

**State Parks and Natural  
Resource Areas in Maryland:  
A Survey of Public Opinion**

By

Donald F. Norris  
Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research  
and  
Royce Hanson  
Center for Urban Environmental Research and Education  
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

May 2003

# **State Parks and Natural Resource Areas in Maryland: A Survey of Public Opinion**

## **Executive Summary**

This study reports on data from a statewide telephone survey conducted by the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (MIPAR) and the Center for Urban Environmental Research and Education (CUERE) of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) for the Maryland Departments of Natural Resources (DNR) and Planning (MDP) in the winter of 2003. The survey was of 800 randomly selected Maryland households and contained questions about: households' visits to Maryland state parks and natural resource areas and to out-of-state parks; activities that household members engaged in during visits to Maryland state parks and natural resource areas; ratings of experiences during visits to state parks and natural resource areas; ratings of facilities, amenities, and features of state parks and natural resource areas; governmental actions regarding open space; and the management of growth and development.

Most Maryland households (about two-thirds) visited the state's parks and natural resource areas during the past year. Large majorities rated their experiences as either excellent or good. (Typical majorities were in the 80 and 90 percentiles.) Similar, though somewhat smaller, majorities also rated various facilities, amenities, and features of state parks and natural resource areas as either excellent or good. Although about half of Maryland households visited an out-of-state park last year, it was not because of the absence of facilities in Maryland. Instead it was to enjoy unique natural features and one of a kind experiences that are not duplicated in Maryland.

Respondents divided almost evenly on the question of whether governments in Maryland are doing enough to protect open space. Only an extremely small number of respondents (4.4 percent) said that government was currently doing too much to protect open space. Large majorities of respondents expressed support for governmental actions to protect open space for recreation and natural resources i.e., to acquire parkland (90.8 percent said very or somewhat important), to protect lands for the protection of wildlife and the environment (97.1 percent said very or somewhat important), to preserve farmland (91.9 percent said very or somewhat important), and to provide public access to the Bay or rivers (88.6 percent said very or somewhat important). Finally, just over a quarter of respondents indicated that they were very or somewhat familiar with it the state's Smart Growth initiative.

Overall, the data from this survey show that Maryland residents use and highly rate their parks and natural resource areas and that they support a variety of governmental actions to provide land for public parks, natural resource areas, and to protect the environment.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
State Parks and Natural Resource Areas in Maryland: A Survey of Public Opinion .....	1
Methodology .....	1
State Park and Natural Resource Area Use .....	3
Rate the Experience .....	9
Satisfaction with Features and Amenities .....	11
Visits to Out-of-State Parks .....	12
Governmental Action Concerning Open Space .....	14
Managing Growth in Maryland .....	16
Summary and Conclusions .....	19
 Tables	
Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?.....	3
Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?.....	4
Table 3: Activities .....	5
Table 4: Favorite Activities .....	8
Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas .....	10
Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities.....	11
Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks .....	13
Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks .....	14
Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space? .....	15
Table 10: Government Actions Concerning Open Space .....	15
Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth .....	11
Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county? .....	17
Table 13: Land Use Regulation .....	18

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Methodology

Methodology .....	22
Table A-1: DNR Regions by County .....	27
Table A-2: Sample and Statewide Demographics .....	28

### Appendix B: Verbatim Responses

Verbatim Responses .....	32
--------------------------	----

### Appendix C: Regional Narratives and Data Tables

Regional Narratives .....	34
DNR Eastern Region .....	34
DNR Southern Region .....	34
DNR Central Region .....	35
DNR Western Region .....	35
Statewide and Regional Comparison Tables	
Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?.....	38
Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?....	38
Table 3: Activities .....	39
Table 4: Favorite Activities .....	40
Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas .....	41
Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities.....	46
Table 7: Visits to Out-of-State-Parks .....	48
Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks .....	48
Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space? .....	48
Table 10: Government Actions Concerning Open Space .....	49
Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth .....	50

Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county? .....	50
Table 13: Land Use Regulation .....	51

DNR Eastern Region Data Tables

Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?.....	53
Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?....	53
Table 3: Activities .....	54
Table 4: Favorite Activities .....	55
Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas .....	56
Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities.....	57
Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks .....	57
Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks .....	57
Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space? .....	58
Table 10: Government Actions Concerning Open Space .....	58
Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth .....	58
Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county? .....	59
Table 13: Land Use Regulation .....	59

DNR Southern Region Data Tables

Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?.....	61
Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?....	61
Table 3: Activities .....	62
Table 4: Favorite Activities .....	63
Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas .....	64
Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities.....	65

Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks .....	65
Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks .....	65
Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space? .....	66
Table 10: Government Actions Concerning Open Space .....	66
Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth .....	66
Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county? .....	67
Table 13: Land Use Regulation .....	67
 DNR Central Data Tables	
Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?.....	69
Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?....	69
Table 3: Activities .....	70
Table 4: Favorite Activities .....	71
Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas .....	72
Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities.....	73
Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks .....	73
Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks .....	73
Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space? .....	74
Table 10: Government Actions Concerning Open Space .....	74
Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth .....	74
Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county? .....	75
Table 13: Land Use Regulation .....	75

DNR Western Data Tables

Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?.....	77
Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?....	77
Table 3: Activities .....	78
Table 4: Favorite Activities .....	79
Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas .....	80
Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities.....	81
Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks .....	81
Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks .....	81
Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space? .....	82
Table 10: Government Actions Concerning Open Space .....	82
Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth .....	82
Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county? .....	83
Table 13: Land Use Regulation .....	83
Appendix D: Survey Instrument .....	85

## **State Parks and Natural Resource Areas in Maryland: A Survey of Public Opinion**

In the spring of 2002, the Maryland Departments of Planning (MDP) and Natural Resources (DNR) asked the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (MIPAR) at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) to conduct a survey of Maryland residents' experiences with, and views about, state parks and natural resource areas and related issues. MIPAR designed the survey instrument in conjunction with a committee of MDP and DNR staff and contracted with the market research firm of Mason-Dixon to conduct the survey which was completed in February of 2003.

### **Methodology**

The survey was completed in two parts – a statewide sample and four regional sub-samples. These regions correspond to the DNR regions and are Western, Central, Southern, and Eastern (See Table A-1 in Appendix A for the counties in each region). The statewide sample consisted of 800 Maryland households which produced a margin of error of 3.5 percent at a 95 percent level of confidence. The regional sub-samples and their respective margins of error (also at a 95 percent level of confidence) are: Western – 200, 7.1 percent; Central 450, 5 percent; Southern – 230, 7.1 percent; and Eastern – 200, 7.1 percent.<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the methodology for this survey, see the Appendix.

The survey instrument included questions about the households' visits to state parks and natural resource areas, the activities in which household members engaged during those visits,

---

<sup>1</sup>A margin of error means that researchers can be confident that if a similar survey were conducted using the same methodology, the results obtained would, 95 times out of 100, be within plus or minus 3.5 percent (or 5.0 percent or 7.1 percent, depending on sample size) of those observed in this survey.



their favorite activities, residents' ratings of their experiences in state parks and natural resource areas, their ratings of various facilities, features and amenities of state parks and natural resource areas, visits to out-of-state parks, their attitudes about various governmental actions concerning open space and protection of land for recreation and natural resources, and their views about the management of growth to protect open space and the natural environment. The questionnaire is contained in Appendix C.

DNR and MDP requested an analysis of the data from all respondents and analyses based on two demographic characteristics, age and race, for selected questions. These included: whether families had visited Maryland state parks and natural resource areas in the past year and, if not, why they had not; activities in which families engaged while visiting Maryland state parks and natural resource areas and their favorite activities; whether families took trips to visit out-of-state parks in the past year and, if so, why they did so; respondents' opinions about whether governments in Maryland are doing enough to protect land for open space and natural resource areas in their counties; respondents' familiarity with Maryland's Smart Growth program; and respondents' opinions about whether governments in Maryland are doing enough to manage growth and development in their counties.

The data in the tables found throughout this analysis are frequencies of all responses. They are not divided by age or race. Where significant associations are found between age or race and any of the independent variables, however, we report them in the narrative. If there is no discussion of a statistically significant association between age or race for a particular question or from the survey, this is because none was observed in the data.

### State Park and Natural Resource Area Use

The first question asked was whether members of households had visited state parks or natural resource areas. Nearly two-thirds (62.8 percent) of respondents indicated that they or members of their households had visited a state park or natural resource area during the past year. Just over one-third (37.3 percent) had not visited a state park or natural resource area (Table 1). Significantly fewer senior citizens, persons ages 65 and older, (28.1 percent) than persons 18-44 (67.4 percent) and persons 45-64 (62.0 percent) reported visiting a state park or natural resource area during the past year.

<b>Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	502	62.8
No	298	37.3
Total	800	100.0

When we asked non-visitors why they had not gone to a state park or natural resource area during the past year, the reason given most frequently was lack of interest or desire (55.7 percent). See Table 2. The next most frequent response was “don’t know/not sure/no answer” (23.2 percent). This was followed by lack of convenience (facilities not located near enough to the respondent’s home) – 9.4 percent. Physical disability accounted for 4.0 percent. All other responses totaled 7.7 percent.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The verbatim “other” responses (a total of 14) are found in Appendix B.

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No interest or desire	166	55.7
None close enough to me	28	9.4
Physical disability	12	4.0
Other	23	7.7
Don't know/not sure/no answer	69	23.2
Total	298	100.0

Fewer seniors indicated that lack of interest or desire kept them from visiting state parks or natural resource areas (36.6 percent versus 60.0 percent for persons 18-44, and 57.5 percent for persons 45-64). More seniors (24.4 percent) than younger persons, however, reported physical disability as a reason for not visiting (0.0 percent for persons 18-44 and 1.8 percent for persons 45-64). More seniors (12.2 percent) also reported lack of transportation (versus 18-44 – 0.0 percent; and 45-64 – 0.9 percent).

Next, we asked respondents who reported that they or members of their families had visited a Maryland state park or natural resource area in the last year a series of questions about their visits and their views about certain aspects of the parks and natural resource areas. First we asked if respondents or members of their households had engaged in any of 23 listed activities.<sup>3</sup> They could choose none, any, or all of the activities, and we also asked them if there were any activities other than the 23 listed in which they or members of their households had engaged during visits to the parks and natural resource areas. (Table 3).

---

<sup>3</sup>The data in Tables 3 through 6 are from only those respondents who reported that they or members of their families had visited a Maryland state park or natural resource area in the last year (n = 502). The data in tables 7 through 13 are from all respondents (n = 800).

<b>Table 3: Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent of Households Responding</b>
Walking	87.8
Family outing	82.7
Nature appreciation	68.3
Hiking	51.6
Family picnicking	48.2
Fishing from shore or pier	40.0
Bicycling	34.7
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	33.7
Picnicking/outing with organized group	33.3
Fishing from boat	29.7
Camping at a campsite	28.3
Power boating	21.7
Canoeing or kayaking	20.7
Primitive camping	15.7
Backpacking	14.7
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	14.3
Sailing	11.8
Hunting	10.8
Rock Climbing	10.4
Mountain biking	9.2
Off-road vehicle	8.6
Horseback riding	7.1
Trapping	0.7
Other	9.4

Respondents named walking as the most frequent activity in which they or members of their households engaged (87.8 percent). This was followed by family outings (82.7 percent), nature appreciation activities (68.3 percent), and hiking (51.6 percent). Seven activities were

reported by between one-quarter and one-half of households, including family picnicking (48.2 percent), fishing from pier or shore (40.0 percent), bicycling (34.7 percent), nature center activities or naturalist programs (33.7 percent), picnicking with organized groups (33.3 percent), fishing from a boat (29.7 percent), and camping at a campsite (28.3 percent). All other activities were named by fewer than one in four of households, including five with fewer than one in ten of households reporting.<sup>4</sup>

For six of the 23 activities, statistically significant associations based on age were observed. Seniors were less likely than persons 18-44 and 45-64 to engage in the following activities: hiking (12.5 percent for seniors versus 55.2 percent for 18-44 year olds and 49.5 percent for 45-64 year olds); bicycling (6.3 percent versus 36.9 percent and 39.8 percent); canoeing and kayaking (0.0 percent versus 22.1 percent and 20.7 percent); primitive camping (6.3 percent versus 20.0 percent and 10.3 percent); backpacking (6.3 percent versus 19.3 percent and 8.7 percent); mountain biking (0.0 percent versus 12.4 percent and 5.4 percent); and horseback riding (0.0 percent versus 7.9 percent and 7.1 percent). These data suggest that older persons are less likely to engage in physically strenuous activities. Note also, that while the following was not found to be statistically significant, fewer seniors (18.8 percent) engaged in nature center activities or naturalist programs than persons 18-44 (31.7 percent) and 45-64 (39.1 percent).

For ten of the 23 activities, statistically significant associations were observed based on race. They were as follows. Whites were more likely than African-Americans to report that they engaged in: nature appreciation (72.7 percent versus 58.3 percent); hiking (56.5 percent versus

---

<sup>4</sup>The verbatim “other” responses (a total of 64) are found in Appendix B.

40.8 percent); fishing from shore or pier (43.5 percent versus 29.2 percent); camping at a camp site (33.4 percent versus 16.7 percent); power boating (24.5 percent versus 15.0 percent); canoeing and kayaking (23.1 percent versus 14.4 percent); and hunting (13.1 percent versus 4.2 percent). African-Americans were more likely than whites to report that they engaged in: picnicking with an organized group (50.0 percent versus 28.4 percent); staying in a park lodge or cabin ( 20.0 percent versus 12.8 percent); and horseback riding (11.7 percent versus 5.6 percent).

We also asked the respondents to indicate which was their favorite activity (Table 4). Hiking (18.9 percent), walking (12.9 percent), and family outing (10.6 percent) were the top “favorite” activities. These were followed by camping at a campground (8.4 percent), family picnicking and fishing from a boat (6.8 percent each), bicycling (5.2 percent), and nature appreciation and fishing from pier or shore (4.8 percent each). All others were named by less than four percent of respondents.

In terms of age, six significant associations were observed. More older persons (25.0 percent) reported family outings as their favorite activity than persons 18-44 (8.6 percent) and 45-64 (12.0 percent); camping at a campground (18.8 percent versus 8.6 percent and 7.1 percent); family picnics (12.5 percent versus 8.3 percent and 4.3 percent); and hunting (6.3 percent versus 0.7 percent and 1.1 percent). Fewer seniors, however, reported hiking as their favorite activity (0.0 percent versus 19.7 percent and 19.0 percent); and nature appreciation (0.0 percent versus 4.5 percent and 6.0 percent).

Only three significant associations were observed based on race. African-Americans were more likely than whites to report that family outings were their favorite activity (19.2 percent versus 7.8 percent) and to report family picnics as their favorite activity (12.5 percent

versus 5.0 percent). Whites were more likely than African-Americans to report hiking as their favorite activity (22.6 percent versus 10.0 percent).

<b>Table 4: Favorite Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent of Households Responding</b>
Walking	12.9
Family outing	10.6
Nature appreciation	4.8
Hiking	18.9
Family picnicking	6.8
Fishing from shore or pier	4.8
Bicycling	5.6
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	0.8
Picnicking/outing with organized group	3.2
Fishing from boat	6.8
Camping at a campsite	8.4
Power boating	3.6
Canoeing or kayaking	1.8
Primitive camping	2.6
Backpacking	0.4
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	0.4
Sailing	0.4
Hunting	1.0
Rock Climbing	0.0
Mountain biking	0.8
Off-road vehicle	0.0
Horseback riding	0.4
Trapping	0.0
Other	5.2

## Rate the Experience

In addition to asking about the activities in which Maryland households had engaged during their visits to state parks or natural resource areas within the past year, we asked respondents to tell us if their experiences with these activities were excellent, good, fair, or poor. As shown in Table 5, for the most part respondents rated their experiences with activities in Maryland state parks and natural resource areas very highly.<sup>5</sup>

For 12 of the 21 activities, 90 percent or more of respondents rated their experiences as excellent or good. Examples included walking, hiking, camping at a campsite, family outing, and family and organized group picnicking. There were relatively few (four in number) activities for which respondents gave less than stellar ratings. These included hunting (66.7 percent excellent and good), backpacking (77 percent), rock climbing (78.8 percent), and off-road vehicle (79.1 percent). All of the remaining activities (five in number) received combined excellent/good ratings of between 80 and 89 percent.

Another way to view these data that also shows how strongly positive they are is to examine the frequencies of Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor responses. For 13 activities in state parks or natural resource areas, between 40 and 50 percent of respondents said that their experiences were excellent. For five activities, between 30 and 40 percent said excellent, and for two activities, between 20 and 30 percent said excellent. For two activities, more than 60 percent of respondents said that their experiences were good. This was followed by 18 activities in which between 40 and 50 percent of respondents said that their experiences were good, and one in which 30 to 40 percent said that their experiences were good. Only two activities received

---

<sup>5</sup>Because the responses to these questions were so highly positive, it made little sense to endeavor to ascertain whether statistically significant associations were observed based on age or race.



combined fair and poor responses from between 20 and 29 percent of respondents. Finally, readers should note that there were practically no “poor” responses: for eight activities there were zero “poor” responses. For 12 activities “poor” was cited by fewer than five percent of respondents, and for one activity “poor” was cited by between only five and 10 percent of respondents.

These data clearly show that the vast majority of Maryland residents who use state parks and natural resource areas rate their experiences in them as excellent or good.

**Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas**

Activity <sup>a</sup>	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK/NA	Total
Walking	51.0	46.9	1.8	0.0	0.2	100.0
Family outing	43.1	53.7	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nature appreciation	53.9	42.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hiking	47.1	52.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family picnicking	45.0	50.8	3.3	0.4	0.4	100.0
Fishing from shore or pier	27.9	52.7	15.9	1.5	2.0	100.0
Bicycling	48.3	43.7	4.6	0.6	2.9	100.0
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	49.1	43.2	6.5	0.0	1.2	100.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	37.1	56.9	4.8	0.0	1.2	100.0
Fishing from boat	32.2	50.3	14.8	0.7	2.0	100.0
Camping at a campsite	33.1	62.7	3.5	0.7	0.0	100.0
Power boating	54.1	42.2	3.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canoeing or kayaking	57.7	34.6	6.7	1.0	0.0	100.0
Primitive camping	35.4	53.2	11.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Backpacking	43.2	33.8	20.3	1.4	1.4	100.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	44.4	48.6	5.6	0.0	1.4	100.0
Sailing	47.5	40.7	11.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hunting	25.9	40.7	24.1	0.0	9.3	100.0
Rock Climbing	25.0	53.8	15.4	1.9	3.8	100.0
Mountain biking	45.7	43.5	4.3	0.0	6.5	100.0
Off-road vehicle	18.6	60.5	16.3	2.3	2.3	100.0
Horseback riding	36.1	52.8	8.3	0.0	2.8	100.0

a. Only four respondents reported trapping as an activity in state parks or natural resource areas. This number is so small that it is not possible to calculate satisfaction ratings or to extrapolate them to the larger population. Additionally, because several activities were reported under the “other” category, a combined satisfaction rating would not be meaningful. Hence, trapping and “other” were not included in the table.

### Satisfaction with Features and Amenities

We asked respondents to rate various facilities, features, and amenities of state parks and natural resource areas (Table 6). That is, did they feel that the facilities, features, and amenities were excellent, good, fair, or poor. The data portray generally (and, in some cases, highly) positive ratings of the facilities, features, and amenities.<sup>6</sup> For example, more than nine in ten respondents rated trails excellent or good, more than eight in ten rated parking and trails as excellent or good, and over 90 percent rated their overall experience in the state’s parks and natural resource areas as excellent or good. The only facility that did not receive strongly positive ratings was restrooms where a majority of respondents (53.0 percent) rated them excellent or good while slightly more than one-third (36.5 percent) rated them as fair or poor.

<b>Table 6: Ratings of facilities, features and amenities (percent)</b>						
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parking	25.9	56.4	12.2	4.6	1.0	100.0
Picnic pavilions	16.7	52.8	9.8	1.0	19.7	100.0
Restrooms	12.4	41.6	30.1	6.4	9.6	100.0
Visitor centers	22.1	45.4	9.4	0.2	22.9	100.0
Signs, maps, information	23.9	54.2	10.0	0.4	11.6	100.0
Helpfulness of rangers and other personnel	32.2	35.9	8.4	0.6	22.9	100.0
General conditions	30.3	59.8	9.2	0.0	0.8	100.0
Trails	24.5	60.0	5.6	0.2	9.8	100.0
Rate overall experience	43.4	53.4	3.2	0.0	0.0	100.0

---

<sup>6</sup>Because the responses to these questions were so highly positive, it made little sense to endeavor to ascertain whether statistically significant associations were observed based on age or race.

There were three instances in which relatively sizeable fractions of respondents said that they did not know or did not answer (e.g., picnic pavilions – 19.7 percent; visitor centers – 22.9 percent; and helpfulness of rangers and other staff – 22.9 percent). Since these responses would skew results (by reducing the percentages of either favorable or unfavorable responses), we eliminated the DK/NA responses from the table and recalculated percentages based on total respondents who said either excellent, good, fair, or poor. The results are as follows:

- picnic pavilions    excellent – 20.8%; good – 65.8%; fair – 12.2%; poor – 1.2%.
- visitor centers      excellent – 28.7%; good – 58.9%; fair – 12.1%; poor – 0.3%.
- helpfulness        excellent – 41.8%; good – 46.5%; fair – 10.9%; poor – 0.8%.

They show that the ratings of these facilities and features are high indeed, ranging from 86.6 percent excellent and good to 88.3 percent.

### **Visits to Out-of-State Parks**

To assist staff at DNR in park and natural resource area planning, we asked the respondents if they had taken a vacation within the past year that involved visiting an out-of-state park or natural resource area. If sizeable fractions of Maryland residents had visited other states' parks and natural resource areas and if those visits were because of a lack of parks or natural resource areas in Maryland, this would be valuable information for planning purposes. Table 7 shows that just over half of all respondents had visited another state's parks or natural resource areas during the past year. More seniors (62.3 percent) than persons 18-44 (46.7 percent) and 45-64 (49.5 percent) said that they did not visit an out-of-state park last year. Between African-Americans and whites there was no difference in the likelihood to visit an out-of-state park once or twice in the past year. However more whites (24.8 percent) than African-Americans (16.4 percent) reported making more than two trips to visit out of state parks in the past year.

<b>Table 7: Visits to out-of-state parks</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
None	49.0
Once	15.8
Twice	12.6
More than twice	22.6
Total	100.0

Among all respondents, reasons for visiting out-of-state parks were not because of a lack of parks and natural resource areas in Maryland (Table 8). Rather, the visits were mainly because of the availability of unique natural features (31.4 percent), because it was the opportunity for a special or one of a kind experience (18.9 percent), or because it was part of a planned trip (18.1 percent). Other reasons included: closeness to home (8.8 percent); availability of special accommodations (5.9percent); remoteness (4.9 percent); no answer/not sure/don't know (8.8 percent); and other (3.2) percent.<sup>7</sup>

Seniors were less likely than other 18-44 year olds and 45-64 year olds to report that proximity was a reason for visiting an out-of-state park (0.0 percent versus 11.8 percent and 5.3 percent) and to indicate that such a visit was part of a planned trip (9.5 percent versus 19.7 percent and 17.3 percent). Seniors were more likely, however, to report that an out-of-state park visit was because of an opportunity for a special or one of a kind experience (23.8 percent versus 11.4 percent and 12.7 percent). Finally, persons 44-65 (36.7 percent) were more likely to say that the reason for visiting an out-of-state park was because of the availability of unique natural features than those 18-44 (27.1 percent) and 65 and over (28.6 percent).

---

<sup>7</sup>The verbatim “other” responses (a total of 14) are found in Appendix B.

<b>Table 8: Reasons for visiting out of state parks</b>	
<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Unique natural features	31.4
Special or one of a kind experience	18.9
Part of a planned trip	18.1
Closeness to home	8.8
Special accommodations	5.9
Remoteness	4.9
Other	3.2
No answer/don't know	8.8
Total	100.0

### **Governmental Action Concerning Open Space**

We asked the respondents whether, in general, they felt that state and local governments in Maryland were doing more than enough, enough, or not enough to protect open space for recreation and natural resources in their counties (Table 9). Respondents split nearly evenly with 42.9 percent saying government is currently doing enough and 45.1 percent responding not enough. An extremely small percentage (4.4 percent) said government was currently doing too much to preserve lands. A small fraction (7.6 percent) did not have an opinion.<sup>8</sup>

Next, we read a list of actions that some say state and local governments should take to protect more land for recreation and natural resources (Table 10). Specifically, we asked respondents how important four possible governmental actions affecting parkland and open space were to them (very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not important at all).

---

<sup>8</sup>No statistically significant associations were found between either age or race and responses to this question.

<b>Table 9: Are Maryland state and local governments doing enough to protect open space for recreation and natural resources in your county?</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than Enough	4.4
Enough	42.9
Not enough	45.1
No opinion	7.6
Total	100.0

The results show that Maryland residents are highly supportive of actions by their governments to protect more land for recreation and natural resources.<sup>9</sup> Large majorities supported governmental action to acquire parkland (90.8 percent said very or somewhat important), protect lands for the protection of wildlife and the environment (97.1 percent said very or somewhat important), preserve farmland (91.9 percent said very or somewhat important), and provide public access to the Bay or rivers (88.6 percent said very or somewhat important).

<b>Table 10: Possible governmental actions to protect more land for recreation and natural resources (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental Action</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Somewhat Important</b>	<b>Not too Important</b>	<b>Not at all Important</b>	<b>Not Sure</b>	<b>Total</b>
Acquire parkland for active recreation	52.3	38.5	6.5	2.6	0.1	100.0
Protect lands for protection of wildlife, water quality and a healthy environment	83.6	13.5	2.6	0.0	0.3	100.0
Preserve farmland	65.6	26.3	4.8	3.0	0.4	100.0
Provide public access to the Bay or rivers	49.8	38.8	9.9	0.5	1.1	100.0

---

<sup>9</sup>Because the responses to these questions were so highly positive, it made little sense to endeavor to ascertain whether statistically significant associations were observed based on age or race.

## Managing Growth in Maryland

To the extent that growth and development impinge on open space, the ability of state and local governments to provide land for passive and active recreation and to protect the environment may be limited. Consequently, we sought Marylanders' opinions about issues surrounding growth and development.

We asked respondents how familiar they were with Maryland's Smart Growth Initiative. Were they very familiar, somewhat familiar, not very familiar, or not familiar at all (Table 11)? Only slightly more than a quarter of the state's residents (28.7 percent) felt that they were either very or somewhat familiar with Smart Growth. This compares with 71.4 percent who said that they were either not very familiar or not familiar at all with it.

Senior citizens (36.7 percent) were more likely to be very or somewhat familiar with Smart Growth than persons of other ages (18-44 – 24.6 percent; 45-64 – 33.3 percent). And whites (31.6 percent) were more likely than African-Americans (22.9 percent) to indicate that they were either very or somewhat familiar with Smart Growth.

<b>Table 11: Familiarity with Maryland's Smart Growth Initiative</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very familiar	6.3
Somewhat familiar	22.4
Not very familiar	35.6
Not familiar at all	35.8
Total	100.0

Additionally, we asked if respondents felt that government was doing enough to manage growth and development in their counties (Table 12). Here, a clear majority (51.6 percent) said that government was not doing enough, while just over one third (37.9 percent) said enough or

more than enough. One in ten (10.5 percent) did not know or had no opinion. When we examine these results by taking only those respondents with opinions (i.e., by eliminating the don't know and no answer responses), the majority saying that government does not do enough to manage growth and development grows to 57.7 percent, with 42.3 percent saying enough or more than enough.<sup>10</sup>

<b>Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than enough	6.8
Enough	31.1
Not enough	51.6
DK/NA	10.5
Total	100.0

We also wanted to know how respondents felt about certain methods that have been suggested to manage growth and protect land and natural resources. We read four statements and asked respondents to indicate whether they strongly agreed, somewhat agreed, or somewhat or strongly disagreed (Table 13). These results clearly show that a strong base of support exists among Maryland residents for governmental actions to manage growth and development and to protect the environment.<sup>11</sup> The first statement was that government should limit growth and development through planning and land use regulation. More than eight in ten (84.0 percent)

---

<sup>10</sup> No statistically significant associations were found between either age or race and responses to this question.

<sup>11</sup> Because the responses to these questions were so highly positive, it made little sense to endeavor to ascertain whether statistically significant associations were observed based on age or race.



either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and 13.4 percent disagreed or disagreed strongly. Nearly eight in ten (78.9 percent) agreed or agreed strongly that government should buy more land for parks and resource protection, and 19 percent disagreed. Over nine in ten (91.9 percent) agreed or agreed strongly that government should require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space when they develop and only 7.4 percent disagreed. Nearly nine in 10 respondents (87.9 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that government should provide economic incentives to private land owners for conservation and resource protection, and only 10.4 percent disagreed.

<b>Governmental action</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development	44.4	39.6	10.5	2.9	2.6	100.0
Buy more land for parks and resource protection	40.9	38.0	12.6	6.8	1.8	100.0
Require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space	64.5	27.4	6.8	0.6	0.8	100.0
Provide economic incentives to land owners for conservation and resource protection	47.0	40.9	6.4	4.0	1.8	100.0

## **Summary and Conclusions**

A substantial fraction (nearly two-thirds) of Maryland residents use the state's parks and natural resource areas each year. They engage in a variety of activities in the parks and resource areas, most particularly walking, family outings, family and group picnicking, nature appreciation, hiking, fishing, bicycling, and nature center activities. Moreover, residents rate their experiences with these activities in the state's parks and natural resource areas very highly (mostly excellent or good). They also rate various features and amenities of state parks and natural resource areas highly as well, with the sole exception of restroom facilities.

Slightly over half of Marylanders visited out-of-state parks during the past year, but not because of the lack of parks in-state. Rather, they go to out-of-state parks for their unique features, for special or one of a kind experiences, or as part of planned trips.

When asked if various potential governmental actions to protect land for recreation and natural resources were important to them, very large majorities of Maryland residents responded affirmatively. This included actions such as acquiring parkland for active recreation, protecting lands for wildlife, water quality, and healthy environment, preserving farmland, and providing access to the bay or rivers.

Only about a quarter of Marylanders are familiar with the state's Smart Growth Initiative. However, a clear majority felt that governments in Maryland were not doing enough to manage growth and development in their counties. Even larger majorities voiced support for governmental actions to manage growth and protect land and natural resources, including the use of planning and land use regulation, buying land for parks and resource protection, requiring

developers to preserve open space as they develop, and providing economic incentives to private land owners for conservation and resource protection.

Age or race are associated with responses to some of the questions in this survey. For the most part, however, and regardless of age and race, respondents were more similar than different in their behavior and attitudes towards parks, recreation, and open space in Maryland.

Overall, the data from this survey show that Maryland residents use and highly rate their parks and natural resource areas and that they support a variety of means to provide land for public parks, natural resource areas, and to protect the environment.

## **Appendix A:**

### **Methodology**

## Methodology

As indicated in the text, the survey involved a statewide sample and four regional subsamples. These regions correspond to the DNR regions and are Western, Central, Eastern, and Southern. The counties that constitute each region are found in Table A-1 that follows.

Mason-Dixon uses a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system that randomly selects telephone numbers to ensure that a sample is representative of the state. In this case the sample size was 800 Maryland households. A random sample ensures that each household has an equal chance of being selected. A sample of this size enables researchers to be confident that if the survey were conducted again with a randomly drawn sample, the results obtained would, 95 times out of 100, be within plus or minus 3.5 percent of those observed here.

In the main, the sample is reasonably representative of the state as a whole (see Table A-2). For example, the 18-44 age group in the sample almost exactly mirrored the age distribution in the state. The 45- 64 age group was slightly over-represented, and the 65 and over group was slightly under-represented. Whites were somewhat over-represented in the sample compared to African-Americans and members of other races, and men were somewhat over-represented. Persons with lower incomes were also somewhat under-represented. Finally, the sample slightly under-represented the Central DNR region and slightly over-represented the Western, Southern, and Eastern regions. These are relatively slight differences and should not diminish confidence in the validity and reliability of the results and our ability to generalize from them to the broader population of the state.

Because of the way in which the data were collected it is not possible to compare educational attainment data between the sample and the state as a whole. This is also true with respect to marital status. However, even with the differences in the data, sample respondents

appeared to be more similar than dissimilar to state residents regarding both educational attainment and marital status.

In addition to statewide results, MDP and DNR wanted to be able to examine results from each of the four regions. A randomly selected sample would, necessarily, produce unequal sample sizes (and in some cases relatively small sample sizes) in the four regions because of their unequal population sizes. This would mean that analysis within the regions with smaller sample sizes would be compromised. Hence, we asked Mason-Dixon to over-sample in the Western and Eastern regions to ensure that each of these region would have a sample size of at least 200.<sup>12</sup> For statistical analysis purposes, this means that if the survey were conducted in the regions again with a randomly drawn sample, the results obtained would, 95 times out of 100, be within plus or minus 7.1 percent of those observed here.

Readers who are not familiar with survey research may be concerned that samples these sizes cannot possibly be used to represent the views of Marylanders as a whole. Their concern may be that researchers cannot extrapolate from the sample population to the population at large. This is an understandable concern, but one with little or no foundation. If properly conducted (that is, following known scientific principles), a survey is a well known and reliable way to gather information and estimate public opinion. It is also far more efficient and less costly than alternatives such as personal interviews with large numbers of subjects. Moreover, because of the random nature of the sampling, size is of little consequence. To quote one expert source:

---

<sup>12</sup>A sample of 800 proportioned correctly across the state produced the following sub-samples among the four regions: Western – 65; Central – 450; Eastern – 47; Southern – 238. Thus, we increased the Western sample by 135 and the Eastern sample by 153 to achieve minimum sample sizes in each region of 200. A sample fo 200 produces a margin of error of 7.1 percent at a 95 percent level of confidence.

“The size of the [overall] population has little bearing on sample size whenever the sample size is less than 5 percent of the population.” Charles H. Backstrom and Gerald D. Hursh, Survey Research. (Chicago: Northwestern University Press. 1963), p. 28.

See also Don A. Dillman, Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. 2d Ed. (New York: Wiley, 2000, esp. pp. 204-211).

Thus, readers should have a high level of confidence that the results presented here represent the experiences and views of the sample respondents, and, by extrapolation, of Marylanders as a whole.

Once Mason-Dixon completed the survey, we entered the data into a statistical analysis database (SPSS) and conducted data analysis. The product of that analysis is seen in the data tables presented throughout this report. We used simple descriptive statistics and cross-tabulations. Cross-tabs using the Chi Square statistic indicate whether a statistically significant relationship exists between two variables (see discussion below regarding cross tabs by race and age).

As indicated in the body of this report, DNR and MDP requested an analysis of the data from all respondents and analyses based on two demographic characteristics, age and race, for selected questions. These questions included: whether families had visited Maryland state parks or a natural resource areas in the past year and, if not, why they had not; activities in which families engaged while visiting Maryland state parks or natural resource areas and their favorite activities; whether families took trips to visit out-of-state parks in the past year and, if so, why they did so; respondents’ opinions about whether governments in Maryland are doing enough to protect land for open space and natural resource areas in their counties; respondents’ familiarity

with Maryland's Smart Growth program; and respondents' opinions about whether governments in Maryland are doing enough to manage growth and development in their counties.

We cross tabulated these questions by respondents' ages in three categories (18-44, 45-64 and 65 and older) and by race (white and African-American) and computed the chi square statistic. A significant chi square indicates that an association exists between an independent variable (e.g., age or race) and a dependent variable (e.g., whether a household visited a state park or natural resource area).

We report statistically significant relationships if a chi square of  $<.05$  is obtained. This means that there is a 95 percent probability that the relationship is not the product of random chance. We also report differences, in the absence of a significant chi square, if a question received a response from at least five percent of respondents and there is a greater than 5 percent difference among or between respondents. To provide one example, no statistically significant relationship was found between age (the independent variable) and whether a household engaged in nature center activities or naturalist programs while visiting a state park or natural resource area. However, while 36.9 percent of persons aged 18-44 and those aged 45-64 engaged in those activities, only 18.8 percent of senior citizens (persons 65 and older) did so. We reported this result (and others like it) because, even in the absence of statistical significance, the percent difference seemed relevant for park planning purposes.

Wherever a relationship is observed, whether statistically significant or based on percent differences, the prudent reader should ask whether the relationship is real and important or whether it is a distinction without a difference? In other words, does it matter in terms of public policy or programming for parks and natural resource areas, for example, that age or race are associated in a particular way with a particular activity or attitude?



With respect to analyses based on age, an important limitation should be noted. The total number of persons 65 and older who were surveyed was only 57 (7.3 percent of all respondents who volunteered their ages, n = 784 of 800 surveyed). Of this number (that is, 57 seniors), only 16 had visited a state park or natural resource area during the past year. For the questions involving activities in the parks and natural resource areas, the numbers of senior citizens responding were often too small to compute the chi square statistic. This is another reason that we reported differences based on percentages.<sup>13</sup> No similar problem exists with respect to race because about a quarter (26.4 percent) of the respondents who gave their race (n = 762 of 800 surveyed) were African-American.

---

<sup>13</sup>For those readers interested in differences based on age in the regional samples, the numbers of senior citizens are too small in the regional samples to calculate reliable statistics indicating significant relationships. The numbers are: Eastern – 15 or 7.7 percent of all respondents who volunteered their ages; Southern – 31 or 12.9 percent; Central – 19 or 4.2 percent; and Western – 16 or 8.0 percent

**Table A-1**  
**DNR Regions by County**  
(2000 Census)

<u>Region and Counties</u>		<u>Population</u>	<u>% of State</u>
<b>Eastern</b>	Caroline	74,563	0.6
	Dorchester	30,674	0.6
	Kent	19,197	0.4
	Queen Anne's	40,563	0.8
	Somerset	24,747	0.5
	Talbot	33,812	0.6
	Wicomico	86,644	1.6
	<u>Worcester</u>	<u>46,543</u>	<u>0.9</u>
Total	356,743	6.0	
<b>Southern</b>	Anne Arundel	489,656	9.2
	Calvert	74,563	1.4
	Charles	120,546	2.3
	Prince George's	801,515	15.1
	<u>St. Mary's</u>	<u>86,211</u>	<u>1.6</u>
	Total	1,572,491	29.6
<b>Central</b>	Baltimore City	651,154	12.3
	Baltimore County	754,292	14.2
	Carroll	150,897	2.9
	Cecil	85,951	1.6
	Harford	218,590	4.1
	Howard	247,842	4.7
	<u>Montgomery</u>	<u>873,341</u>	<u>16.5</u>
	Total	2,982,067	56.3
<b>Western</b>	Allegany	74,903	1.4
	Frederick	195,277	3.7
	Garrett	29,846	0.6
	<u>Washington</u>	<u>131,923</u>	<u>2.5</u>
	Total	431,976	8.2

**Table A-2  
Sample and Statewide Demographics<sup>14</sup>**

<b>Age</b>			
Age in years	Sample	State	Difference (%)
18-44	53.8	53.7	+0.1
45-65	37.1	31.1	+6.0
65 and over	7.1	15.2	-8.1
Refused	2.0	NA	
Total	100.0	100.0	

Note: The sample consisted only of respondents over the age of 18. Hence the percentages of state population from the 2000 Census are taken from only those persons 18 or older.

<b>Educational Attainment</b>			
Education	Sample	State	Difference (%)
Less than high school	6.8	16.2	
High school/GED	21.5	26.7	
Some College	19.5	26.6	
College graduate	31.0	18.0	
Graduate work or degree	20.4	13.4	
Refused	0.9	NA	
Total	100.0	100.0	

Note: It is not possible to directly compare the sample data and the statewide data from the 2000 Census because: 1) The 2000 Census reported data about the educational attainment of persons 25 years old and older. The sample data were from all respondents 18 years and older. 2) The "some college" data at the state level (from the Census) include persons with Associate of Arts degrees. No comparable question was asked of sample respondents. 3) The "graduate work or degree" data for the sample includes both but at the state level (from the Census) includes only graduate degrees.

---

<sup>14</sup>For all of the demographic comparison tables, the "difference" represents the percent difference between the survey data and the data from the 2000 US Census.

<b>Race</b>			
Race	Sample	State	Difference (%)
White	70.1	64.0	+6.1
African-American	25.1	27.9	-2.8
Other	2.6	8.1	-5.5
Refused	2.1	NA	
Total	100.0	100.0	

<b>Median Household Income</b>			
Income	Sample	State	Difference (%)
Less than \$25,000	11.4	20.6	-9.2
\$25,000 to \$49,999	22.6	26.1	-3.5
\$50,000 to \$74,999	22.4	21.6	+0.8
\$75,000 to \$99,999	18.5	13.6	+4.9
\$100,000 and more	12.6	18.1	-5.5
Refused	12.5	NA	
Total	100.0	100.0	

<b>Gender</b>			
Gender	Sample	State	Difference (%)
Male	50.4	48.3	+2.1
Female	49.6	51.7	-2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	

<b>Marital Status</b>			
Marital Status	Sample	State	Difference (%)
Single <sup>1</sup>	36.9	47.2	
Married/DR <sup>2</sup>	59.4	52.8	
Other <sup>3</sup>	3.8	NA	
Total	100.0	100.0	
<p>Note: It is not possible to directly compare the survey and the statewide data (from the Census) for marital status because: 1) The Census reported never married, separated, divorced and widowed. The survey reported single, separated, divorced or widowed. 2) The Census reported married (not separated); the survey asked married or in domestic relationship. 3) There was no "other" category in the Census data.</p>			

<b>DNR Regions</b>			
Region	Sample	State	Difference (%)
Eastern	31.3	29.6	+1.7
Southern	7.5	6.0	+1.5
Central	53.1	56.3	-3.2
Western	8.1	8.2	+0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	
<p>Note: See Table A-1 for the counties that make up each DNR region.</p>			

**Appendix B:**  
**Verbatim Responses**

**Appendix B**  
**Verbatim “Other” Responses to Questions**

**Question 2: “Other” reasons why respondents did not visit Maryland state parks and natural resource areas during the past year. (N = 14 of 298)**

No. Answer

- 11 – Not enough time
- 1 – Respondent ill
- 1 – Respondent’s children ill
- 1 – Not convenient/Virginia parks closer

**Question 26: “Other” activities in a park or natural resource area. (N = 64 of 502)**

No. Answer

- 11 – Swimming
- 8 – To get away/relax
- 6 – Nature related
- 4 – Family activity or event related
- 4 – Related to history
- 3 – Jogging or running
- 3 – Photography
- 2 – Concerts
- 13 – Other (random)

(Note: Some [5] with more than one answer.)

**Question 38: “Other” reasons for visiting out-of-state parks. (N = 19 of 408)**

No. Answer

- 4 – Unique features
- 4 – Hunting or fishing
- 3 – Part of a trip or vacation
- 2 – Family lives near there
- 2 – Different scenery
- 2 – Get away/relax
- 1 – Close to home
- 1 – Less pollution

## **Appendix C:**

### **Regional Narratives and Data Tables**



## **Regional Narratives**

The following pages contain a brief narrative discussing significant differences between the results from the surveys within the four DNR regions and the results obtained from the statewide survey. A comparison table and tables containing data for each of the regions follow.

### **DNR Eastern Region**

In the DNR Eastern region, about the same fraction of families visited state parks or natural resource areas in the past year as families in the other regions or in the statewide sample. The reasons that families in the DNR Southern region gave for not visiting state parks or natural resource areas were quite similar to those of families in other regions and in the statewide sample.

Regarding activities in which families engaged while visiting state parks or natural resource areas, nearly half were different by five percentage points or more than those observed in the statewide survey. For example, 17 percent more Eastern region households reported fishing from the shore or a pier than households in the statewide sample; 5.4 percent more reported picnicking/outings with organized groups; 15.5 percent more reported fishing from a boat; 10.4 percent more reported camping at a campsite; 10.1 percent more reported primitive camping; 5.1 percent more reported sailing; 10.2 percent more reported hunting; and 11.6 percent more reported off-road vehicle. Nearly nine percent fewer, however, reported bicycling. And almost one in ten (9.5 percent) more Eastern region households reported that they had not visited out-of-state parks in the past year.

Although a strong majority of Eastern region households (83.5 percent) favored governmental action to acquire parkland for active recreation, this was 7.3 percent fewer than in the statewide sample. Similarly, while a strong majority (75.5 percent) agreed or agreed strongly with the use of planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development, this was 8.5 percent fewer than in the statewide sample.

### **DNR Southern Region**

In the DNR Southern region fewer families (56.4 percent) visited a state park or natural resource areas in the past year than families in the other regions or in the statewide sample.<sup>15</sup> The reasons that families in the DNR Southern region gave for not visiting state parks or natural resource areas, however, were quite similar to those of families in other regions and in the statewide sample.

---

<sup>15</sup>We discuss differences between regional and statewide results only if the variation exceeds five percent.

In terms of activities in which families engaged while visiting state parks or natural resource areas, most were similar to those observed in the statewide survey and in other regions. Notable exceptions included: fishing from shore or pier (- 6.0 percent from the statewide results); nature center activities/naturalist programs (+8.7 percent); fishing from a boat (-23.9 percent); camping at a campsite (-11.2 percent); and primitive camping (- 10.0 percent).

When queried about possible governmental actions concerning parks and open space, respondents in the Southern region were more likely than in other regions or statewide to state that acquiring parkland for active recreation was either important or very important to them (+ 5.6 percent).

### **DNR Central Region**

In the DNR Central region, about the same fraction of families visited state parks or natural resource areas in the past year as families in the other regions or in the statewide sample. The reasons that families in this region gave for not visiting state parks or natural resource areas were quite similar to those of families in other regions and in the statewide sample. There were virtually no differences between the activities in which Central region families engaged while visiting state parks or natural resource areas and those reported in the statewide sample. Indeed, this finding held true throughout the survey. That is, the responses of Central region households were very similar to the results found in the statewide survey.

### **DNR Western Region**

More than one in ten (10.2 percent) households in the Western region reported visiting state parks or natural resource areas during the past year than households in the statewide survey. Their reasons for not visiting state parks or natural resource areas varied only slightly from the statewide sample (5.4 percent more responded “no interest or desire” – but this is of 10 percent fewer non-visitors).

In terms of activities in which families engaged while visiting state parks or natural resource areas, most were similar to those observed in the statewide survey. Notable exceptions included: 5.0 percent more reported hiking; 13.4 percent more said that they and their families picnicked; 11.8 percent more reported hunting; 9.0 fewer said nature center activities/naturalist programs; 5.9 percent fewer said power boating; 5.4 percent fewer reported staying in a park cabin or lodge; and 7.0 percent fewer said that they sailed.

More Western region respondents said that they felt that government was doing enough or more than enough to protect open space (56.5 percent) than respondents in the statewide sample or any of the other regions. Although a strong majority of Western region households (82.5 percent) favored governmental action to acquire parkland for active recreation, this was 8.3 percent fewer than in the statewide sample. Likewise, while strong majorities of Western region respondents supported governmental action to manage growth and protect land and natural

resources, the fractions were smaller than in the statewide sample. For example, 8.0 percent fewer agreed or strongly agreed with using planning and land use regulations to limit growth and guide development; 7.4 percent fewer agreed or strongly agreed that government should buy more land for parks and resource protection; and 5.9 percent fewer agreed or strongly agreed that government should require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space.

**Statewide and Regional  
Comparison Tables**

**Comparison Tables**  
**State and Regional Survey Results**

<b>Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
Yes	62.8	62.0	56.4	65.8	73.0
No	37.3	38.0	43.6	34.2	27.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<b>Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
No interest or desire	55.7	56.6	52.3	55.8	61.1
None close enough to me	9.4	9.2	3.7	13.5	11.1
Physical Disability	4.0	0.0	5.5	1.9	2.0
Other	7.7	10.4	9.2	7.7	5.6
Don't know/not sure/refused	23.2	23.7	29.4	21.2	4.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<b>Table 3: Activities</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
Walking	87.8	90.3	88.6	88.0	89.7
Family outing	82.7	85.5	78.4	85.3	87.7
Nature appreciation	68.3	68.5	62.4	72.7	67.1
Hiking	51.6	41.9	51.1	54.3	46.6
Family picnicking	48.2	50.0	43.3	47.0	61.6
Fishing from shore or pier	40.0	57.3	34.0	39.0	45.2
Bicycling	34.7	25.8	35.5	34.3	38.4
Nature center activities/naturalist programs	33.7	33.1	41.8	34.7	24.7
Picnicking/outing with organized group	33.3	38.7	32.6	33.7	33.7
Fishing from boat	29.7	45.2	21.3	32.3	25.3
Camping at a campsite	28.3	38.7	17.0	29.3	30.8
Power boating	21.7	28.2	19.1	24.3	15.8
Canoeing or kayaking	20.7	25.0	19.9	22.0	24.0
Primitive camping	15.7	25.8	5.7	17.3	13.0
Backpacking	14.7	12.9	9.2	17.7	10.3
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	14.3	15.3	16.3	14.3	8.9
Sailing	11.8	16.9	8.5	14.3	4.8
Hunting	10.8	21.0	5.7	9.3	22.6
Rock Climbing	10.4	9.7	12.8	10.3	13.7
Mountain biking	9.2	4.0	9.9	10.7	7.5
Off-road vehicle	8.6	20.2	5.7	7.3	13.0
Horseback riding	7.1	9.7	9.2	6.0	5.5
Trapping	0.7	2.4	0.7	0.7	0.0
Other	9.4	14.5	12.8	0.0	8.9

<b>Table 4: Favorite Activities</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions</b> (Percentages)			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
Walking	12.9	11.3	17.0	10.7	15.1
Family outing	10.6	16.1	16.3	8.0	7.5
Nature appreciation	4.8	9.7	2.8	5.3	5.5
Hiking	18.9	14.5	12.1	22.7	17.8
Family picnicking	6.8	3.2	6.4	8.3	6.8
Fishing from shore or pier	4.8	4.8	2.1	6.3	6.8
Bicycling	5.6	1.6	11.3	3.3	0.7
Nature center activities/naturalist programs	0.8	0.0	2.1	0.3	0.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	3.2	1.6	5.7	2.0	4.8
Fishing from boat	6.8	8.1	2.1	7.0	9.6
Camping at a campsite	8.4	10.5	2.1	11.0	8.2
Power boating	3.6	5.6	5.0	3.7	1.4
Canoeing or kayaking	1.8	0.8	3.5	1.0	2.1
Primitive camping	2.6	1.6	0.0	3.3	3.4
Backpacking	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.3	0.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.7	0.0
Sailing	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
Hunting	1.0	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.7
Rock Climbing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Mountain biking	0.8	0.0	0.7	1.0	0.0
Off-road vehicle	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
Horseback riding	0.4	1.6	1.4	0.0	0.0
Trapping	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	5.2	4.8	6.4	4.0	4.8

<b>Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas</b>						
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>				
<b>Activity<sup>a</sup></b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Walking	Excellent	51.0	43.8	56.8	50.0	45.3
	Good	46.9	58.5	39.2	48.9	51.6
	Fair	1.8	4.9	4.0	1.1	2.3
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.2	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.8
Family outing	Excellent	43.1	41.5	46.7	43.8	40.5
	Good	53.7	47.2	51.4	51.6	56.5
	Fair	3.1	10.4	1.9	4.7	2.3
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
	DK/NA	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nature appreciation	Excellent	53.9	49.4	58.0	53.2	45.9
	Good	42.0	45.9	37.5	44.0	50.0
	Fair	3.8	3.5	3.4	2.8	4.1
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.0
Hiking	Excellent	47.1	50.0	50.0	46.6	48.5
	Good	52.1	46.2	48.6	52.8	51.5
	Fair	0.8	3.8	1.4	0.6	0.0
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Family picnicking	Excellent	45.0	58.1	47.5	41.8	43.3
	Good	50.8	38.7	42.6	56.0	54.4
	Fair	3.3	1.6	8.2	1.4	2.2
	Poor	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
	DK/NA	0.4	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0



<b>Table 5 (continued): Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas</b>						
			<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b>Activity<sup>a</sup></b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Fishing from shore or pier	Excellent	27.9	39.4	27.1	28.2	31.8
	Good	52.7	46.5	58.3	51.3	47.0
	Fair	15.9	12.7	8.3	18.8	16.7
	Poor	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.7	4.5
	DK/NA	2.0	1.4	6.3	0.0	0.0
Bicycling	Excellent	48.3	50.0	44.0	54.4	35.7
	Good	43.7	31.3	48.0	39.8	53.6
	Fair	4.6	15.6	2.0	4.9	7.1
	Poor	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.8
	DK/NA	2.9	3.1	6.0	0.0	1.8
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	Excellent	49.1	31.7	49.2	51.9	44.4
	Good	43.2	58.5	39.0	44.2	47.2
	Fair	6.5	4.9	10.2	2.9	8.3
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	1.2	4.9	1.7	1.0	0.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	Excellent	37.1	58.3	41.3	31.7	32.7
	Good	56.9	33.3	54.3	61.4	59.2
	Fair	4.8	6.3	2.2	6.98	6.1
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	1.2	2.1	2.2	0.0	2.0
Fishing from boat	Excellent	32.2	42.9	40.0	26.8	35.1
	Good	50.3	39.3	50.0	54.6	48.6
	Fair	14.8	16.1	3.3	16.5	13.5
	Poor	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.7
	DK/NA	2.0	1.8	6.7	1.0	0.0

<b>Table 5 (continued): Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas</b>						
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>				
<b>Activity<sup>a</sup></b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Camping at a campsite	Excellent	33.1	37.5	33.3	30.7	40.0
	Good	62.7	45.8	58.3	65.9	46.7
	Fair	3.5	10.4	4.2	3.4	8.9
	Poor	0.7	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	4.4
Power boating	Excellent	54.1	60.0	63.0	49.3	43.5
	Good	42.2	34.3	37.0	46.6	39.1
	Fair	3.7	2.9	0.0	4.1	13.0
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	4.3
Canoeing or kayaking	Excellent	57.7	61.3	67.9	48.5	60.0
	Good	34.6	32.3	28.6	42.4	34.3
	Fair	6.7	3.2	3.6	7.6	5.7
	Poor	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Primitive camping	Excellent	35.4	43.8	75.0	36.5	57.9
	Good	53.2	43.8	25.0	51.9	31.6
	Fair	11.4	6.3	0.0	11.5	10.5
	Poor	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Backpacking	Excellent	43.2	37.5	28.6	47.2	46.7
	Good	33.8	25.0	50.0	28.3	40.0
	Fair	20.3	25.0	21.4	20.8	13.3
	Poor	1.4	6.3	0.0	1.9	0.0
	DK/NA	1.4	6.3	0.0	1.9	0.0

<b>Table 5 (continued): Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas</b>						
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>				
<b>Activity<sup>a</sup></b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	Excellent	44.4	21.1	30.4	48.8	15.4
	Good	48.6	57.9	60.9	44.2	69.2
	Fair	5.6	10.5	8.7	4.7	7.7
	Poor	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	1.4	5.3	0.0	2.3	7.7
Sailing	Excellent	47.5	23.8	25.0	58.1	42.9
	Good	40.7	47.6	58.3	27.9	28.6
	Fair	11.9	19.0	16.7	14.0	28.6
	Poor	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hunting	Excellent	25.9	61.5	12.5	14.3	45.5
	Good	40.7	15.4	50.0	53.6	30.3
	Fair	24.1	11.5	12.5	28.6	15.2
	Poor	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	6.1
	DK/NA	0.0	7.7	25.0	3.6	3.0
Rock Climbing	Excellent	25.0	16.7	44.4	19.4	50.0
	Good	53.8	50.0	44.4	51.6	40.0
	Fair	15.4	16.7	11.1	19.4	10.0
	Poor	1.9	8.3	0.0	3.2	0.0
	DK/NA	3.8	8.3	0.0	6.5	0.0
Mountain biking	Excellent	45.7	20.0	50.0	43.8	45.5
	Good	43.5	60.0	28.6	50.0	54.5
	Fair	4.3	0.0	7.1	3.1	0.0
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	6.5	20.0	14.3	3.1	0.0

<b>Table 5 (continued): Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas</b>						
			<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b>Activity<sup>a</sup></b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Off-road vehicle	Excellent	18.6	44.0	25.0	4.5	42.1
	Good	60.5	56.0	75.0	54.5	57.9
	Fair	16.3	0.0	.0	31.8	0.0
	Poor	2.3	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0
	DK/NA	2.3	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0
Horseback riding	Excellent	36.1	50.0	46.2	16.7	75.0
	Good	52.8	50.0	30.8	77.8	25.0
	Fair	8.3	0.0	15.4	5.6	0.0
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	2.8	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
<p>a. Only four respondents reported trapping as an activity in state parks or natural resource areas. This number is so small that it is not possible to calculate satisfaction ratings or to extrapolate them to the larger population. Additionally, because several activities were reported under the “other” category, a combined satisfaction rating would not be meaningful. Hence, trapping and “other” were not included in the table.</p>						

<b>Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities<sup>a</sup></b>						
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>				
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Parking	Excellent	25.9	20.2	29.1	23.3	32.2
	Good	56.4	57.3	58.9	56.7	51.4
	Fair	12.2	13.7	9.2	13.0	15.1
	Poor	4.6	6.5	2.1	5.3	1.4
	DK/NA	1.0	2.4	0.7	1.7	0.0
Picnic pavilions	Excellent	16.7	19.4	19.1	13.7	21.2
	Good	52.8	56.5	40.4	59.7	47.3
	Fair	9.8	11.3	13.5	8.3	8.2
	Poor	1.0	1.6	1.4	0.3	1.4
	DK/NA	19.7	11.3	25.5	18.0	21.9
Restrooms	Excellent	12.4	12.9	14.9	11.0	7.5
	Good	41.6	46.8	44.0	34.7	50.0
	Fair	30.1	21.0	24.8	36.7	23.3
	Poor	6.4	8.1	4.3	6.7	10.3
	DK/NA	9.6	11.3	12.1	11.0	8.9
Visitor centers	Excellent	22.1	25.0	27.7	16.7	28.1
	Good	45.4	41.1	44.0	47.0	42.5
	Fair	9.4	6.5	7.1	11.7	6.8
	Poor	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
	DK/NA	22.9	27.4	21.3	24.3	22.6
Signs, maps, information	Excellent	23.9	32.3	27.0	19.7	24.0
	Good	54.2	51.6	55.3	54.0	56.2
	Fair	10.0	6.5	4.3	13.7	8.2
	Poor	0.4	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	11.6	9.7	12.1	12.7	11.6

<b>Table 6 (continued): Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities<sup>a</sup></b>						
			<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Helpfulness of rangers and other personnel	Excellent	32.2	39.5	31.2	30.0	38.4
	Good	35.9	39.5	38.3	35.3	24.7
	Fair	8.4	3.2	6.4	11.3	3.4
	Poor	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	2.1
	DK/NA	22.9	17.7	23.4	23.3	31.5
General conditions	Excellent	30.3	41.9	35.5	25.0	41.8
	Good	59.8	52.4	53.9	63.3	50.7
	Fair	9.2	5.6	9.2	11.0	6.2
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
	DK/NA	0.8	0.0	1.4	0.7	0.7
Trails	Excellent	24.5	29.0	22.7	22.7	26.7
	Good	60.0	50.8	59.6	62.3	58.2
	Fair	5.6	8.9	5.0	6.7	4.8
	Poor	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	9.8	11.3	12.1	8.3	10.3
Rate overall experience	Excellent	43.4	46.8	44.0	41.0	44.5
	Good	53.4	51.6	52.5	55.0	54.1
	Fair	3.2	1.6	3.5	3.7	1.4
	Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DK/NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
<p>a. There were several instances in which relatively sizeable fractions of respondents said that they didn't know or provided no answer (e.g., picnic pavilions - 19.7 percent; visitor centers - 22.9 percent; and helpfulness of rangers and other staff - 22.9 percent). Since these responses would skew results (by reducing the percentages of either favorable or unfavorable responses), we eliminated the DK/NA responses from the table and calculated percentages based on total respondents who said either excellent, good, fair, or poor.</p>						

<b>Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
None	49.0	58.5	54.8	45.4	49.0
Once	15.8	12.5	12.8	18.0	19.5
Twice	12.6	10.5	12.0	12.1	11.5
More than twice	22.6	18.5	20.4	24.6	20.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<b>Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Reasons</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
Unique natural features	31.4	25.3	38.9	30.5	24.5
Special or one of a kind experience	18.9	12.0	18.5	22.5	15.7
Part of a planned trip	18.1	14.5	19.5	16.9	20.6
Closeness to home	8.8	9.6	1.8	10.4	8.8
Special accommodations	5.9	7.2	8.8	4.0	6.9
Remoteness	4.9	7.2	5.3	4.4	5.9
Other	3.2	8.4	2.7	2.0	6.9
No answer/don't know	8.8	15.7	4.4	9.2	10.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<b>Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space?</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
More than enough	4.4	7.5	5.6	3.3	8.0
Enough	42.9	43.0	42.8	40.6	48.5
Not enough	45.1	44.5	40.0	49.6	36.5
No opinion	7.6	5.0	11.2	6.6	7.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 10: Governmental Action Concerning Open Space**

		Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)				
<b>Governmental Action</b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Acquired parkland for active recreation	Very Important	52.3	44.5	57.2	50.9	54.0
	Somewhat Important	38.5	39.0	39.2	38.2	28.5
	Not too Important	6.5	10.0	2.0	8.8	10.5
	Not at all important	2.6	4.0	1.6	2.0	6.0
	Not sure	0.1	2.5	0.0	0.2	1.0
Protect land for protection of wildlife & environment	Very Important	83.6	79.5	87.2	82.0	83.5
	Somewhat Important	13.5	14.0	12.4	14.0	13.5
	Not too Important	2.6	5.0	0.4	3.7	2.5
	Not at all important	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
	Not sure	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Preserve farmland	Very Important	65.6	70.5	66.4	62.3	73.0
	Somewhat Important	26.3	23.0	23.6	29.4	20.5
	Not too Important	4.8	6.5	8.0	3.3	4.5
	Not at all important	3.0	0.0	1.6	4.6	2.0
	Not sure	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0
Provide public access to the bay or rivers	Very Important	49.8	47.0	58.4	47.1	41.0
	Somewhat Important	38.8	41.5	33.6	39.0	45.5
	Not too Important	9.9	9.0	7.2	12.3	9.5
	Not at all important	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.7	1.0
	Not sure	1.1	2.0	0.8	0.9	3.0



<b>Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
Very Familiar	6.3	8.0	5.6	5.7	8.5
Somewhat familiar	22.4	25.5	24.0	22.4	22.5
Not very familiar	35.6	32.0	35.2	33.3	32.0
Not familiar at all	35.8	34.5	35.2	38.6	37.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<b>Table 12: Is Government doing enough to manage growth and development in your county?</b>					
		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>			
<b><u>Response</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Eastern</u></b>	<b><u>Southern</u></b>	<b><u>Central</u></b>	<b><u>Western</u></b>
More than enough	6.8	7.0	6.4	7.0	8.5
Enough	31.1	34.5	35.6	28.5	32.0
Not enough	51.6	47.5	46.4	53.5	52.5
DK/NA	10.5	11.0	11.6	11.0	7.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 13: Land Use Regulation**

		<b>Department of Natural Resources Regions (Percentages)</b>				
<b>Governmental Action</b>		<b>State</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Western</b>
Planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development	Strongly agree	44.4	30.5	42.0	48.0	39.5
	Somewhat agree	39.6	45.0	39.6	39.0	36.5
	somewhat disagree	10.5	16.0	10.8	9.9	13.0
	strongly disagree	2.9	6.0	4.4	1.3	6.0
	DK/NA	2.6	2.5	3.2	1.8	5.0
Buy more land for parks and resource protection	Strongly agree	40.9	40.0	40.8	44.7	35.0
	Somewhat agree	38.0	36.5	37.2	35.5	36.5
	somewhat disagree	12.6	12.5	12.8	13.2	12.5
	strongly disagree	6.8	9.0	6.0	5.7	13.5
	DK/NA	1.8	2.0	3.2	0.9	2.5
Require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space	Strongly agree	64.5	68.0	66.4	62.3	61.0
	Somewhat agree	27.4	22.0	22.4	31.8	25.0
	somewhat disagree	6.8	7.0	9.6	4.8	10.5
	strongly disagree	0.6	1.0	0.0	0.7	2.0
	DK/NA	0.8	2.0	1.6	0.4	1.5
Provide economic incentives to land owners for conservation and resource protection	Strongly agree	47.0	50.0	43.2	43.9	58.5
	Somewhat agree	40.9	38.0	43.2	42.8	29.0
	somewhat disagree	6.4	5.5	5.6	7.9	7.5
	strongly disagree	4.0	4.5	4.8	4.2	4.5
	DK/NA	1.8	2.0	3.2	1.3	0.5

**DNR Eastern Region  
Data Tables**

## DNR Eastern Region

<b>Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	124	62.0
No	76	38.0
Total	200	100.0

<b>Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No interest or desire	43	56.6
None close enough to me	7	9.2
Other	8	10.4
Don't know/not sure/refused	18	23.7
Total	76	100.0

<b>Table 3: Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	90.3
Family outing	85.5
Nature appreciation	68.5
Hiking	41.9
Family picnicking	50.0
Fishing from shore or pier	57.3
Bicycling	25.8
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	33.1
Picnicking/outing with organized group	38.7
Fishing from boat	45.2
Camping at a campsite	38.7
Power boating	28.2
Canoeing or kayaking	25.0
Primitive camping	25.8
Backpacking	12.9
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	15.3
Sailing	16.9
Hunting	21.0
Rock Climbing	9.7
Mountain biking	4.0
Off-road vehicle	20.2
Horseback riding	9.7
Trapping	2.4
Other	14.5

<b>Table 4: Favorite Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	11.3
Family outing	16.1
Nature appreciation	9.7
Hiking	14.5
Family picnicking	3.2
Fishing from shore or pier	4.8
Bicycling	1.6
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	0.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	1.6
Fishing from boat	8.1
Camping at a campsite	10.5
Power boating	5.6
Canoeing or kayaking	0.8
Primitive camping	1.6
Backpacking	0.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	0.8
Sailing	0.0
Hunting	3.2
Rock Climbing	0.0
Mountain biking	0.0
Off-road vehicle	0.0
Horseback riding	1.6
Trapping	0.0
Other	4.8

**Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas**

<b>Activity*</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Walking	43.8	58.5	4.9	0.0	4.9	100.0
Family outing	41.5	47.2	10.4	0.0	0.9	100.0
Nature appreciation	49.4	45.9	3.5	0.0	1.2	100.0
Hiking	50.0	46.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family picnicking	58.1	38.7	1.6	0.0	1.6	100.0
Fishing from shore or pier	39.4	46.5	12.7	0.0	1.4	100.0
Bicycling	50.0	31.3	15.6	0.0	3.1	100.0
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	31.7	58.5	4.9	0.0	4.9	100.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	58.3	33.3	6.3	0.0	2.1	100.0
Fishing from boat	42.9	39.3	16.1	0.0	1.8	100.0
Camping at a campsite	37.5	45.8	10.4	4.2	2.1	100.0
Power boating	23.8	47.6	19.0	4.8	4.8	100.0
Canoeing or kayaking	61.3	32.3	3.2	0.0	3.2	100.0
Primitive camping	43.8	43.8	6.3	3.1	3.1	100.0
Backpacking	37.5	25.0	25.0	6.3	6.3	100.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	21.1	57.9	10.5	5.3	5.3	100.0
Sailing	23.8	47.6	19.0	4.8	4.8	100.0
Hunting	61.5	15.4	11.5	3.8	7.7	100.0
Rock Climbing	16.7	50.0	16.7	8.3	8.3	100.0
Mountain biking	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Off-road vehicle	44.0	56.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Horseback riding	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

<b>Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities* (Percent)</b>						
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parking	20.2	57.3	13.7	6.5	2.4	100.0
Picnic pavilions	19.4	56.5	11.3	1.6	11.3	100.0
Restrooms	12.9	46.8	21.0	8.1	11.3	100.0
Visitor centers	25.0	41.1	6.5	0.0	27.4	100.0
Signs, maps, information	32.3	51.6	6.5	0.0	9.7	100.0
Helpfulness of rangers and other personnel	39.5	39.5	3.2	0.0	17.7	100.0
General conditions	41.9	52.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Trails	29.0	50.8	8.9	0.0	11.3	100.0
Rate overall experience	46.8	51.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

<b>Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
None	58.5
Once	12.5
Twice	10.5
More than twice	18.5
Total	100.0

<b>Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Unique natural features	25.3
Special or one or a kind experience	12.0
Part of a planned trip	14.5
Closeness to home	9.6
Special accommodations	7.2
Remoteness	7.2
Other	8.4
No answer/don't know	15.7
Total	100.0



<b>Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space?</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than Enough	7.5
Enough	43.0
Not enough	44.5
No opinion	5.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 10: Governmental Actions Concerning Open Space (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental Action</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Somewhat Important</b>	<b>Not too Important</b>	<b>Not at all Important</b>	<b>Not Sure</b>	<b>Total</b>
Acquire parkland for active recreation	44.5	39.0	10.0	4.0	2.5	100.0
Protect lands for protection of wildlife and environment	79.5	14.0	5.0	0.5	1.0	100.0
Preserve farmland	70.5	23.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Provide public access to the bay or rivers	47.0	41.5	9.0	0.5	2.0	100.0

<b>Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very familiar	8.0
Somewhat familiar	25.5
Not very familiar	32.0
Not familiar at all	34.5
Total	100.0

<b>Table 12: Is Government Doing Enough to Manage Growth and Development in Your County?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than enough	7.0
Enough	34.5
Not enough	47.5
DK/NA	11.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 13: Land Use Regulation (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental action</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development	30.5	45.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	100.0
Buy more land for parks and resource protection	40.0	36.5	12.5	9.0	2.0	100.0
Require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space	68.0	22.0	7.0	1.0	2.0	100.0
Provide economic incentives to land owners for conservation and resource protection	50.0	38.0	5.5	4.5	2.0	100.0

**DNR Southern Region  
Data Tables**

## DNR Southern Region

<b>Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	141	56.4
No	109	43.6
Total	250	100.0

<b>Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No interest or desire	57	52.3
None close enough to me	4	3.7
Physical disability	6	5.5
Other	10	9.2
Don't know/not sure/refused	32	29.4
Total	109	100.0

<b>Table 3: Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	88.6
Family outing	78.4
Nature appreciation	62.4
Hiking	51.1
Family picnicking	43.3
Fishing from shore or pier	34.0
Bicycling	35.5
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	41.8
Picnicking/outing with organized group	32.6
Fishing from boat	21.3
Camping at a campsite	17.0
Power boating	19.1
Canoeing or kayaking	19.9
Primitive camping	5.7
Backpacking	9.2
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	16.3
Sailing	8.5
Hunting	5.7
Rock Climbing	12.8
Mountain biking	9.9
Off-road vehicle	5.7
Horseback riding	9.2
Trapping	0.7
Other	12.8

<b>Table 4: Favorite Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	17.0
Family outing	16.3
Nature appreciation	2.8
Hiking	12.1
Family picnicking	6.4
Fishing from shore or pier	2.1
Bicycling	11.3
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	2.1
Picnicking/outing with organized group	5.7
Fishing from boat	3.5
Camping at a campsite	2.1
Power boating	5.0
Canoeing or kayaking	3.5
Primitive camping	0.0
Backpacking	0.7
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	0.0
Sailing	0.0
Hunting	0.7
Rock Climbing	0.0
Mountain biking	0.7
Off-road vehicle	0.0
Horseback riding	1.4
Trapping	0.0
Other	6.4

**Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas**

<b>Activity*</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Walking	56.8	39.2	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family outing	46.7	51.4	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nature appreciation	58.0	37.5	3.4	0.0	1.1	100.0
Hiking	50.0	48.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family picnicking	47.5	42.6	8.2	0.0	1.6	100.0
Fishing from shore or pier	27.1	58.3	8.3	0.0	6.3	100.0
Bicycling	44.0	48.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	100.0
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	49.2	39.0	10.2	0.0	1.7	100.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	41.3	54.3	2.2	0.0	2.2	100.0
Fishing from boat	40.0	50.0	3.3	0.0	6.7	100.0
Camping at a campsite	33.3	58.3	4.2	4.2	0.0	100.0
Power boating	63.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canoeing or kayaking	67.9	28.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primitive camping	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Backpacking	28.6	50.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	30.4	60.9	8.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Sailing	25.0	58.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hunting	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	100.0
Rock Climbing	44.4	44.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mountain biking	50.0	28.6	7.1	0.0	14.3	100.0
Off-road vehicle	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Horseback riding	46.2	30.8	15.4	0.0	7.7	100.0

<b>Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities* (Percent)</b>						
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parking	29.1	58.9	9.2	2.1	0.7	100.0
Picnic pavilions	19.1	40.4	13.5	1.4	25.5	100.0
Restrooms	14.9	44.0	24.8	4.3	12.1	100.0
Visitor centers	27.7	44.0	7.1	0.0	21.3	100.0
Signs, maps, information	27.0	55.3	4.3	1.4	12.1	100.0
Helpfulness of rangers and other personnel	31.2	38.3	6.4	0.7	23.4	100.0
General conditions	35.5	53.9	9.2	0.0	1.4	100.0
Trails	22.7	59.6	5.0	0.7	12.1	100.0
Rate overall experience	44.0	52.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

<b>Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
None	54.8
Once	12.8
Twice	12.0
More than twice	20.4
Total	100.0

<b>Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Unique natural features	38.9
Special or one of a kind experience	18.5
Part of a planned trip	19.5
Closeness to home	1.8
Special accommodations	8.8
Remoteness	5.3
Other	2.7
No answer/don't know	4.4
Total	100.0



<b>Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space?</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than Enough	5.6
Enough	42.8
Not enough	40.4
No opinion	11.2
Total	100.0

<b>Table 10: Governmental Actions Concerning Open Space (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental Action</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Somewhat Important</b>	<b>Not too Important</b>	<b>Not at all Important</b>	<b>Not Sure</b>	<b>Total</b>
Acquire parkland for active recreation	57.2	39.2	2.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
Protect lands for protection of wildlife and environment	87.2	12.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Preserve farmland	66.4	23.6	8.0	1.6	0.4	100.0
Provide public access to the bay or rivers	58.4	33.6	7.2	0.0	0.8	100.0

<b>Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very familiar	5.6
Somewhat familiar	24.0
Not very familiar	35.2
Not familiar at all	35.2
Total	100.0

<b>Table 12: Is Government Doing Enough to Manage Growth and Development in Your County?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than enough	6.4
Enough	35.6
Not enough	46.4
DK/NA	11.6
Total	100.0

<b>Table 13: Land Use Regulation (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental action</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development	42.0	39.6	10.8	4.4	3.2	100.0
Buy more land for parks and resource protection	40.8	37.2	12.8	6.0	3.2	100.0
Require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space	66.4	22.4	9.6	0.0	1.6	100.0
Provide economic incentives to land owners for conservation and resource protection	43.2	43.2	5.6	4.8	3.2	100.0

**DNR Central Region  
Data Tables**

## DNR Central Region

<b>Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	300	65.8
No	156	34.2
Total	456	100.0

<b>Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No interest or desire	87	55.8
None close enough to me	21	13.5
Physical disability	3	1.9
Other	12	7.7
Don't know/not sure/refused	33	21.2
Total	156	100.0

<b>Table 3: Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	88.0
Family outing	85.3
Nature appreciation	72.7
Hiking	54.3
Family picnicking	47.0
Fishing from shore or pier	39.0
Bicycling	34.3
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	34.7
Picnicking/outing with organized group	33.7
Fishing from boat	32.3
Camping at a campsite	29.3
Power boating	24.3
Canoeing or kayaking	22.0
Primitive camping	17.3
Backpacking	17.7
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	14.3
Sailing	14.3
Hunting	9.3
Rock Climbing	10.3
Mountain biking	10.7
Off-road vehicle	7.3
Horseback riding	6.0
Trapping	0.7
Other	

<b>Table 4: Favorite Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	10.7
Family outing	8.0
Nature appreciation	5.3
Hiking	22.7
Family picnicking	8.3
Fishing from shore or pier	6.3
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	0.3
Bicycling	3.3
Picnicking/outing with organized group	2.0
Fishing from boat	7.0
Camping at a campsite	11.0
Power boating	3.7
Canoeing or kayaking	1.0
Backpacking	0.3
Primitive camping	3.3
Sailing	0.7
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	0.7
Mountain biking	1.0
Rock Climbing	0.0
Hunting	0.0
Off-road vehicle	0.3
Horseback riding	0.0
Trapping	0.0
Other	4.0

<b>Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas</b>						
<b>Activity*</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Walking	50.0	48.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family outing	43.8	51.6	4.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Nature appreciation	53.2	44.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hiking	46.6	52.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family picnicking	41.8	56.0	1.4	0.7	0.0	100.0
Fishing from shore or pier	28.2	51.3	18.8	1.7	0.0	100.0
Bicycling	54.4	39.8	4.9	1.0	0.0	100.0
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	51.9	44.2	2.9	0.0	1.0	100.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	31.7	61.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fishing from boat	26.8	54.6	16.5	1.0	1.0	100.0
Camping at a campsite	30.7	65.9	3.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Power boating	49.3	46.6	4.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Canoeing or kayaking	48.5	42.4	7.6	1.5	0.0	100.0
Primitive camping	36.5	51.9	11.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Backpacking	47.2	28.3	20.8	1.9	1.9	100.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	48.8	44.2	4.7	0.0	2.3	100.0
Sailing	58.1	27.9	14.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hunting	14.3	53.6	28.6	0.0	3.6	100.0
Rock Climbing	19.4	51.6	19.4	3.2	6.5	100.0
Mountain biking	43.8	50.0	3.1	0.0	3.1	100.0
Off-road vehicle	4.5	54.5	31.8	4.5	4.5	100.0
Horseback riding	16.7	77.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

<b>Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities* (Percent)</b>						
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parking	23.3	56.7	13.0	5.3	1.7	100.0
Picnic pavilions	13.7	59.7	8.3	0.3	18.0	100.0
Restrooms	11.0	34.7	36.7	6.7	11.0	100.0
Visitor centers	16.7	47.0	11.7	0.3	24.3	100.0
Signs, maps, information	19.7	54.0	13.7	0.0	12.7	100.0
Helpfulness of rangers and other personnel	30.0	35.3	11.3	0.0	23.3	100.0
General conditions	25.0	63.3	11.0	0.0	0.7	100.0
Trails	22.7	62.3	6.7	0.0	8.3	100.0
Rate overall experience	41.0	55.0	3.7	0.0	0.3	100.0

<b>Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
None	45.4
Once	18.0
Twice	12.1
More than twice	24.6
Total	100.0

<b>Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Unique natural features	30.5
Special or one of a kind experience	22.5
Part of a planned trip	16.9
Closeness to home	10.4
Special accommodations	4.0
Remoteness	4.4
Other	2.0
No answer/don't know	9.2
Total	100.0



<b>Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space?</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than Enough	3.3
Enough	40.6
Not enough	49.6
No opinion	6.6
Total	100.0

<b>Table 10: Governmental Actions Concerning Open Space (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental Action</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Somewhat Important</b>	<b>Not too Important</b>	<b>Not at all Important</b>	<b>Not Sure</b>	<b>Total</b>
Acquire parkland for active recreation	50.9	38.2	8.8	2.0	0.2	100.0
Protect lands for protection of wildlife and environment	82.0	14.0	3.7	0.0	0.2	100.0
Preserve farmland	62.3	29.4	3.3	4.6	0.4	100.0
Provide public access to the bay or rivers	47.1	39.0	12.3	0.7	0.9	100.0

<b>Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very familiar	5.7
Somewhat familiar	22.4
Not very familiar	33.3
Not familiar at all	38.6
Total	100.0

<b>Table 12: Is Government Doing Enough to Manage Growth and Development in Your County?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than enough	7.0
Enough	28.5
Not enough	53.5
DK/NA	11.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 13: Land Use Regulation (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental action</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development	48.0	39.0	9.9	1.3	1.8	100.0
Buy more land for parks and resource protection	44.7	35.5	13.2	5.7	0.9	100.0
Require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space	62.3	31.8	4.8	0.7	0.4	100.0
Provide economic incentives to land owners for conservation and resource protection	43.9	42.8	7.9	4.2	1.3	100.0

**DNR Western Region  
Data Tables**

## DNR Western Region

<b>Table 1: Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	146	73.0
No	54	27.0
Total	200	100.0

<b>Table 2: Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No interest or desire	33	61.1
None close enough to me	6	11.1
Physical disability	4	2.0
Other	3	5.6
Don't know/not sure/refused	8	4.0
Total	54	100.0

<b>Table 3: Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	87.7
Family outing	89.7
Nature appreciation	67.1
Hiking	46.6
Family picnicking	61.6
Fishing from shore or pier	45.2
Bicycling	38.4
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	24.7
Picnicking/outing with organized group	33.7
Fishing from boat	25.3
Camping at a campsite	30.8
Power boating	15.8
Canoeing or kayaking	24.0
Primitive camping	13.0
Backpacking	10.3
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	8.9
Sailing	4.8
Hunting	22.6
Rock Climbing	13.7
Mountain biking	7.5
Off-road vehicle	13.0
Horseback riding	5.5
Trapping	0.0
Other	8.9

<b>Table 4: Favorite Activities</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Walking	15.1
Family outing	7.5
Nature appreciation	5.5
Hiking	17.8
Family picnicking	11.0
Fishing from shore or pier	6.8
Bicycling	0.7
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	0.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	4.8
Fishing from boat	9.6
Camping at a campsite	8.2
Power boating	1.4
Canoeing or kayaking	2.1
Primitive camping	3.4
Backpacking	0.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	0.0
Sailing	0.0
Hunting	0.7
Rock Climbing	0.7
Mountain biking	0.0
Off-road vehicle	0.0
Horseback riding	0.0
Trapping	0.0
Other	4.8

**Table 5: Ratings of experiences in parks and natural resource areas**

<b>Activity*</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Walking	45.3	51.6	2.3	0.0	0.8	100.0
Family outing	40.5	56.5	2.3	0.8	0.0	100.0
Nature appreciation	45.9	50.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hiking	48.5	51.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Family picnicking	43.3	54.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fishing from shore or pier	31.8	47.0	16.7	4.5	0.0	100.0
Bicycling	35.7	53.6	7.1	1.8	1.8	100.0
Nature center activities/ naturalist programs	44.4	47.2	8.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Picnicking/outing with organized group	32.7	59.2	6.1	0.0	2.0	100.0
Fishing from boat	35.1	48.6	13.5	2.7	0.0	100.0
Camping at a campsite	40.0	46.7	8.9	0.0	4.4	100.0
Power boating	43.5	39.1	13.0	0.0	4.3	100.0
Canoeing or kayaking	60.0	34.3	5.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primitive camping	57.9	31.6	10.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Backpacking	46.7	40.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Staying at a park cabin or lodge	15.4	69.2	7.7	0.0	7.7	100.0
Sailing	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Hunting	45.5	30.3	15.2	6.1	3.0	100.0
Rock Climbing	50.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mountain biking	45.5	54.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Off-road vehicle	42.1	57.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Horseback riding	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

<b>Table 6: Ratings of Facilities, Features and Amenities* (Percent)</b>						
<b>Facilities, etc.</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parking	32.2	51.4	15.1	1.4	0.0	100.0
Picnic pavilions	21.2	47.3	8.2	1.4	21.9	100.0
Restrooms	7.5	50.0	23.3	10.3	8.9	100.0
Visitor centers	28.1	42.5	6.8	0.0	22.6	100.0
Signs, maps, information	24.0	56.2	8.2	0.0	11.6	100.0
Helpfulness of rangers and other personnel	38.4	24.7	3.4	2.1	31.5	100.0
General conditions	41.8	50.7	6.2	0.7	0.7	100.0
Trails	26.7	58.2	4.8	0.0	10.3	100.0
Rate overall experience	44.5	54.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0

<b>Table 7: Visits to Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
None	49.0
Once	19.5
Twice	11.5
More than twice	20.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 8: Reasons for Visiting Out of State Parks</b>	
<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Unique natural features	24.5
Special or one or a kind experience	15.7
Part of a planned trip	20.6
Closeness to home	8.8
Special accommodations	6.9
Remoteness	5.9
Other	6.9
No answer/don't know	10.8
Total	100.0



<b>Table 9: Are governments doing enough to protect open space?</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than Enough	8.0
Enough	48.5
Not enough	36.5
No opinion	7.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 10: Governmental Actions Concerning Open Space (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental Action</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Somewhat Important</b>	<b>Not too Important</b>	<b>Not at all Important</b>	<b>Not Sure</b>	<b>Total</b>
Acquire parkland for active recreation	54.0	28.5	10.5	6.0	1.0	100.0
Protect lands for protection of wildlife and environment	83.5	13.5	2.5	0.5	0.0	100.0
Preserve farmland	73.0	20.5	4.5	2.0	0.0	100.0
Provide public access to the bay or rivers	41.0	45.5	9.5	1.0	3.0	100.0

<b>Table 11: Familiarity with Smart Growth</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very familiar	8.5
Somewhat familiar	22.5
Not very familiar	32.0
Not familiar at all	37.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 12: Is Government Doing Enough to Manage Growth and Development in Your County?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
More than enough	8.5
Enough	32.0
Not enough	52.5
DK/NA	7.0
Total	100.0

<b>Table 13: Land Use Regulation (Percent)</b>						
<b>Governmental action</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning and land use regulation to limit growth and guide development	39.5	36.5	13.0	6.0	5.0	100.0
Buy more land for parks and resource protection	35.0	36.5	12.5	13.5	2.5	100.0
Require developers to preserve more natural areas and open space	61.0	25.0	10.5	2.0	1.5	100.0
Provide economic incentives to land owners for conservation and resource protection	58.5	29.0	7.5	4.5	0.5	100.0

## Appendix D

### Survey Instrument

MARYLAND PARKS & LAND USE SURVEY - FEBRUARY 2003

Good (morning, evening), I'm \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. We're conducting a survey to help Maryland government plan to identify and meet public needs for outdoor recreation, land conservation, and growth management. Would you have a few minutes to participate? Your participation is voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential.

SCREENER #1: Are you a resident of the State of Maryland?

YES - PROCEED NO TERMINATE

SCREENER #2: Are you at least 18 years old?

YES - PROCEED NO TERMINATE

1. Have you or other members of your household visited a state park or natural resource area in Maryland in the last year?

Yes **1-SKIP TO Q3** No 2

2. Why haven't you visited a state park or natural resource area? **Interviewer does not read list, but marks response on table below:**

1 =	No interest/desire
2 =	New to area
3 =	Lack of information about them
4 =	Physical disability
5 =	Lack of transportation
6 =	None is close enough to where I live
7 =	Lack of facilities that interest me
8 =	Entrance fees too high
9 =	Not safe
10 =	Lack of programs/activities
11 =	Other: _(Interviewer record answer verbatim)_
12 =	Not sure - refused

\*\*\*\*\* **SKIP TO Q37** \*\*\*\*\*

I am going to read some activities that occur in state parks and natural resource areas. As I read each of them, tell me if it was something you or members of your household did during your visits during the past year. Interviewer reads each activity from drop-down list.

**After each "yes" answer, interviewer asks:** Would you say your experience with this activity was Excellent, Good, Only Fair, or Poor.

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBER VISITED/DID DURING VISIT - PERSONALLY CANNOT GIVE RATING
6 =	DK/REFUSED
7 =	NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD DID/PARTICIPATE IN ACTIVITY IN PAST YEAR

3. Family Outing
4. Family Picnicking
5. picnicking/outing with Organized group other than your family
6. Nature Appreciation
7. Backpacking
8. Rock Climbing
9. Primitive Camping
10. Camping at a campground
11. Staying at a park cabin or lodge
12. Off-Road vehicle
13. Fishing from Shore or Pier
14. Fishing from boat
15. Power boating
16. Sailing
17. Canoeing or Kayaking
18. Hunting
19. Trapping
20. Nature Center Activities or Naturalist Programs
21. Walking
22. Hiking
23. Bicycling
24. Mountain biking
25. Horseback riding
26. Any other major reasons for visits to state parks and natural resource areas?

Interviewer Records Answers Verbatim \_\_\_\_\_

27. Thinking of all the activities you mentioned that you or members of your household did in state parks or natural resource areas in the past year, which of them would you say is your favorite activity?

1 =	Family outing
2 =	Family picnicking
3 =	Picnicking/outing with organized group other than your family
4 =	Nature appreciation
5 =	Backpacking
6 =	Rock climbing
7 =	Primitive camping
8 =	Camping at a campground
9 =	Staying at a park cabin or lodge
10 =	Off-road vehicle
11 =	Fishing from shore or pier
12 =	Fishing from boat
13 =	Power boating
14 =	Sailing
15 =	Canoeing or Kayaking
16 =	Hunting
17 =	Trapping
18 =	Nature center activities or naturalist programs
19 =	Walking
20 =	Hiking
21 =	Bicycling
22 =	Mountain biking
23 =	Horseback riding
24 =	Verbatim

Thinking of your visits to Maryland State Parks or natural resource areas, Would you rate each of the following things excellent, good, only fair, or poor, no opinion or don't know, or did not use.

28. Parking

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

29. Picnic pavilions

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

30. Restrooms

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

31. Visitor's Centers

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

32. Signs/Maps/Information

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

33. Helpfulness of rangers and other park personnel

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

34. General condition of the grounds and facilities

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

35. Trails

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED



36. Overall, would you say your experience in visiting Maryland State parks or natural resource areas has been?

1 =	EXCELLENT
2 =	GOOD
3 =	ONLY FAIR
4 =	POOR
5 =	DK/REFUSED

37. Thinking of the past year, how often did you take a trip or vacation that involved a visit to a park or natural resource area outside the State of Maryland?

1 =	<b>None- SKIP TO Q39</b>
2 =	Once - Go to Question 38
3 =	Two times - Go to Question
4 =	More than two times - Go to Question 39

38. What things attracted you to the particular out-of-state parks or natural resource areas you visited? Was it:

1 =	Unique natural features
2 =	Part of planned trip
3 =	Special Accommodations
4 =	Remoteness
5 =	Opportunity for a special recreational experience
6 =	Closeness to home
7 =	One-of-a-kind experience
8 =	Cost
9 =	Other: <b>Record Verbatim</b>
10 =	Don't know/no reason/not sure

39. In general, do you think state and local governments in Maryland are doing enough to protect open space for recreation and natural resources in your county? Do you think more than enough, enough, or not enough is being done?

1 =	MORE THAN ENOUGH
2 =	ENOUGH
3 =	NOT ENOUGH
4 =	DON'T KNOW

I am going to read you a list of things some people say the State and Local governments should do to protect more land for recreation and natural resources. Please tell me how important do you think each of them is. That is, is it very important, somewhat important, not too important or not at all important?

40. Acquire Park Land for Active Recreation

1 =	VERY IMPORTANT
2 =	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 =	NOT TOO IMPORTANT
4 =	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
5 =	NOT SURE

41. Protect Forests & Other Natural lands for protection of wildlife, water quality, and a healthy environment

1 =	VERY IMPORTANT
2 =	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 =	NOT TOO IMPORTANT
4 =	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
5 =	NOT SURE

42. Preserve Farmland

1 =	VERY IMPORTANT
2 =	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 =	NOT TOO IMPORTANT
4 =	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
5 =	NOT SURE

43. Provide Public Access to the Bay or Rivers

1 =	VERY IMPORTANT
2 =	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 =	NOT TOO IMPORTANT
4 =	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
5 =	NOT SURE

**Now, I'm going to ask you some questions about growth and development in Maryland and your county. [If respondent lives in Baltimore City, replace "County" with "City".]**

44. How familiar would you say you are with Maryland's Smart Growth Initiative? Would you say you are very familiar, somewhat familiar, not very familiar, not at all familiar of it?

1 =	VERY FAMILIAR
2 =	SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR
3 =	NOT VERY FAMILIAR
4 =	NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR

45. Do you think government is doing more than enough, enough, or not enough to manage growth and development in your county?

1 =	MORE THAN ENOUGH
2 =	ENOUGH
3 =	NOT ENOUGH
4 =	DON'T KNOW

A variety of ways have been suggested to manage growth and protect land and natural resources. As I read each of them, tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, or have no opinion

46. Government should limit growth and guide development through planning, and regulation of land uses

1 =	STRONGLY AGREE
2 =	SOMEWHAT AGREE
3 =	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
4 =	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5 =	DK/REFUSED

47. Government should buy more land for public parks and resource protection

1 =	STRONGLY AGREE
2 =	SOMEWHAT AGREE
3 =	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
4 =	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5 =	DK/REFUSED

48. Government should require developers to preserve more natural areas and

1 =	STRONGLY AGREE
2 =	SOMEWHAT AGREE
3 =	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
4 =	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5 =	DK/REFUSED

49. Government should provide economic incentives to private landowners for land conservation and resource protection

1 =	STRONGLY AGREE
2 =	SOMEWHAT AGREE
3 =	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
4 =	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5 =	DK/REFUSED

Finally, I'd like to ask you a few questions about you and your household.

50. What is your current age? \_\_

51. What is your highest level of education?

1 =	Did not complete high school
2 =	High school graduate/ GED
3 =	Some college
4 =	Some graduate or professional courses
5 =	Refused (Do not read)

52. Sex: by observation:

1 =	MALE
2 =	FEMALE

53. In what county do you live? (Do not read county names; however if respondent says Baltimore, probe for City or County.)

1 =	Allegany	9 =	Charles	17 =	Prince George's
2 =	Anne Arundel	10 =	Dorchester	18 =	Queen Anne's
3 =	Baltimore City	11 =	Frederick	19 =	St. Mary's
4 =	Baltimore County	12 =	Garrett	20 =	Somerset
5 =	Calvert	13 =	Harford	21 =	Talbot
6 =	Caroline	14 =	Howard	22 =	Washington
7 =	Carroll	15 =	Kent	23 =	Wicomico
8 =	Cecil	16 =	Montgomery	24 =	Worcester

54. What is your zip code? \_\_\_\_\_

55. What is your race or ethnicity?

1 =	White/Caucasian
2 =	Black/African American
3 =	Hispanic or Latino
4 =	Asian or Pacific Islander
5 =	Native American or Alaskan Native
6 =	Other _____
7 =	Don't know (Do not read)
8 =	Refused (Do not read)

56. I'm now going to read you some income categories. Please stop me when I get to the category that includes your household income before taxes in 2002. If not sure, please give your best estimate.

1 =	< \$25,000
2 =	\$25,000 - \$49,000
3 =	\$50,000 - \$74,999
4 =	\$75,000 - \$99,999
5 =	\$100,000 or more
6 =	Don't know (Do not read)
7 =	Refused (Do not read)

57. Are you:

1 =	Single
2 =	Married
3 =	In a domestic relationship
4 =	Separated/Divorced
5 =	Widowed
6 =	Other

58. NOTE REGION

1 =	WESTERN
2 =	CENTRAL
3 =	EASTERN
4 =	SOUTHERN

This concludes our interview. Thank you for participating.