

## CHAPTER 3: REGISTERED VOTER SURVEY

During July and August 2007, a mail survey of 2,001 registered Michigan voters was conducted by Michigan State University to better understand public outdoor recreation needs, preferences, activities and use of Michigan's public outdoor recreation resources. A list of all 7.1 million Michigan registered voters was obtained from the Michigan Secretary of State Bureau of Elections. A sample of 2,001 voters was randomly selected. Each received an initial mailing of the questionnaire, along with a cover letter and business reply envelope. The questionnaire was clearly identified on the cover as a "Michigan Outdoor Recreation Survey" and was mailed from Michigan State University and returned to Michigan State University. The questionnaire, cover letter (consent form) and the survey procedures were all approved by the Institutional Review Board of Michigan State University per University policy. Ten days after the initial mailing, non-respondents were mailed a reminder postcard encouraging their response. Two weeks after the postcard, those who had still not responded were sent a second mailing of the questionnaire with a revised cover letter and another business reply envelope. The cutoff date for all survey responses was August 17, 2007. The survey, initial cover letter and additional written comments by respondents are provided in Appendix A.

Of the 2,001 addresses, according to the U.S. Postal Service 202 (10 percent) were invalid for the person listed. Of the remaining 1,799 valid addresses, 460 (26 percent) responded with a completed questionnaire. In addition, 11 more mailed back a blank questionnaire with the explanation that they felt unqualified to complete the questionnaire since they were not active in outdoor recreation due to age, health or lack of interest. Of the respondents, 51 percent rated outdoor recreation as very important, 35 percent as moderately important, 10 percent as slightly important and 4 percent as unimportant.

### **Outdoor Recreation Participation**

In addition to generally rating outdoor recreation as important, respondents also were active participants. From a defined list of outdoor recreational activities, walking outdoors was the most common activity for respondent households (Table 12). While the list was not exhaustive of every potential type of outdoor recreation activity, it had a wide range. Unfortunately, mountain biking and paved trail biking were not included, which was an oversight. More than 50 percent of the respondents participated in one or more of eight activities: walk outdoors, relax outdoors, drive for pleasure; swim in a lake; river or pond; sightsee; picnic; bicycle on a road/sidewalk or fish. When asked which of the activities from the list was the first, second and third most important to their household regardless of whether they participated in them or not, the top five is different than that for participation. The five activities with the highest percentage noting them as first, second or third most important to their household were walking outdoors, relaxing outdoors, fishing, hunting and swimming in a lake, river or pond. Only one activity, hunting was identified by more than half of the participants as a most important activity for their household.

Table 12--Michigan Outdoor Recreation Activities and their Relative Importance

ACTIVITY	PARTICIPATING	1ST MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITY	2ND MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITY	3RD MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> , 2 <sup>ND</sup> OR 3 <sup>RD</sup> MOST IMPORTANT
Walk Outdoors	85.7%	25.7%	12.8%	5.7%	44.2%
Relax Outdoors	78.3%	6.0%	7.7%	12.4%	26.1%
Drive for Pleasure	67.2%	7.4%	4.7%	4.8%	16.9%
Swim in Lake, River or Pond	54.8%	3.7%	6.3%	7.1%	17.1%
Sightseeing	53.5%	1.6%	1.0%	5.7%	8.3%
Picnic	53.3%	1.8%	3.0%	2.9%	7.7%
Bicycle on Road/Sidewalk	52.0%	3.4%	7.2%	4.3%	14.9%
Fish	50.7%	8.3%	10.5%	5.5%	24.3%
Play Outdoor Games/Sports	49.1%	3.2%	2.8%	7.1%	13.1%
Swim in Outdoor Pool	45.9%	0.9%	2.8%	3.8%	7.5%
Wildlife Viewing	44.65	2.1%	4.4%	6.2%	12.7%
Visit Outdoor Historic Site	42.0%	-	1.9%	2.6%	4.5%
Photograph Nature or Scenery	40.4%	-	1.4%	3.8%	5.2%
Camp	38.5%	8.0%	5.1%	4.8%	17.9%
Motorized Boating	37.6%	3.2%	3.0%	3.8%	10.0%
Golf	33.9%	5.5%	3.3%	4.8%	13.6%
Hunt	30.4%	9.2%	7.0%	3.6%	19.8%
Canoe/Kayak	28.7%	0.7%	3.7%	2.9%	7.3%
Run/Jog Outdoors	24.3%	3.2%	1.2%	0.7%	5.1%
Ride an Off-Road Vehicle	20.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.7%	4.0%
Day Hike	20.0%	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	3.7%
Outdoor Ice Skating	13.0%	-	-	0.2%	0.2%
Snowmobile	12.8%	1.1%	2.1%	1.0%	4.2%
Downhill Ski/Snowboard	12.2%	-	0.2%	1.0%	1.2%
Water Ski	11.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%	1.2%
In-line Skate	10.2%	-	0.5%	0.5%	1.0%
Horseback Ride	8.7%	0.9%	0.2%	-	1.1%
Cross-Country Ski	8.7%	0.2%	0.9%	0.5%	1.6%
Volunteer for Outdoor Games/Sports	8.3%	-	-	-	-
Volunteer for Habitat, Trails, Parks, Etc.	4.1%	-	-	-	-
Overnight Backpack	3.9%	0.7%	-	-	0.7%
Rock Climb	3.3%	-	-	0.2%	0.2%
Scuba Dive	2.8%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%
Trap	2.6%	-	-	0.7%	0.7%
Geocache	2.6%	0.2%	0.2%	-	0.4%

Most respondent households provided some funding support for conservation through the purchase of a license, permit, fee or registration related to outdoor recreation. The most common purchase was a fishing license, followed by a motor vehicle or entry permit to a local park or a state park (Table 13). In terms of the state of Michigan, purchase of any of the listed items other than a local or regional park permit result in revenues being placed in a constitutionally protected restricted fund focused on DNR conservation work. For most local units of government, restricted funds also have been established to safeguard user fees from use not related to outdoor recreation and conservation of recreation resources.

Table 13--Outdoor Recreation Licenses, Permits, Fees and Registrations Purchased in the Past 12 Months

LICENSE, PERMIT, FEE OR REGISTRATION	PERCENT
MI Fishing (any type)	44.1%
Motor Vehicle Permit/Entrance Fee to Local Park (e.g. city, twp, regional, county)	39.5%
MI State Park Motor Vehicle (annual or daily)	32.8%
MI Hunt (any type)	25.8%
MI Watercraft Registration	23.8%
MI State Park Nightly Camp Fee	21.0%
MI Boat Access Site Motor Vehicle (annual or daily)	11.4%
MI State Forest Campground Nightly Camp Fee	10.3%
MI ORV license	9.2%
MI Snowmobile Registration	8.1%
MI Snowmobile Trail Permit	6.8%
MI Junior Hunt (any type)	2.8%
MI Apprentice Hunt (any type)	0.2%

A total of 72.7 percent of respondents purchased one or more licenses, permits, registrations, camping or entrance fees related to outdoor recreation for their household in the past 12 months (Table 14). Two-thirds purchased state of Michigan license, permit, registration, nightly camping fee or entrance fee. Almost half of all respondents (48.3 percent) purchased a Michigan hunting or fishing license and 48.0 percent purchased one or more Michigan hunting licenses.

Table 14--Purchase of One or More Licenses, Permits, Fees or Registrations in the past 12 Months

LICENSE, PERMIT, FEE OR REGISTRATION GROUPING	PERCENT
Any of the above licenses, permits, fees or registrations	72.7%
Any state of Michigan license, permit, fee or registration	66.8%
Any hunt or fish license	48.3%
Any hunt license	48.0%
Any snowmobile or ORV license or permit	12.9%

Respondent households reported median spending of \$40 per household over the past 12 months on outdoor recreation related fees, licenses, permits and registrations (Table 15). However, 26 percent spent more than \$100 over the past year.

Table 15--Amount Spent on Licenses, Permits, Fees and Registrations During Past 12 Months

AMOUNT	PERCENT
\$ Less than 26	44.7%
\$26-50	14.5%
\$51-75	5.5%
\$76-100	9.3%
\$101-199	9.7%
\$200 and more	16.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Respondent households reported ownership of a wide variety of recreation equipment when asked to respond to a close-ended list of recreational items. More than two-thirds own one or more bicycles (Table 16). Rounding out the top five in ownership, are fishing equipment, firearms, tent or pop-up camper and motorized boats. One in seven owned a second home. Less common recreational equipment included motor homes, sailboats and scuba equipment. Slightly more than three percent owned a horse.

Table 16--Ownership of Selected Recreation Equipment by Respondent Households

TYPE OF RECREATIONAL PROPERTY	PERCENT
Bicycle	69.0%
Fishing Equipment	60.3%
Firearm	40.8%
Tent or Pop-up Camper	39.5%
Motorized Boat	28.6%
Hunting Equipment besides gun or bow	26.4%
Archery Equipment	22.3%
Canoe/Kayak	20.3%
Cross-country Skis	17.9%
Second Home	16.4%
Off-road Vehicle	15.1%
Downhill Skis	12.9%
Travel Trailer/5th Motor home	10.5%
Snowmobile	10.3%
Motor Home	5.2%
Sailboat	3.7%
Horse	3.1%
Scuba Equipment	3.1%

Respondent households were active in visiting public outdoor recreation sites in Michigan. More than three-fourths visited some Michigan outdoor recreation venue in the past 12 months (Table 17). Almost six in 10 visited a Michigan state park, recreation area, state forest, boating access site or wildlife area. Over half reported visiting a local public (city, county, township, village or regional) outdoor recreation venue and almost one-fourth visited federal lands for outdoor recreation. More than a third of households reported more than 10 visits in the past 12 months to Michigan outdoor recreation venues with the median respondent household reporting five visits. The mean is less valuable here as the distribution is not normal due to a small number of households reporting a very high number of visits (e.g. more than 200 times annually). Over one-third of the households reported that they had visited some combination of public outdoor recreation venues more than 10 times in the past twelve months.

Table 17--Respondent Households Who Visited Public Outdoor Recreation Venues During the past 12 Months

Outdoor Recreation Venues	Percent	% Visiting Venue More Than Ten Times	Mean # of Days Visited	Median # of Days Visited
State of MI Park/Recreation/Forest/Game/Wildlife /Boating Access Sites/Harbors	59.5%	21.2%	7.3	0.000
County, city, township, village or Huron Clinton metro parks	53.4%	16.8%	6.4	0.000
National park, lakeshore, wildlife refuge, forests	23.3%	3.8%	2.6	0.000
Any public outdoor recreation venue	75.4%	37.8%	16.3	5.000

In addition to public lands, 55.7 percent of respondent households had access to private lands for outdoor recreation, either owned by the respondent's household or by another with their permission where they could enjoy outdoor recreation without a fee.

### Actions to Improve Outdoor Recreation

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the amount of public outdoor recreation opportunities available in Michigan on a scale of 1 (highly dissatisfied) to 9 (highly satisfied), 69.8 percent responded that they were satisfied (rating 7-9), 27.5 percent were neutral (rating 4-6) and 2.7 percent were dissatisfied (rating of 1-3).

In response to the open-ended question "What one action could the State of Michigan take to improve the amount of outdoor recreation opportunity in Michigan,? not increasing or reducing/eliminating fees was the most common suggestion (Table 18). In terms of capital improvements, acquisition of additional public land for parks, greenways and protecting sensitive areas such as wetlands, more and improved trails (non-motorized and motorized), additional outdoor recreation facilities and more access to outdoor recreation facilities were among the top priorities.

Table 18--Most Important Action the State Should Take to Improve Amount of Outdoor Recreation Opportunity

ACTION	PERCENT
Reduce/eliminate/don't increase fees	16.9%
Acquire more land for parks/greenways/protected areas such as wetlands	13.5%
None/nothing/keep up the good work	7.8%
Acquire more waterfront land	6.8%
Better maintenance on public lands/facilities	6.8%
More/better non-motorized trails	5.7%
Improve surface water quality	4.7%
More/better motorized trails	4.7%
More outdoor recreation activities available	4.4%
More outdoor recreation facilities	3.7%
Increase funding	3.0%
More outdoor recreation venues handicap accessible	3.0%
More advertising/marketing about outdoor recreation venues/opportunities	2.0%
Better/cleaner restrooms	2.0%
Re-open closed parks/campgrounds	2.0%

ACTION	PERCENT
More bike lanes on roads	1.4%
Improve roads	1.0%
More swimming opportunities/facilities	1.0%
More dog parks	1.0%
More hunting land/permits to hunt	0.7%
Protect the Great Lakes	0.7%
Emergency improvements	0.7%
More golf courses	0.3%
Improve ORV trails	0.3%
Other (mentioned by less than 0.3% each)	5.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the *quality* of Michigan public outdoor recreation opportunities, respondents were less satisfied than they were with the *amount* of public outdoor recreation opportunities. Again, using a rating scale of 1 (highly dissatisfied) to 9 (highly satisfied), 42.4 percent were satisfied (rating 7-9), 38.9 percent were neutral (rating 4-6) and 18.7 percent were dissatisfied (rating 1-3). When asked an open-ended question to suggest one action the state of Michigan should take to improve the quality of public outdoor recreation opportunities, improved maintenance was the most common response (Table 19). More than 5 percent of the respondents suggested operational improvements such as improved security/enforcement, fees stable or declining and cleaner restrooms. Major capital improvement suggestions included better restrooms and more parks. Cleaner surface waters may fall into both an operational and a capital improvement category as it requires changes in management practices across the landscape to reduce non-point source pollution as well as targeted point source pollution reduction and control.

Table 19--Recommended Actions to Improve the Quality of Public Outdoor Recreation Opportunities

ACTION	PERCENT
Better maintenance	13.1%
None/nothing/keep up the good work	12.2%
Other	7.2%
More security/better law enforcement	6.8%
Reduce/eliminate fees/keep same	6.8%
More parks	6.3%
Better/cleaner restrooms	5.9%
Cleaner water	5.9%
More funding	4.5%
Better access/proximity	4.1%
More information/advertising/marketing	4.1%
More/better non-motorized trails	3.6%
More/better motorized trails	3.2%
More camping sites	3.2%
More staff	2.7%
More activities	2.7%
Get more input from public	1.8%
Better facilities	1.4%
Lower gas prices	1.4%
No smoking	1.4%
Better roads	0.9%

Dog Parks	0.5%
More outdoor pools	0.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

When asked the open-ended question “What one action could the state of Michigan take to increase your household’s participation in Michigan outdoor recreation,?” the most common response was to reduce or eliminate fees (Table 20). However, the second most common response was nothing, often with a complement of “keep up the good work.” Other suggestions by more than five percent of the respondents included additional information about opportunities, acquiring more public land for outdoor recreation activities (with camping, parks and land open to public hunting most commonly mentioned), providing better and more non-motorized trails, more funding for outdoor recreation venues to improve quality and lower fees and provide a wider range of activities.

Table 20--Most Important Action to Increase Respondent’s Household Outdoor Recreation Participation

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>PERCENT</b>
Reduce/eliminate fees	24.3%
None/nothing/keep up the good work	16.4%
More information/marketing/advertising	8.0%
More land (camping, parks, hunting)	7.1%
Better/more non-motorized trails	5.8%
More funding	5.8%
More activities	5.3%
Other	4.9%
Better access	4.4%
Better facilities	3.5%
Lower gas prices	3.1%
Preserve/conserve nature	1.8%
Cleaner water	1.8%
Better/more motorized trails	1.8%
More beaches	1.3%
Cabins/lodges at campgrounds	1.3%
Education/Information	0.9%
Areas for children	0.4%
Boat rentals	0.4%
Dog Parks	0.4%
More golf courses	0.4%
Crossbow legalization during archery season	0.4%
Better maintenance	0.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Respondents were very supportive of all the major initiatives in the 2003-07 SCORP (Table 21). The strongest support was for the conservation, protection and restoration of natural resources in public outdoor recreation venues. For conservation 93 percent were supportive, 7 percent neutral and less than 1 percent opposed. However, for each of the seven initiatives at least 74 percent of the respondents were supportive and, at the most, 4 percent were in opposition.

Table 21--Rated support of the initiatives from the 2003-2007 SCORP

INITIATIVE	STRONGLY SUPPORT %	MODERATELY SUPPORT %	NEUTRAL %	MODERATELY OPPOSE %	STRONGLY OPPOSE %
Conserve, protect and restore MI natural resources in public outdoor recreation venues	72.6%	20.1%	6.8%	0.5%	-
Expand and develop the system of land and water based trails in MI	50.1	28.6	17.4	2.7	1.2%
Provide appropriate access to enable all citizens to enjoy MI outdoor recreation, including those who are disabled	60.1	26.5	11.7	1.5	0.2
Improve community based outdoor recreation in MI	47.1	28.7	22.7	0.7	0.8
Improve the MI state forest recreation system	42.6	31.2	24.3	1.5	0.5
Improve the MI state park system	52.6	27.6	19.3	0.5	-
Improve cooperation among local, state and federal government and the private sector in the provision of outdoor recreation and sharing of comparable information	60.6	25.7	12.9	0.5	0.2

When asked the open-ended question, “What other broad initiative/direction would you propose to improve Michigan outdoor recreation over the next five years,?” 37 percent of the respondents provided suggestions. The most common responses were to improve maintenance of existing venues, reduce or eliminate user fees and keep things as they are (Table 22). Many of the additional initiatives proposed were very similar to the existing seven initiatives from the 2003-2007 SCORP or could easily fit under them. For example, preservation/conservation/restoration is the most highly supported 2003-07 initiative. More non-motorized and motorized trails is already covered under the existing initiatives. Many other suggestions tend to focus on operational efforts (e.g. better maintenance, information/marketing/advertising, security/law enforcement, etc.). In summary, there does not appear to be a strong new direction in terms of capital improvements from these suggestions. Rather there appears to be additional confirmation that the goals/initiatives of the last SCORP were on target. Further, many of the needs for public outdoor recreation focus on operational issues and the ongoing funding needed to support operational activities. This is at odds with a desire to reduce fees as general fund support for outdoor recreation and conservation at the state level has declined substantially over the past decade.

Table 22--Initiative/Direction to Improve MI Outdoor Recreation Over the Next Five Years

INITIATIVE/DIRECTION	PERCENT
Better maintenance	10.9%
Reduce/eliminate fees	10.3%
Keep it as it is/nothing/not sure	10.3%
More activities/programs	8.05
Preservation/conservation/restoration	7.4%
Acquire more land	6.9%
Clean water/control invasive species	6.3%
Information/marketing/advertising	5.7%
More/better non-motorized trails	5.1%
Cooperation of agencies/stake holders	5.1%
More funding	4.0%
Better access	2.9%

INITIATIVE/DIRECTION	PERCENT
Better security/more law enforcement	2.3%
More/better motorized trails	1.7%
Better roads	1.1%
More recycling	1.1%
More playgrounds	0.6%
Other (a)	10.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(a) Many of the other responses tended to focus on a specific improvement at a specific place (e.g. dredge this boat launch, improve this campground, etc.)

### Respondent Demographics

The distribution of the county of residence of respondents mirrors Michigan's population distribution and the sample drawn from registered voters (Table 23). However, some counties with lower levels of population had very few or no respondents.

Table 23--Respondent's County of Residence

COUNTY	PERCENT	COUNTY	PERCENT	COUNTY	PERCENT	COUNTY	PERCENT
Alcona	-	Dickinson	0.7%	Lake	0.2%	Oceana	0.7%
Alger	-	Eaton	1.1%	Lapeer	0.7%	Ogemaw	0.2%
Allegan	0.9%	Emmet	0.2%	Leelanau	0.2%	Ontonagon	0.2%
Alpena	0.7%	Genesee	4.0%	Lenawee	1.1%	Osceola	0.2%
Antrim	0.7%	Gladwin	0.2%	Livingston	2.7%	Oscoda	0.2%
Arenac	-	Gogebic	-	Luce	-	Otsego	-
Baraga	-	Grand Traverse	1.3%	Mackinac	0.2%	Ottawa	3.6%
Barry	1.1%	Gratiot	1.1%	Macomb	8.7%	Presque Isle	0.2%
Bay	0.9%	Hillsdale	0.4%	Manistee	0.4%	Roscommon	0.2%
Benzie	-	Houghton	0.2%	Marquette	0.7%	Saginaw	2.7%
Berrien	0.9%	Huron	0.4%	Mason	0.4%	Sanilac	0.4%
Branch	-	Ingham	1.3%	Mecosta	0.4%	Schoolcraft	-
Calhoun	1.3%	Ionia	1.1%	Menominee	0.7%	Shiawassee	1.1%
Cass	0.2%	Iosco	0.7%	Midland	1.1%	St. Clair	2.0%
Charlevoix	0.4%	Iron	-	Missaukee	-	St. Joseph	0.7%
Cheboygan	0.4%	Isabella	1.9%	Monroe	0.9%	Tuscola	-
Chippewa	0.2%	Jackson	0.7%	Montcalm	1.3%	Van Buren	0.7%
Clare	0.4%	Kalamazoo	2.9%	Montmorency	-	Washtenaw	3.4%
Clinton	1.1%	Kalkaska	0.2%	Muskegon	2.7%	Wayne	12.6%
Crawford	0.2%	Kent	6.3%	Newaygo	1.3%	Wexford	-
Delta	0.2%	Keweenaw	-	Oakland	12.8%	Total	100.0%

The mean respondent has lived in the community where they currently are located for an average of 25 years. However, almost 30 percent have been in their current community for a decade or less (Table 24).

Table 24--Duration of Respondent Residence in Their Current Community

YEARS	PERCENT
0-10	29.8%
11-20	24.0%
21-30	14.3%
31-40	10.8%
41-60	16.8%
61-80	4.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The average respondent to the survey was 51.7 years and the median age was 51, suggesting a normally distributed population of respondents (Table 25). Although the 2000 Census includes those under the voting age, the proportions of respondents by age category indicates that respondents are generally similar to Michigan's voting-age structure, although older voters are slightly over represented by respondents and younger voters are slightly underrepresented.

Table 25--Age of Respondents

AGE	RESPONDENT PERCENT	2000 CENSUS PERCENT
0-14	0.0%	21.8%
15-19	0.7%	7.2%
20-24	3.1%	6.5%
25-29	6.3%	6.6%
30-34	7.1%	7.1%
35-39	8.9%	7.9%
40-44	8.9%	8.2%
45-49	10.3%	7.4%
50-54	12.1%	6.4%
55-59	10.9%	4.9%
60-64	8.7%	3.8%
65-69	5.8%	3.3%
70-74	6.7%	3.2%
75-79	5.1%	2.6%
80-84	4.2%	1.7%
85 +	1.1%	1.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The 2000 Census for Michigan indicates that 48.2 percent of Michigan residents over 18 are male and 51.8 percent are female. Respondents to the survey were very similar to those proportions, with 50.2 percent male and 49.8 percent female. The 2000 Census also notes that 3.3 percent of Michigan's population is Hispanic, Latino or of Spanish origin. A total of 2.3 percent of survey respondents reported that they were Hispanic, Latino or of Spanish origin. The race of respondents corresponded closely to the racial make up of Michigan based on the 2000 Census (Table 26). However, Whites and Native Americans responded in slightly higher proportion in comparison to their population, while Blacks and Asians responded in a somewhat lower proportion compared to their population levels.

Table 26--Race of Respondents Compared to Michigan's Population from the 2000 Census

RACE	RESPONDENT PERCENT	2000 CENSUS PERCENT (a)
White	90.6%	81.8%
Black/African American	5.6%	14.8%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2.7%	1.4%
Asian	1.1%	2.1%
Other	1.6%	2.0%

(a) Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=04000US26&-qr\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U\\_QTP5&-ds\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=04000US26&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_QTP5&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U).

The highest level of educational achievement by respondents was higher than reported for the Michigan population 25 and older by the 2000 Census (Table 27). In particular, there was a lower percentage of respondents who had not completed high school than the general population and a higher percentage of respondents who had completed a bachelor's degree or higher.

Table 27--Highest level of school respondent has completed

LEVEL/DEGREE	RESPONDENT PERCENT	2000 CENSUS PERCENT
Less than high school graduate	3.6 %	16.6 %
High school/GED	23.5%	31.3%
Some college, not yet graduated	21.9%	23.3%
Associate's college degree	12.2%	7.0%
Bachelor's college degree	23.3%	13.7%
Master's, PhD or Professional Degree (MD, DDS, JD, DVM)	15.6%	8.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(a) Source: US Bureau of the Census [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=04000US26&-qr\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF3\\_U\\_QTP20&-ds\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF3\\_U&-redoLog=false](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=04000US26&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_QTP20&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&-redoLog=false).

Compared to the 2000 Census for Michigan, respondents were more likely to live in two-person households than Michigan's population in general and less likely to live in single person households (Table 28). Household sizes of three and higher were similar for respondents and Michigan's overall population. The mean Michigan household size from the 2000 Census was 2.6 persons and for the respondents it was 2.7 persons.

Table 28--Number of Individuals Living in Respondent and All Michigan Households

NUMBER	RESPONDENT PERCENT	2000 CENSUS PERCENT
1	10.5%	26.3%
2	45.4%	33.0%
3	19.05	16.1%
4	16.3%	14.3%
5	5.4%	6.6%
6 or more	3.4%	3.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Slightly more than 30 percent of respondents lived in households where there were children under 18 years of age; in comparison the 2000 Census for Michigan reported 35 percent lived in households with one or more children under 18. A total of 19.1 percent of respondents lived in a household where one or more members was disabled in a way that significantly impacted their ability to work or recreate. The 2000 Census for Michigan notes that 18.7 percent of the Michigan population over age 5 is considered disabled.

### **Summary**

In summary, the registered voter survey appears reasonably representative of Michigan's population as reflected in the 2000 Census. As a group, the respondents tend to place strong importance on outdoor recreation and are active in many forms of outdoor recreation. The most common outdoor recreation activities were walking outdoors, followed by relaxing outdoors; driving for pleasure; swimming in a lake, river or pond and sightseeing. When asked how important activities were, the activity most important were not all the same. The top five were walking outdoors, relaxing outdoors, fishing, hunting and camping. Hunting was the one activity that more than half the participants rated as one of their three most important outdoor recreation pursuits.

Respondents were strongly supportive of the initiatives/directions in the 2003-2007 SCORP. This support is the strongest for conservation of natural resources. The respondents provide considerable guidance in the types of capital and operational improvements they want in terms of public recreation opportunities. In particular, they want continued public acquisition of lands for outdoor recreation with an emphasis on conservation, water access and trails. They also want to see better maintenance at public facilities and stable or reduced fees. To improve the quality of outdoor recreation, respondents were most likely to recommend improving maintenance, security, trail systems and environmental protection.

