What could Pennsylvania State Parks do to accommodate your recreation needs and interests?")

_____

General Recreation Questions

Thank you for answering questions regarding Pennsylvania's State Parks, now we would like to ask you questions about outdoor recreation in general.

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Outdoor recreation activities include a variety of things you do outdoors with your free time. They include walking and cycling along trails and roads, hunting and fishing, boating, camping, bird watching, sightseeing, playing sports like golf and soccer, and many more examples.

17. During the past year, how often did you participate in any outdoor recreation activities?
　　__Two or more times per week
　　__About once per week
　　__About once or twice per month
　　__Several times during the year
　　__Once or twice during the year
　　__I never participate in outdoor recreation

[If outdoor recreation participant go to 17b] [If non-participant go to 18]
17b. What is your favorite or primary outdoor recreation activity (list one)? _____

17c. About how often did you participate in that activity during the past 12 months? (numbers only) _____

17d. When considering the primary outdoor recreation activity stated above, how important are the following reasons for participating in that activity?

Statement	Not at all important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
To do something with your family	1	2	3	4	5
To be with your friends	1	2	3	4	5
To be with other people	1	2	3	4	5
To get exercise	1	2	3	4	5
To keep physically fit	1	2	3	4	5
To improve your physical health	1	2	3	4	5
To relax physically	1	2	3	4	5
To experience the calm and peace	1	2	3	4	5
To experience tranquility	1	2	3	4	5
To be close to nature	1	2	3	4	5
To gain a better appreciation of nature	1	2	3	4	5
To enjoy the sounds and smells of nature	1	2	3	4	5

18. Thinking about all of the outdoor recreation activities you do, including but not limited to your primary outdoor recreation activity. In the past year, how often did you use each of the following types of outdoor recreation areas?

Type of area	Did you visit this type of area?		How many days did you participate in outdoor recreation at this type of area?
Local/Municipal parks, trails, and recreation areas	Yes	No	
County parks, rails, and recreation areas	Yes	No	
State Parks, forests, and recreation areas	Yes	No	
Federal parks, forests and recreation areas	Yes	No	
Private/commercial recreation areas	Yes	No	
Other (Please specify) _____	Yes	No	

19. How important to you are each of the following priorities for managing Pennsylvania State Parks?

Statement	Not at all important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Acquire and protect open space (as undeveloped, conserved land)	1	2	3	4	5
Acquire additional land and water areas for developed recreation	1	2	3	4	5
Provide environmental and conservation programs	1	2	3	4	5
Provide recreation programs in the parks	1	2	3	4	5
Protect wildlife and fish habitat	1	2	3	4	5
Build more greenways/trails	1	2	3	4	5
Restore damaged rivers and streams	1	2	3	4	5
Build pedestrian and cycling paths between places of work, parks, schools, and shopping areas	1	2	3	4	5
Provide outdoor recreation opportunities that meet the recreation needs and interests of ethnically diverse visitors	1	2	3	4	5
Increase signs and communication in multiple languages at parks and outdoor recreation areas	1	2	3	4	5
Increase the number of multi-lingual outdoor recreation programs	1	2	3	4	5
Increase safety at parks and outdoor recreation areas	1	2	3	4	5
Make outdoor recreation areas more welcoming and inviting to diverse visitors	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more organized outdoor recreation programs for children and youth	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more information on outdoor recreation opportunities in local communities	1	2	3	4	5

20. From the list of priorities in the question above, which one do you consider to be the highest management priority for Pennsylvania?

    (Dropdown of the statements from Q19.)

Demographic information

21. What is your home zip code?

22. How many years have you lived in that zip code?

23. What is your marital status?
    __Married
    __Widowed
    __Divorced
    __Separated
    __Never married

24. How many people live in your household including yourself?

25. In what year were you born?

26. In which annual income group would you place your household?
    __Under $25,000
    __$25,000 - $49,999
    __$50,000 - $74,999
    __$75,000 - $99,999
    __$100,000 - $149,999
    __$150,000 or over
    __Don't know

27. Which statement best describes your current employment status?
　　__Working (paid employee)
　　__Working (self-employed)
　　__Not working (temporary layoff from a job)
　　__Not working (looking for work)
　　__Not working (disabled)
　　__Not working (retired)
　　__Not working (Other –please describe) _____

28. Are you currently a student?
　　__Yes
　　__No

29. Which of the following best describes the area where you live?
　　__Open countryside
　　__Village or town of under 10,000 people
　　__Town of 10,000 to 20,000 people
　　__City of 20,000 to 50,000 people
　　__City of 50,000 to 100,000 people
　　__Urban area (100,000 to 250,000 people)
　　__Metropolitan area (over 250,000 people)
　　__Military base
　　__Other (please specify)_____

Thank you for your time! Please click Next to submit your response.

Appendix C: Age Comparisons Within Race

Table 1. White means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by age

Statement[1]	White			
	18-24 (235)	**25-34 (316)**	**35-50 (366)**	**50+ (355)**
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	4.05 (78.6)	4.12 (80.4)	4.11 (79.5)	4.15 (84.5)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.82 (66.4)	3.99 (74.4)	4.01 (75.5)	4.10 (82.2)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.41 (45.9)	3.48 (52.4)	3.59 (56.3)	3.64 (60.1)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.78 (66.1)	3.81 (67.9)	3.72 (62.9)	3.41 (48.3)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.56 (56.0)	3.60 (59.3)	3.55 (57.0)	3.43 (49.3)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.40 (48.5)	3.54 (53.8)	3.41 (50.7)	3.25 (39.9)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.32 (45.3)	3.34 (44.9)	3.41 (50.8)	3.41 (48.3)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.37 (47.2)	3.40 (48.7)	3.26 (42.1)	3.09 (32.7)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.35 (46.2)	3.32 (44.2)	3.25 (37.5)	3.14 (33.0)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.45 (45.3)	3.69 (57.2)	3.64 (54.5)	3.74 (60.0)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.56 (20.9)	2.71 (25.4)	2.82 (28.0)	2.93 (31.3)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.86 (20.4)	2.83 (22.0)	2.82 (23.3)	2.92 (24.6)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.83 (25.2)	2.90 (31.2)	2.84 (28.3)	2.66 (22.9)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to Improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.85 (69.7)	3.80 (67.0)	3.81 (65.6)	3.84 (68.9)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.75 (64.7)	3.82 (63.0)	3.76 (62.3)	3.66 (57.6)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.63 (56.2)	3.75 (60.6)	3.73 (60.7)	3.63 (54.8)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.83 (67.7)	3.79 (63.1)	3.76 (61.6)	3.74 (63.9)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.69 (64.5)	3.78 (62.8)	3.73 (61.6)	3.80 (66.1)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.62 (16.6)	2.59 (19.6)	2.59 (18.4)	2.71 (22.3)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.48 (53.4)	3.59 (55.3)	3.55 (51.5)	3.47 (48.7)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.34 (45.5)	3.36 (42.0)	3.35 (44.2)	3.32 (38.9)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.59 (61.4)	3.54 (56.6)	3.51 (56.4)	3.27 (45.2)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.22 (46.4)	3.20 (44.3)	3.17 (44.5)	3.10 (38.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 2. Black means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by age

Statement[1]	Black/African American			
	18-24 (89)	25-34 (96)	35-50 (118)	50+ (104)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	3.49 (57.3)	3.95 (67.0)	3.80 (65.3)	3.98 (73.5)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.36 (46.1)	3.82 (63.5)	3.71 (60.2)	3.84 (64.4)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.36 (44.3)	3.49 (50.5)	3.42 (46.6)	3.43 (46.5)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.60 (57.5)	3.86 (67.7)	3.86 (65.3)	3.70 (61.5)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.58 (57.0)	3.81 (58.6)	3.81 (63.0)	3.74 (62.4)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.50 (55.7)	3.61 (56.7)	3.59 (53.4)	3.38 (45.6)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.44 (46.1)	3.68 (56.4)	3.55 (51.3)	3.52 (52.4)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.41 (46.6)	3.57 (54.7)	3.43 (49.2)	3.39 (44.2)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.48 (55.1)	3.58 (54.1)	3.51 (49.6)	3.35 (37.3)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.25 (40.4)	3.81 (60.8)	3.47 (51.7)	3.79 (61.4)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	3.03 (35.2)	3.11 (37.4)	3.07 (33.6)	2.98 (26.5)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	3.05 (37.1)	3.23 (36.4)	2.97 (30.8)	2.92 (20.6)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	3.27 (39.8)	3.23 (41.4)	3.01 (34.7)	2.89 (23.3)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.38 (55.2)	3.92 (69.1)	3.85 (68.1)	3.92 (67.0)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.49 (50.0)	3.60 (55.8)	3.41 (47.9)	3.54 (50.5)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.43 (51.1)	3.66 (57.1)	3.62 (56.4)	3.79 (64.1)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.52 (55.7)	3.73 (62.1)	3.64 (62.2)	3.76 (61.2)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.43 (53.9)	3.61 (56.7)	3.75 (62.7)	3.83 (62.5)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	3.07 (33.7)	3.19 (38.1)	3.09 (32.8)	2.76 (17.6)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.55 (58.0)	3.64 (55.7)	3.63 (56.8)	3.65 (55.4)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.54 (52.9)	3.69 (54.7)	3.63 (55.9)	3.64 (53.8)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.45 (52.9)	3.82 (66.7)	3.72 (61.0)	3.47 (49.0)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.53 (53.4)	3.58 (51.0)	3.70 (63.9)	3.65 (58.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 3. Latino means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by age

Statement[1]	Hispanic/Chicano/Latino			
	18-24 (98)	25-34 (97)	35-50 (114)	50+ (60)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	3.79 (58.2)	4.06 (76.3)	4.16 (83.9)	4.15 (91.7)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.63 (51.5)	3.81 (69.1)	3.89 (71.1)	3.93 (71.7)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.45 (47.9)	3.42 (50.5)	3.56 (53.1)	3.50 (51.7)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.71 (55.7)	3.85 (70.8)	3.94 (72.6)	3.97 (78.3)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.68 (60.2)	3.74 (61.9)	3.77 (66.7)	3.93 (72.9)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.65 (58.6)	3.67 (66.0)	3.73 (66.7)	3.72 (65.0)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.63 (57.1)	3.54 (59.8)	3.56 (50.9)	3.72 (58.3)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.36 (45.9)	3.38 (50.0)	3.45 (49.6)	3.58 (58.3)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.54 (51.5)	3.37 (47.4)	3.38 (43.5)	3.70 (55.0)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.51 (52.0)	3.42 (44.3)	3.70 (57.0)	3.70 (56.7)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	3.12 (37.8)	2.69 (27.6)	2.89 (26.3)	3.28 (48.3)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	3.17 (37.4)	2.93 (28.1)	2.92 (22.8)	2.93 (25.0)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	3.24 (40.4)	2.99 (30.9)	2.91 (27.2)	2.88 (28.3)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.77 (62.6)	3.89 (73.2)	3.96 (71.9)	3.92 (75.0)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.65 (60.2)	3.88 (67.0)	3.72 (57.4)	3.77 (61.7)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.62 (61.2)	3.78 (63.9)	3.75 (61.4)	3.78 (63.3)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.56 (56.1)	3.77 (66.0)	3.82 (65.8)	3.86 (70.7)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.67 (57.1)	3.77 (69.1)	3.84 (71.3)	3.85 (71.2)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	3.15 (39.4)	2.53 (18.6)	2.82 (20.2)	2.69 (20.3)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.53 (45.5)	3.64 (63.3)	3.72 (58.4)	3.67 (58.3)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.57 (55.1)	3.53 (56.3)	3.50 (52.2)	3.70 (61.7)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.54 (52.5)	3.80 (63.5)	3.71 (58.8)	3.65 (56.7)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.46 (49.0)	3.38 (56.7)	3.32 (48.7)	3.69 (62.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 4. Asian/Pacific Islander means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by age

Statement[1]	Asian/Pacific Islander			
	18-24 (29)	25-34 (50)	35-50 (51)	50+ (15)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	4.21 (79.3)	3.78 (67.3)	3.90 (68.6)	3.60 (66.7)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.07 (75.9)	3.84 (74.0)	3.96 (74.5)	4.00 (73.3)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.59 (51.7)	3.47 (55.1)	3.78 (68.6)	3.60 (53.3)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.93 (72.4)	3.70 (58.0)	3.80 (66.7)	3.67 (66.7)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.72 (51.7)	3.63 (57.1)	3.61 (60.8)	3.67 (46.7)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.62 (44.8)	3.48 (52.0)	3.57 (56.9)	3.40 (53.3)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.55 (48.3)	3.40 (50.0)	3.61 (54.9)	3.67 (60.0)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.34 (37.9)	3.26 (40.0)	3.47 (47.1)	3.40 (46.7)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.71 (60.7)	3.44 (46.0)	3.53 (54.9)	3.40 (46.7)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.59 (58.6)	3.54 (56.0)	3.80 (64.7)	4.07 (66.7)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.79 (27.6)	3.00 (34.0)	3.18 (39.2)	3.00 (33.3)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.79 (17.2)	3.34 (48.0)	3.45 (54.9)	2.93 (33.3)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.90 (31.0)	3.31 (42.9)	3.37 (51.0)	3.13 (33.3)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.97 (75.9)	3.86 (69.4)	3.84 (68.6)	3.93 (66.7)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.90 (72.4)	3.54 (64.0)	3.69 (60.8)	3.53 (46.7)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.79 (69.0)	3.63 (59.2)	3.84 (74.5)	3.67 (46.7)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	4.03 (69.0)	3.62 (58.0)	3.80 (72.5)	3.67 (66.7)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.90 (69.0)	3.74 (64.0)	3.76 (68.6)	3.60 (46.7)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.86 (13.8)	3.10 (32.7)	2.98 (29.4)	2.60 (13.3)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.69 (55.2)	3.68 (56.0)	3.80 (70.6)	3.47 (46.7)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.59 (51.7)	3.30 (44.0)	3.71 (64.7)	3.67 (60.0)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.79 (65.5)	3.48 (52.0)	3.80 (62.7)	3.53 (53.3)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.62 (58.6)	3.58 (62.0)	3.69 (60.8)	3.87 (66.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 5. Mixed Race/Other means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by age

Statement[1]	Mixed Race/Other			
	18-24 (48)	25-34 (53)	35-50 (51)	50+ (44)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	3.40 (55.3)	3.85 (64.2)	3.84 (68.6)	4.14 (84.1)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.52 (60.4)	3.68 (58.5)	3.71 (64.7)	4.09 (81.8)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.38 (47.9)	3.34 (43.4)	3.53 (49.0)	3.52 (56.8)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.65 (58.3)	3.52 (42.6)	3.62 (60.0)	3.39 (40.9)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.42 (45.8)	3.52 (50.0)	3.51 (51.0)	3.30 (47.7)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.58 (56.3)	3.24 (33.3)	3.53 (56.9)	3.34 (40.9)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.40 (41.7)	3.28 (44.4)	3.32 (44.0)	3.41 (50.0)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.35 (45.8)	3.04 (29.4)	3.26 (42.0)	3.14 (34.1)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.21 (38.3)	3.23 (34.6)	3.33 (39.2)	3.28 (37.2)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.25 (37.5)	3.49 (47.2)	3.56 (56.0)	3.93 (72.7)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.71 (22.9)	2.68 (24.5)	2.76 (33.3)	2.43 (13.6)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.90 (22.9)	2.74 (18.9)	2.84 (29.4)	2.81 (20.9)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	3.00 (33.3)	2.94 (32.1)	2.75 (23.5)	2.50 (18.2)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.73 (62.5)	3.72 (56.6)	3.59 (56.9)	3.95 (72.7)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.44 (50.0)	3.72 (54.7)	3.55 (51.0)	3.93 (63.6)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.28 (42.6)	3.64 (54.7)	3.51 (55.1)	3.91 (70.5)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.50 (47.9)	3.52 (55.6)	3.65 (62.7)	3.73 (68.2)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.56 (58.3)	3.45 (50.9)	3.66 (56.0)	3.75 (63.6)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.79 (27.1)	2.75 (22.6)	2.60 (18.0)	2.48 (15.9)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.23 (47.9)	3.34 (41.5)	3.24 (39.2)	3.45 (50.0)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.13 (36.2)	3.06 (34.0)	3.25 (37.3)	3.26 (34.9)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.52 (56.3)	3.44 (46.3)	3.31 (47.1)	3.43 (56.8)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.19 (39.6)	3.06 (37.7)	3.41 (51.0)	3.20 (50.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Appendix D: Race Comparisons with Age Groups

Table 6. 18-24 means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by race.

Statement[1]	Ages 18-24				
	White (235)	Black/African American (89)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (98)	Asian /Pacific Islander (29)	Mixed/ Other (48)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	4.05 (78.6)	3.49 (57.3)	3.79 (58.2)	4.21 (79.3)	3.40 (55.3)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.82 (66.4)	3.36 (46.1)	3.63 (51.5)	4.07 (75.9)	3.52 (60.4)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.41 (45.9)	3.36 (44.3)	3.45 (47.9)	3.59 (51.7)	3.38 (47.9)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.78 (66.1)	3.60 (57.5)	3.71 (55.7)	3.93 (72.4)	3.65 (58.3)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.56 (56.0)	3.58 (57.0)	3.68 (60.2)	3.72 (51.7)	3.42 (45.8)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.40 (48.5)	3.50 (55.7)	3.65 (58.6)	3.62 (44.8)	3.58 (56.3)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.32 (45.3)	3.44 (46.1)	3.63 (57.1)	3.55 (48.3)	3.40 (41.7)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.37 (47.2)	3.41 (46.6)	3.36 (45.9)	3.34 (37.9)	3.35 (45.8)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.35 (46.2)	3.48 (55.1)	3.54 (51.5)	3.71 (60.7)	3.21 (38.3)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.45 (45.3)	3.25 (40.4)	3.51 (52.0)	3.59 (58.6)	3.25 (37.5)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.56 (20.9)	3.03 (35.2)	3.12 (37.8)	2.79 (27.6)	2.71 (22.9)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.86 (20.4)	3.15 (37.1)	3.17 (37.4)	2.79 (17.2)	2.90 (22.9)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.83 (25.2)	3.27 (39.8)	3.24 (40.4)	2.90 (31.0)	3.00 (33.3)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.85 (69.7)	3.38 (55.2)	3.77 (62.6)	3.97 (75.9)	3.73 (62.5)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.75 (64.7)	3.49 (50.0)	3.65 (60.2)	3.90 (72.4)	3.44 (50.0)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.63 (56.2)	3.43 (51.1)	3.62 (61.2)	3.79 (69.0)	3.28 (42.6)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.83 (67.7)	3.52 (55.7)	3.56 (56.1)	4.03 (69.0)	3.50 (47.9)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.69 (64.5)	3.43 (53.9)	3.67 (57.1)	3.90 (69.0)	3.56 (58.3)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.62 (16.6)	3.07 (33.7)	3.15 (39.4)	2.86 (13.8)	2.79 (27.1)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.48 (53.4)	3.55 (58.0)	3.53 (45.5)	3.69 (55.2)	3.23 (47.9)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.34 (45.5)	3.54 (52.9)	3.57 (55.1)	3.59 (51.7)	3.13 (36.2)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.59 (61.4)	3.45 (52.9)	3.54 (52.5)	3.79 (65.5)	3.52 (56.3)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.22 (46.4)	3.53 (53.4)	3.46 (49.0)	3.62 (58.6)	3.19 (39.6)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 7. 25-34 means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by race.

Statement[1]	Ages 25-34				
	White (316)	Black/African American (98)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (97)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (50)	Mixed/Ot her (53)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	4.12 (80.4)	3.95 (67.0)	4.06 (76.3)	3.78 (67.3)	3.85 (64.2)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	3.99 (74.4)	3.82 (63.5)	3.81 (69.1)	3.84 (74.0)	3.68 (58.5)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.48 (52.4)	3.49 (50.5)	3.42 (50.5)	3.47 (55.1)	3.34 (43.4)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.81 (67.9)	3.86 (67.7)	3.85 (70.8)	3.70 (58.0)	3.52 (42.6)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.60 (59.3)	3.81 (58.6)	3.74 (61.9)	3.63 (57.1)	3.52 (50.0)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.54 (53.8)	3.61 (56.7)	3.67 (66.0)	3.48 (52.0)	3.24 (33.3)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.34 (44.9)	3.68 (56.4)	3.54 (59.8)	3.40 (50.0)	3.28 (44.4)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.40 (48.7)	3.57 (54.7)	3.38 (50.0)	3.26 (40.0)	3.04 (29.4)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.32 (44.2)	3.58 (54.1)	3.37 (47.4)	3.44 (46.0)	3.23 (34.6)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.69 (57.2)	3.81 (60.8)	3.42 (44.3)	3.54 (56.0)	3.49 (47.2)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.71 (25.4)	3.11 (37.4)	2.69 (27.6)	3.00 (34.0)	2.68 (24.5)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.83 (22.0)	3.23 (36.4)	2.93 (28.1)	3.34 (48.0)	2.74 (18.9)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.90 (31.2)	3.23 (41.4)	2.99 (30.9)	3.31 (42.9)	2.94 (32.1)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.80 (67.0)	3.92 (69.1)	3.89 (73.2)	3.86 (69.4)	3.72 (56.6)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.82 (63.0)	3.60 (55.8)	3.88 (67.0)	3.54 (64.0)	3.72 (54.7)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.75 (60.6)	3.66 (57.1)	3.78 (63.9)	3.63 (59.2)	3.64 (54.7)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.79 (63.1)	3.73 (62.1)	3.77 (66.0)	3.62 (58.0)	3.52 (55.6)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.78 (62.8)	3.61 (56.7)	3.77 (69.1)	3.74 (64.0)	3.45 (50.9)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.59 (19.6)	3.19 (38.1)	2.53 (18.6)	3.10 (32.7)	2.75 (22.6)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.59 (55.3)	3.64 (55.7)	3.64 (63.3)	3.68 (56.0)	3.34 (41.5)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.36 (42.0)	3.69 (54.7)	3.53 (56.3)	3.30 (44.0)	3.06 (34.0)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.54 (56.6)	3.82 (66.7)	3.80 (63.5)	3.48 (52.0)	3.44 (46.3)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.20 (44.3)	3.58 (51.0)	3.38 (56.7)	3.58 (62.0)	3.06 (37.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 8. 35-50 means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by race.

Statement[1]	Ages 35-50				
	White (366)	Black/African American (119)	Hispanic/ Chicano/L atino (114)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (51)	Mixed/ Other (51)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	4.11 (79.5)	3.80 (65.3)	4.16 (83.9)	3.90 (68.6)	3.84 (68.6)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.01 (75.5)	3.71 (60.2)	3.89 (71.1)	3.96 (74.5)	3.71 (64.7)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.59 (56.3)	3.42 (46.6)	3.56 (53.1)	3.78 (68.6)	3.53 (49.0)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.72 (62.9)	3.86 (65.3)	3.94 (72.6)	3.80 (66.7)	3.62 (60.0)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.55 (57.0)	3.81 (63.0)	3.77 (66.7)	3.61 (60.8)	3.51 (51.0)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.41 (50.7)	3.59 (53.4)	3.73 (66.7)	3.57 (56.9)	3.53 (56.9)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.41 (50.8)	3.55 (51.3)	3.56 (50.9)	3.61 (54.9)	3.32 (44.0)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.26 (42.1)	3.43 (49.2)	3.45 (49.6)	3.47 (47.1)	3.26 (42.0)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.25 (37.5)	3.51 (49.6)	3.38 (43.5)	3.53 (54.9)	3.33 (39.2)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.64 (54.5)	3.47 (51.7)	3.70 (57.0)	3.80 (64.7)	3.56 (56.0)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.82 (28.0)	3.07 (33.6)	2.89 (26.3)	3.18 (39.2)	2.76 (33.3)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.82 (23.3)	2.97 (30.8)	2.92 (22.8)	3.45 (54.9)	2.84 (29.4)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.84 (28.3)	3.01 (34.7)	2.91 (27.2)	3.37 (51.0)	2.75 (23.5)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.81 (65.6)	3.85 (68.1)	3.96 (71.9)	3.84 (68.6)	3.59 (56.9)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.76 (62.3)	3.41 (47.9)	3.72 (57.4)	3.69 (60.8)	3.55 (51.0)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.73 (60.7)	3.62 (56.4)	3.75 (61.4)	3.84 (74.5)	3.51 (55.1)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.76 (61.6)	3.64 (62.2)	3.82 (65.8)	3.80 (72.5)	3.65 (62.7)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.73 (61.6)	3.75 (62.7)	3.84 (71.3)	3.76 (68.6)	3.66 (56.0)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.59 (18.4)	3.09 (32.8)	2.82 (20.2)	2.98 (29.4)	2.60 (18.0)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.55 (51.5)	3.63 (56.8)	3.72 (58.4)	3.80 (70.6)	3.24 (39.2)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.35 (44.2)	3.63 (55.9)	3.50 (52.2)	3.71 (64.7)	3.25 (37.3)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.51 (56.4)	3.72 (61.0)	3.71 (58.8)	3.80 (62.7)	3.31 (47.1)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.17 (44.5)	3.70 (63.9)	3.32 (48.7)	3.69 (60.8)	3.41 (51.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Table 9. 50+ means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items by race.

Statement[1]	Ages 50 and above				
	White (353)	Black/African American (103)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (60)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (15)	Mixed/Ot her (44)
Outdoor Recreation Opportunities in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation	4.15 (84.5)	3.98 (73.5)	4.15 (91.7)	3.60 (66.7)	4.14 (84.1)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.10 (82.2)	3.84 (64.4)	3.93 (71.7)	4.00 (73.3)	4.09 (81.8)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park participation should be limited	3.64 (60.1)	3.43 (46.5)	3.50 (51.7)	3.60 (53.3)	3.52 (56.8)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities	3.41 (48.3)	3.70 (61.5)	3.97 (78.3)	3.67 (66.7)	3.39 (40.9)
Travel and camping vacation packages for more programmed vacations should be provided	3.43 (49.3)	3.74 (62.4)	3.93 (72.9)	3.67 (46.7)	3.30 (47.7)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	3.25 (39.9)	3.38 (45.6)	3.72 (65.0)	3.40 (53.3)	3.34 (40.9)
Enhancing Existing Overnight Accommodations in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.41 (48.3)	3.52 (52.4)	3.72 (58.3)	3.67 (60.0)	3.41 (50.0)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	3.09 (32.7)	3.39 (44.2)	3.58 (58.3)	3.40 (46.7)	3.14 (34.1)
State Parks modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	3.14 (33.0)	3.35 (37.3)	3.70 (55.0)	3.40 (46.7)	3.28 (37.2)
Financing State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of State Park rehabilitation projects	3.74 (60.0)	3.79 (61.4)	3.70 (56.7)	4.07 (66.7)	3.93 (72.7)
State Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.93 (31.3)	2.98 (26.5)	3.28 (48.3)	3.00 (33.3)	2.43 (13.6)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.92 (24.6)	2.92 (20.6)	2.93 (25.0)	2.93 (33.3)	2.81 (20.9)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.66 (22.9)	2.89 (23.3)	2.88 (28.3)	3.13 (33.3)	2.50 (18.2)
Protecting State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should conduct more resource management to improve water quality of streams and lakes	3.84 (68.9)	3.92 (67.0)	3.92 (75.0)	3.93 (66.7)	3.95 (72.7)
State Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks	3.66 (57.6)	3.54 (50.5)	3.77 (61.7)	3.53 (46.7)	3.93 (63.6)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged	3.63 (54.8)	3.79 (64.1)	3.78 (63.3)	3.67 (46.7)	3.91 (70.5)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.74 (63.9)	3.76 (61.2)	3.86 (70.7)	3.67 (66.7)	3.73 (68.2)
State Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources	3.80 (66.1)	3.83 (62.5)	3.85 (71.2)	3.60 (46.7)	3.75 (63.6)
There is no need to acquire more land for the State Park system	2.71 (22.3)	2.76 (17.6)	2.69 (20.3)	2.60 (13.3)	2.48 (15.9)
More Modern Conveniences in State Parks	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*	*M(%)*
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.47 (48.7)	3.65 (55.4)	3.67 (58.3)	3.47 (46.7)	3.45 (50.0)
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	3.32 (38.9)	3.64 (53.8)	3.70 (61.7)	3.67 (60.0)	3.26 (34.9)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	3.27 (45.2)	3.47 (49.0)	3.65 (56.7)	3.53 (53.3)	3.43 (56.8)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	3.10 (38.4)	3.65 (58.7)	3.69 (62.7)	3.87 (66.7)	3.20 (50.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree

Appendix E: State Park Visitation, Age by Race Comparisons

Table 10. State Park Visitation: White

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?				
	18-24	25-34	35-50	50+
Yes	154 (65.5)	217 (68.2)	248 (67.8)	200 (56.3)
No	81 (34.5)	101 (31.8)	118 (32.2)	155 (43.7)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between age groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 11. State Park Visitation: Black/African American

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?				
	18-24	25-34	35-50	50+
Yes	53 (59.6)	50 (50.0)	52 (43.7)	42 (40.0)
No	36 (40.4)	50 (50.0)	67 (56.3)	63 (60.0)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between age groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 12. State Park Visitation: Hispanic/Chicano/Latino

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?				
	18-24	25-34	35-50	50+
Yes	54 (54.5)	54 (54.5)	69 (60.0)	35 (57.4)
No	45 (45.5)	45 (45.5)	46 (40.0)	26 (42.6)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between age groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 13. State Park Visitation: Asian/Pacific Islander

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?				
	18-24	25-34	35-50	50+
Yes	12 (41.4)	36 (70.6)	36 (69.2)	8 (53.3)
No	17 (58.6)	15 (29.4)	16 (30.8)	7 (46.7)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between age groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 14. State Park Visitation: Mixed Race/Other

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?				
	18-24	25-34	35-50	50+
Yes	20 (41.7)	39 (72.2)	32 (62.7)	24 (55.8)
No	28 (58.3)	15 (27.8)	19 (37.3)	19 (44.2)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between age groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Appendix F: State Park Visitation, Race by Age Comparisons

Table 15. State Park Visitation: Ages 18-24

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?					
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed/ Other
Yes	154 (65.5)	53 (59.6)	54 (54.5)	12 (41.4)	20 (41.7)
No	81 (34.5)	36 (40.4)	45 (45.5)	17 (58.6)	28 (58.3)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between race/ethnicity groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 16. State Park Visitation: Ages 25-34

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?					
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed/ Other
Yes	217 (68.2)	50 (50.0)	54 (54.5)	36 (70.6)	39 (72.2)
No	101 (31.8)	50 (50.0)	45 (45.5)	15 (29.4)	15 (27.8)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between race/ethnicity groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 17. State Park Visitation: Ages 35-50

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?					
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed/ Other
Yes	248 (67.8)	52 (43.7)	69 (60.0)	36 (69.2)	32 (62.7)
No	118 (32.2)	67 (56.3)	46 (40.0)	16 (30.8)	19 (37.3)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between race/ethnicity groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Table 18. State Park Visitation: Ages 50+

In the last 12 months have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?					
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed/ Other
Yes	200 (56.3)	42 (40.0)	35 (57.4)	8 (53.3)	24 (55.8)
No	155 (43.7)	63 (60.0)	26 (42.6)	7 (46.7)	19 (44.2)

*Denotes statistically significant difference (p<.05) between race/ethnicity groups. Significance is indicated within the first category of each comparison.

Appendix G: Appropriateness of Activities, Age by Race Comparisons

Table 19. White means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by age group

Statement[1]	White			
	18-24 (235)	25-34 (316)	35-50 (366)	50+ (353)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.93 (70.6)	3.83 (66.8)	3.81 (65.1)	3.45 (48.7)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.03 (33.6)	3.05 (34.2)	3.01 (33.5)	2.62 (17.6)
Trails for motorized use	3.05 (36.6)	2.91 (34.3)	2.97 (36.7)	2.61 (24.0)
Resort-style development	2.66 (27.2)	2.61 (24.2)	2.70 (28.7)	2.50 (21.2)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.72 (61.7)	3.72 (60.2)	3.65 (58.1)	3.30 (42.7)
Swimming pools	3.44 (51.7)	3.61 (56.2)	3.59 (56.0)	3.45 (48.3)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.73 (59.4)	3.57 (52.1)	3.55 (53.6)	3.36 (42.5)
Development of single use trails systems	3.90 (67.7)	3.99 (73.4)	3.93 (67.8)	3.56 (56.8)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.90 (68.1)	3.90 (70.2)	3.86 (65.9)	3.41 (51.8)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.06 (75.2)	4.00 (74.9)	4.09 (76.9)	3.85 (67.7)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.83 (68.2)	3.87 (67.4)	3.77 (63.9)	3.51 (54.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 20. Black/African American means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by age group

Statement[1]	Black/African American			
	18-24 (89)	**25-34 (96)**	**35-50 (118)**	**50+ (105)**
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.83 (62.1)	4.15 (75.8)	3.94 (60.3)	3.78 (53.4)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.58 (53.9)	3.58 (57.1)	3.37 (41.0)	3.39 (39.0)
Trails for motorized use	3.44 (49.4)	3.66 (55.6)	3.44 (43.6)	3.25 (35.2)
Resort-style development	3.24 (42.0)	3.46 (51.0)	3.40 (41.0)	3.19 (33.7)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.85 (64.0)	3.97 (64.6)	3.75 (55.6)	3.67 (51.4)
Swimming pools	3.79 (59.6)	3.91 (63.9)	3.77 (55.6)	3.80 (59.8)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.53 (53.9)	3.86 (63.3)	3.69 (49.6)	3.71 (54.3)
Development of single use trails systems	3.56 (51.7)	3.87 (62.2)	3.77 (53.4)	3.78 (55.8)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.75 (58.4)	3.93 (65.7)	3.64 (51.3)	3.59 (49.0)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	3.96 (68.5)	4.07 (69.4)	3.96 (59.8)	4.07 (67.0)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.90 (67.4)	4.13 (70.7)	3.81 (55.9)	3.79 (60.2)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 21. Hispanic/Chicano/Latino means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by age group

Statement[1]	Hispanic/Chicano/Latino			
	18-24 (98)	25-34 (97)	35-50 (114)	50+ (61)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.78 (58.8)	4.00 (69.1)	3.75 (57.0)	3.95 (70.5)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.36 (44.4)	3.30 (42.4)	2.95 (28.7)	3.25 (40.7)
Trails for motorized use	3.16 (37.8)	3.47 (47.5)	3.12 (36.0)	3.08 (43.3)
Resort-style development	3.03 (36.4)	3.31 (46.5)	2.94 (26.1)	3.20 (38.3)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.76 (57.6)	4.07 (70.7)	3.71 (55.4)	3.82 (71.7)
Swimming pools	3.60 (51.5)	3.77 (63.6)	3.50 (47.8)	3.90 (67.2)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.44 (47.5)	3.87 (60.8)	3.40 (40.0)	3.67 (57.4)
Development of single use trails systems	3.72 (53.5)	4.00 (65.7)	3.84 (62.6)	3.85 (68.3)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.51 (45.9)	4.00 (64.3)	3.54 (51.8)	3.89 (67.2)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	3.78 (58.2)	4.09 (72.2)	4.03 (76.5)	4.15 (76.7)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.73 (56.1)	4.15 (76.8)	3.87 (64.0)	3.95 (70.5)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 22. Asian/Pacific Islander means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by age group

Statement[1]	Asian/Pacific Islander			
	18-24 (29)	25-34 (50)	35-50 (51)	50+ (15)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	4.10 (72.4)	3.57 (56.9)	3.83 (73.1)	3.40 (40.0)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.41 (51.7)	2.92 (39.2)	3.31 (40.4)	2.60 (26.7)
Trails for motorized use	3.10 (24.1)	3.14 (35.3)	3.17 (40.4)	2.40 (13.3)
Resort-style development	2.89 (21.4)	2.92 (35.3)	3.19 (38.5)	2.87 (26.7)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.69 (48.3)	3.57 (56.9)	3.52 (53.8)	2.40 (20.0)
Swimming pools	3.32 (39.3)	3.33 (45.1)	3.63 (53.8)	3.07 (33.3)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.72 (58.6)	3.61 (58.8)	3.63 (51.9)	2.87 (33.3)
Development of single use trails systems	3.86 (62.1)	3.55 (51.0)	3.65 (55.8)	3.21 (35.7)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.79 (58.6)	3.32 (42.0)	3.79 (65.4)	3.40 (40.0)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.17 (72.4)	3.78 (68.6)	3.87 (61.5)	3.87 (73.3)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.89 (64.3)	3.61 (56.9)	3.82 (68.6)	3.13 (40.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 23. Mixed Race/Other means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by age group

Statement[1]	Mixed Race/Other			
	18-24 (48)	25-34 (53)	35-50 (51)	50+ (43)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.70 (47.8)	3.60 (53.8)	3.65 (54.9)	3.60 (53.5)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.11 (32.6)	3.09 (29.6)	3.20 (35.3)	2.86 (22.7)
Trails for motorized use	3.13 (34.8)	3.13 (42.6)	3.22 (40.0)	3.02 (25.0)
Resort-style development	2.98 (28.3)	2.75 (28.3)	2.59 (19.6)	2.26 (23.3)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.76 (60.9)	3.44 (48.1)	3.71 (59.2)	3.44 (41.9)
Swimming pools	3.48 (50.0)	3.42 (49.1)	3.49 (47.1)	3.53 (53.5)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.57 (47.8)	3.57 (50.0)	3.57 (47.1)	3.40 (44.2)
Development of single use trails systems	3.65 (54.3)	3.46 (50.0)	3.76 (56.9)	3.68 (56.8)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.39 (47.8)	3.72 (61.1)	3.51 (51.0)	3.66 (54.5)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	3.58 (48.9)	3.63 (61.1)	3.86 (62.7)	3.82 (65.9)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.61 (54.3)	3.59 (53.7)	3.69 (56.9)	3.77 (65.9)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Appendix H: Appropriateness of Activities, Race by Age Comparisons

Table 24. Ages 18-24 means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by race

Statement[1]	18-24				
	White (235)	Black/African American (89)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (98)	Asian /Pacific Islander (29)	Mixed/ Other (48)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.93 (70.6)	3.83 (62.1)	3.78 (58.8)	4.10 (72.4)	3.70 (47.8)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.03 (33.6)	3.58 (53.9)	3.36 (44.4)	3.41 (51.7)	3.11 (32.6)
Trails for motorized use	3.05 (36.6)	3.44 (49.4)	3.16 (37.8)	3.10 (24.1)	3.13 (34.8)
Resort-style development	2.66 (27.2)	3.24 (42.0)	3.03 (36.4)	2.89 (21.4)	2.98 (28.3)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.72 (61.7)	3.85 (64.0)	3.76 (57.6)	3.69 (48.3)	3.76 (60.9)
Swimming pools	3.44 (51.7)	3.79 (59.6)	3.60 (51.5)	3.32 (39.3)	3.48 (50.0)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.73 (59.4)	3.53 (53.9)	3.44 (47.5)	3.72 (58.6)	3.57 (47.8)
Development of single use trails systems	3.90 (67.7)	3.56 (51.7)	3.72 (53.5)	3.86 (62.1)	3.65 (54.3)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.90 (68.1)	3.75 (58.4)	3.51 (45.9)	3.79 (58.6)	3.39 (47.8)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.06 (75.2)	3.96 (68.5)	3.78 (58.2)	4.17 (72.4)	3.58 (48.9)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.83 (68.2)	3.90 (67.4)	3.73 (56.1)	3.89 (64.3)	3.61 (54.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 25. Ages 25-34 means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by race

Statement	25-34				
	White (316)	Black/African American (98)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (97)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (50)	Mixed/ Other (53)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.83 (66.8)	4.15 (75.8)	4.00 (69.1)	3.57 (56.9)	3.60 (53.8)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.05 (34.2)	3.58 (57.1)	3.30 (42.4)	2.92 (39.2)	3.09 (29.6)
Trails for motorized use	2.91 (34.3)	3.66 (55.6)	3.47 (47.5)	3.14 (35.3)	3.13 (42.6)
Resort-style development	2.61 (24.2)	3.46 (51.0)	3.31 (46.5)	2.92 (35.3)	2.75 (28.3)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.72 (60.2)	3.97 (64.6)	4.07 (70.7)	3.57 (56.9)	3.44 (48.1)
Swimming pools	3.61 (56.2)	3.91 (63.9)	3.77 (63.6)	3.33 (45.1)	3.42 (49.1)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.57 (52.1)	3.86 (63.3)	3.87 (60.8)	3.61 (58.8)	3.57 (50.0)
Development of single use trails systems	3.99 (73.4)	3.87 (62.2)	4.00 (65.7)	3.55 (51.0)	3.46 (50.0)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.90 (70.2)	3.93 (65.7)	4.00 (64.3)	3.32 (42.0)	3.72 (61.1)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.00 (74.9)	4.07 (69.4)	4.09 (72.2)	3.78 (68.6)	3.63 (61.1)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.87 (67.4)	4.13 (70.7)	4.15 (76.8)	3.61 (56.9)	3.59 (53.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 26. Ages 35-50 means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by race

Statement	35-50				
	White (366)	Black/African American (119)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (114)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (51)	Mixed/ Other (51)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.81 (65.1)	3.94 (60.3)	3.75 (57.0)	3.83 (73.1)	3.65 (54.9)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	3.01 (33.5)	3.37 (41.0)	2.95 (28.7)	3.31 (40.4)	3.20 (35.3)
Trails for motorized use	2.97 (36.7)	3.44 (43.6)	3.12 (36.0)	3.17 (40.4)	3.22 (40.0)
Resort-style development	2.70 (28.7)	3.40 (41.0)	2.94 (26.1)	3.19 (38.5)	2.59 (19.6)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.65 (58.1)	3.75 (55.6)	3.71 (55.4)	3.52 (53.8)	3.71 (59.2)
Swimming pools	3.59 (56.0)	3.77 (55.6)	3.50 (47.8)	3.63 (53.8)	3.49 (47.1)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.55 (53.6)	3.69 (49.6)	3.40 (40.0)	3.63 (51.9)	3.57 (47.1)
Development of single use trails systems	3.93 (67.8)	3.77 (53.4)	3.84 (62.6)	3.65 (55.8)	3.76 (56.9)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.86 (65.9)	3.64 (51.3)	3.54 (51.8)	3.79 (65.4)	3.51 (51.0)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	4.09 (76.9)	3.96 (59.8)	4.03 (76.5)	3.87 (61.5)	3.86 (62.7)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.77 (63.9)	3.81 (55.9)	3.87 (64.0)	3.82 (68.6)	3.69 (56.9)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Table 27. Ages 51-64 means and % of respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items by race

Statement	50+				
	White (353)	Black/African American (105)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (60)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (15)	Mixed/ Other (44)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.45 (48.7)	3.78 (53.4)	3.95 (70.5)	3.40 (40.0)	3.60 (53.5)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.62 (17.6)	3.39 (39.0)	3.25 (40.7)	2.60 (26.7)	2.86 (22.7)
Trails for motorized use	2.61 (24.0)	3.25 (35.2)	3.08 (43.3)	2.40 (13.3)	3.02 (25.0)
Resort-style development	2.50 (21.2)	3.19 (33.7)	3.20 (38.3)	2.87 (26.7)	2.26 (23.3)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	3.30 (42.7)	3.67 (51.4)	3.82 (71.7)	2.40 (20.0)	3.44 (41.9)
Swimming pools	3.45 (48.3)	3.80 (59.8)	3.90 (67.2)	3.07 (33.3)	3.53 (53.5)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	3.36 (42.5)	3.71 (54.3)	3.67 (57.4)	2.87 (33.3)	3.40 (44.2)
Development of single use trails systems	3.56 (56.8)	3.78 (55.8)	3.85 (68.3)	3.21 (35.7)	3.68 (56.8)
Development of shared use trail systems	3.41 (51.8)	3.59 (49.0)	3.89 (67.2)	3.40 (40.0)	3.66 (54.5)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	3.85 (67.7)	4.07 (67.0)	4.15 (76.7)	3.87 (73.3)	3.82 (65.9)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	3.51 (54.3)	3.79 (60.2)	3.95 (70.5)	3.13 (40.0)	3.77 (65.9)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.

Appendix I: Topline Comparisons of PPFA 2017, Telephone Survey, and Ethnic Minority Panel Online Survey

Table 28. Outdoor Recreation: Comparison of PPFA 2017, telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items in descending order of PPFA 2017 overall means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017 Overall	Telephone			Ethnic Minority Panel				
		Overall	User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks should continue to emphasize healthful outdoor recreation activities	4.4 (92.8)	4.3 (88.4)	4.30 (89.2)	4.20 (87.4)	4.11 (81.0)	3.81 (66.0)	4.03 (76.3)	3.89 (70.1)	3.81 (67.7)
Visitors to State Parks should expect a quiet, natural and/or wild experience	4.3 (86.8)	4.03 (80.4)	4.06 (81.5)	3.99 (79.1)	3.99 (75.4)	3.69 (59.0)	3.81 (65.5)	3.94 (74.5)	3.74 (65.8)
State Parks should offer more active adventure recreation activities[3]	3.5 (54.6)	3.5 (53.7)	3.52 (53.5)	3.49 (54.0)	3.67 (60.7)	3.77 (63.2)	3.86 (68.6)	3.78 (64.8)	3.55 (50.5)
Travel and camping vacation packages for a more programmed vacation experiences should be provided	3.0 (34.4)	-	-	-	3.53 (55.2)	3.74 (60.5)	3.77 (64.7)	3.65 (56.3)	3.44 (48.7)
State Parks should develop additional 'splash playgrounds' in some parks in place of swimming pools	2.9 (28.9)	-	-	-	3.39 (48.1)	3.52 (52.7)	3.69 (64.1)	3.53 (52.4)	3.42 (46.7)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[3]Began as, "'Some parks should…" in 2017 in-park and online survey

Table 29. Outdoor Recreation: Appropriateness of Activities for State Parks: Comparison of PPFA 2017, telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means and percentage or respondents reporting "somewhat appropriate" or "appropriate" for appropriateness items in descending order of telephone survey appropriateness means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017 Overall	Telephone Overall	Telephone User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Telephone Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	Ethnic Minority Panel White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Adventure facilities/challenge courses	3.1 (43.9)	3.71 (60.0)	3.71 (60.5)	3.70 (59.4)	3.74 (62.0)	3.93 (62.7)	3.86 (62.9)	3.75 (63.9)	3.64 (52.6)
Trails for motorized use	2.1 (17.9)	3.69 (30.7)	2.71 (32.5)	2.67 (28.7)	2.87 (32.5)	3.44 (45.6)	3.22 (40.7)	3.07 (32.7)	3.13 (36.1)
Special events with greater than 1000 attendees	2.2 (16.2)	3.08 (39.0)	3.04 (39.0)	3.12 (38.9)	2.91 (29.3)	3.47 (47.2)	3.20 (38.4)	3.12 (40.8)	3.07 (30.3)
Resort-style Development	1.7 (9.3)	2.43 (22.6)	2.46 (23.7)	2.39 (21.3)	2.62 (25.2)	3.33 (41.7)	3.10 (36.2)	3.01 (32.9)	2.65 (24.9)
Traditional ball sports such as soccer, volleyball, and softball	-	-	-	-	3.58 (55.0)	3.80 (58.5)	3.84 (62.7)	3.46 (50.3)	3.59 (52.6)
Swimming pools	-	-	-	-	3.53 (53.1)	3.81 (59.5)	3.66 (56.1)	3.41 (45.9)	3.48 (49.7)
Special events with less than 1,000 attendees	-	-	-	-	3.54 (51.2)	3.70 (55.0)	3.58 (50.3)	3.56 (53.7)	3.53 (47.4)
Development of single use trails systems (e.g. mountain bike only trails)	-	-	-	-	3.84 (66.1)	3.75 (55.7)	3.85 (61.9)	3.62 (53.4)	3.64 (54.4)
Development of shared use trail systems (e.g. horses, hikers, and bikers share the same trail)	-	-	-	-	3.75 (63.5)	3.72 (55.7)	3.71 (56.1)	3.59 (53.4)	3.57 (53.8)
Increasing the number of picnic areas available for large multi-family gatherings	-	-	-	-	4.00 (73.5)	4.01 (65.8)	4.00 (70.5)	3.90 (67.3)	3.72 (59.8)
The maintenance of large grassy fields for sports activities	-	-	-	-	3.73 (62.9)	3.90 (63.1)	3.92 (66.4)	3.69 (60.7)	3.66 (57.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=inappropriate to 5=appropriate.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.

Table 30. Overnight Accommodations: Comparison of PPFA 2017, telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items in descending order of PPFA 2017 overall means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017	Telephone			Ethnic Minority Panel				
	Overall	Overall	User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should designate entire campground areas for quiet, wild, and remote camping experiences	3.9 (71.6)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Current State Park accommodations are sufficient	3.4 (47.2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Parks should add more on-site water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups for campsites	3.1 (37.5)	-	-	-	3.52 (52.0)	3.62 (56.4)	3.64 (56.2)	3.70 (60.0)	3.31 (44.4)
State Parks should develop a few more inns in carefully selected locations	3.0 (36.6)	-	-	-	3.38 (47.6)	3.55 (51.6)	3.60 (56.1)	3.53 (52.4)	3.35 (44.9)
State Parks should construct larger cabins that can accommodate multiple families at once	2.8 (26.8)	-	-	-	3.27 (42.1)	3.45 (48.6)	3.43 (50.1)	3.37 (42.8)	3.20 (37.8)
State Parks' modern family cabin or camping areas should include a central all-purpose social hall	2.7 (22.6)	-	-	-	3.25 (39.5)	3.48 (48.8)	3.47 (48.5)	3.52 (52.1)	3.26 (37.3)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.

Table 31. Paying for Parks: Comparison of PPFA 2017, telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items in descending order of PPFA 2017 overall means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017 Overall	Telephone			Ethnic Minority Panel				
		Overall	User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
The commonwealth should allocate additional funding to reduce the backlog of state park rehabilitation projects	4.1 (81.6)	3.73 (64.2)	3.80 (68.8)	3.64 (59.0)	3.64 (55.0)	3.59 (53.8)	3.58 (52.3)	3.70 (60.7)	3.55 (52.8)
Parks should convert low-usage parks to primitive and rustic parks with minimal on-site staff and facilities	3.3 (50.1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parks should increase the existing fees for camping, marinas, cabins, swimming pools, picnic pavilions etc. for all visitors	2.7 (32.7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parks should institute a new annual or daily entrance fee or parking permit system	2.5 (27.0)	2.73 (26.8)	2.57 (23.2)	2.91 (31.1)	2.78 (27.0)	3.05 (33.1)	2.96 (33.2)	3.02 (34.5)	2.65 (24.0)
Facilities that are expensive to operate and maintain should be closed	2.4 (12.9)	2.63 (19.7)	2.63 (20.0)	2.63 (19.5)	2.86 (22.8)	3.06 (31.0)	2.99 (28.5)	3.23 (42.8)	2.82 (23.1)
The operation of select park areas should be leased to private businesses or non-profit organizations to reduce costs	2.3 (21.7)	2.78 (29.7)	2.74 (28.7)	2.82 (30.8)	2.80 (27.0)	3.09 (34.6)	3.02 (31.9)	3.23 (42.4)	2.81 (27.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.

221

Table 32. Protecting Our Parks: Comparison of PPFA 2017, telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items in descending order of PPFA 2017 overall means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017 Overall	Telephone Overall	User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Parks should conduct more resource management activities to improve the water quality of streams and lakes	4.0 (76.2)	3.92 (74.4)	3.95 (76.2)	3.88 (72.3)	3.82 (67.6)	3.78 (65.3)	3.88 (70.3)	3.88 (70.1)	3.74 (61.7)
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to resource management activities that conserve quality native habitats	3.9 (72.8)	3.86 (72.3)	3.86 (72.9)	3.86 (71.7)	3.77 (63.8)	3.66 (60.5)	3.74 (64.0)	3.77 (66.2)	3.59 (58.4)
The boundaries of some State Parks should be enlarged to protect immediate watersheds and adjacent lands that could impact park habitat and outdoor recreation experiences	3.9 (72.4)	3.81 (67.6)	3.84 (68.8)	3.78 (66.2)	3.69 (58.2)	3.63 (57.4)	3.73 (62.3)	3.74 (65.3)	3.58 (55.4)
Parks should continue acquiring land that conserves high value resources and helps to manage the parks[4]	3.9 (74.0)	3.77 (67.7)	3.83 (69.6)	3.70 (65.4)	3.75 (61.6)	3.51 (50.9)	3.75 (61.4)	3.66 (62.8)	3.65 (54.6)
State Parks should invest more time and resources in their volunteer and friends group programs	3.9 (72.6)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parks should devote more staffing and funding to protecting cultural resources (such as historic sites, buildings and artifacts)	3.7 (66.4)	3.84 (71.3)	3.85 (72.5)	3.82 (70.0)	3.75 (63.7)	3.67 (59.3)	3.78 (66.9)	3.77 (64.8)	3.60 (56.9)
When impacts of over use are evident at a State Park, participation should be limited	3.6 (64.3)	3.53 (59.6)	3.51 (57.7)	3.56 (61.9)	3.54 (54.5)	3.43 (47.0)	3.48 (50.8)	3.62 (59.0)	3.44 (49.0)
The natural resources of some State Parks are being impacted by over use	3.4 (47.0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
There is no need to acquire more land for the state park system	2.2 (11.8)	-	-	-	2.63 (19.4)	3.03 (30.5)	2.81 (24.9)	2.96 (25.7)	2.66 (21.0)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.
[4]Was "Parks should continue its strategic land acquisition program" in 2017 in-park and online survey.

Table 33. Modern Conveniences: Comparison of PPFA 2017, telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means and % of respondents reporting "agree" or "strongly agree" for core items in descending order of PPFA 2017 overall means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017 Overall	Telephone Overall	Telephone User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Telephone Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	Ethnic Minority Panel White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Ethnic Minority Panel Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Nothing needs to be modernized. Parks now provide adequate conveniences	3.2 (46.0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Parks should enhance kitchen amenities in cabins	2.7 (22.6)	-	-	-	3.34 (42.4)	3.63 (54.5)	3.56 (55.6)	3.54 (54.5)	3.17 (35.6)
Some modern cabins should have air conditioning	2.7 (28.3)	-	-	-	3.46 (54.2)	3.62 (57.6)	3.68 (58.0)	3.66 (58.6)	3.43 (51.3)
State Parks should offer internet access to visitors	2.4 (22.9)	-	-	-	3.17 (43.1)	3.62 (57.2)	3.43 (53.1)	3.66 (61.4)	3.21 (44.4)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.

Table 34. Ethnicity Panel State Park Visitation: 2018 Ethnicity Panel Survey - Ethnic distribution by use of a state park in the past 12 months (corrected)

In the last 12 months, have you visited a state park in Pennsylvania for any purpose?					
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Mixed Race/Other
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Yes	819 (64.3)	197 (47.7)	212 (56.7)	92 (62.6)	115 (58.7)
No	455 (35.7)	216 (52.3)	162 (43.3)	55 (37.4)	81 (41.3)

Table 35. Overall Satisfaction with Services and Facilities: Comparison of PPFA 2017 and telephone surveys on visitor satisfaction with state park facilities and services in descending order of telephone satisfaction means

Statement[1]	PPFA 2017 M(%)[2]	Telephone M(%)[3]
Feeling of safety	4.5 (89.9)	4.26 (85.5)
Trail conditions	4.2 (83.3)	4.10 (82.1)
Reservation system (e.g. campgrounds, pavilions, etc.)	3.6 (66.6)	4.01 (76.4)
Sanitation and cleanliness	4.1 (78.8)	3.97 (73.9)
Responsiveness of employees	4.1 (80.6)	3.91 (71.4)
Availability of outdoor recreation program activities	3.8 (67.8)	3.87 (70.7)
Availability of education programs	3.7 (65.7)	3.67 (60.8)
State Park's online presence	3.9 (71.8)	3.64 (59.1)
Level of interaction with park staff	3.9 (74.6)	3.60 (57.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=poor to 5=excellent
[2]Percentage of respondents reporting "good" or "excellent"
[3]Only asked of users; not asked of ethnicity panel

224

Table 36. Constraints to Stake Park Visitation: Comparison of telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means for constraints items in descending order of telephone constraints means

Statement[1]	Telephone			Ethnic Minority Panel				
	Overall	User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
Too busy with other life priorities	2.89 (32.9)	2.82 (30.5)	2.98 (35.6)	2.83 (30.1)	2.89 (32.3)	2.81 (31.5)	3.07 (38.1)	2.67 (28.4)
I do not have enough information on State Parks	2.42 (22.5)	2.29 (19.6)	2.58 (25.9)	2.41 (21.2)	2.75 (32.4)	2.87 (32.5)	2.69 (29.2)	2.35 (22.1)
The State Parks are too far away	2.45 (22.6)	2.39 (21.1)	2.53 (24.3)	2.45 (22.5)	2.78 (30.8)	2.76 (30.5)	2.78 (29.9)	2.52 (23.6)
Activities that I like to do are not available in the State Parks	2.36 (20.5)	2.40 (24.0)	2.30 (16.6)	2.13 (14.0)	2.65 (26.6)	2.41 (21.1)	2.62 (23.6)	2.35 (19.5)
Poor personal health	2.31 (24.1)	2.29 (24.0)	2.34 (24.2)	2.02 (16.8)	2.61 (30.9)	2.39 (24.8)	2.31 (20.0)	2.35 (24.1)
Lack of available public transportation	2.32 (23.3)	2.29 (22.5)	2.36 (24.3)	2.07 (17.6)	3.00 (41.3)	2.60 (29.7)	2.69 (29.5)	2.57 (26.2)
Fear of crime	2.29 (23.6)	2.29 (24.5)	2.29 (22.6)	2.03 (16.6)	2.50 (27.9)	2.51 (27.1)	2.51 (27.4)	2.15 (19.1)
Do not have anyone to go with	2.24 (19.9)	2.19 (19.0)	2.30 (20.9)	2.34 (21.6)	2.67 (29.7)	2.57 (27.4)	2.66 (27.9)	2.49 (26.7)
A member of my family is not healthy enough to visit State Parks	2.25 (21.5)	2.24 (21.1)	2.25 (22.0)	1.98 (15.9)	2.40 (24.3)	2.30 (21.7)	2.47 (23.8)	2.10 (15.8)
My friends or family do not enjoy the activities and experiences offered at the State Parks	2.24 (18.7)	2.25 (20.7)	2.21 (16.5)	2.03 (13.3)	2.34 (20.1)	2.38 (20.2)	2.37 (20.1)	2.20 (14.5)
Do not have transportation to the State Parks	2.25 (22.9)	2.24 (22.6)	2.27 (23.3)	2.13 (20.8)	2.96 (41.6)	2.72 (31.6)	2.55 (31.5)	2.63 (29.4)
Visiting State Parks costs too much	2.02 (14.4)	2.00 (15.8)	2.05 (12.7)	1.89 (10.5)	2.40 (21.7)	2.40 (21.5)	2.27 (15.8)	2.15 (14.9)
Feel uneasy or not welcome at the State Parks	2.02 (16.8)	2.12 (20.2)	1.91 (13.0)	1.79 (11.1)	2.40 (21.7)	2.14 (16.9)	2.22 (18.6)	2.05 (16.2)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.

Table 37. Continued. Comparison of telephone, and ethnic minority panel survey means for constraints items in descending order of telephone constraints means

	Telephone			Ethnic Minority Panel				
Statement[1]	Overall	User[2] (N=881, 53.4%)	Non-User (N=769, 46.6%)	White (N=1274, 52.7%)	Black/ African American (N=413, 17.1%)	Hispanic/ Chicano/ Latino (N=374, 15.5%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander (N=147, 6.1%)	Mixed Race/ Other (N=197, 8.1%)
	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)	M (%)
State Parks have too many rules	1.98 (11.7)	2.3 (14.3)	1.91 (8.7)	1.82 (8.1)	2.27 (16.5)	2.18 (14.6)	2.23 (16.0)	1.93 (9.8)
The State Parks are not for people like me	1.88 (12.8)	1.89 (14.0)	1.88 (11.4)	1.69 (8.4)	2.22 (16.1)	2.00 (13.6)	2.07 (15.6)	1.88 (11.4)
Fear of the outdoors	1.81 (11.4)	1.83 (13.2)	1.78 (9.4)	1.64 (8.6)	2.16 (17.3)	2.01 (15.6)	2.00 (16.4)	1.82 (11.2)
Nature is 'not my thing'	-	-	-	1.83 (12.3)	2.37 (21.1)	2.30 (18.6)	2.13 (18.5)	2.01 (17.1)

[1]Items measured on a scale of 1=not at all important to 5=extremely important.
[2]For the purposes of this table, user includes those who have visited in the past 12 months. Non-user was recoded to include those that had visited at some point in the past but not in the past 12 months and those who had never visited.