

---

**Attachments:** draft narrative 430rpt01.doc

**From:** Eychaner, Jim [mailto:jime@rco.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 23, 2007 12:06 PM  
**To:** Scott Kreiter; Lee Webster; Susan\_Rosebrough@nps.gov  
**Subject:** RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis

Scott, I am OK with the changes. Regarding the added text on estimating future recreation, I have new statewide participation data that is of interest to a regional level. I have attached a draft of the narrative report for your use. Note that I am working with my contractor to revise the narrative; that means that the introduction and other text will change, but the data itself will not. Let me know if you have questions.

Jim

**Washington State  
Interagency Committee  
for Outdoor Recreation**

**2006 Outdoor  
Recreation  
Assessment  
Survey**

**Draft  
Report**

July 11, 2006

# **2006 Outdoor Recreation Assessment Survey**

## **Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation**

### **Draft Report**

*Presented by:*

Clearwater Research, Inc.  
1845 South Federal Way  
Boise, ID 83705

*Contact:*

Michael Willmorth  
(208) 376-3376 ext. 422  
(800) 727-5016 ext. 422  
Fax: (208) 376-2008

*E-mail:* [mwillmorth@clearwater-research.com](mailto:mwillmorth@clearwater-research.com)

*Date:*

July 11, 2006



# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Sampling .....	4
Instrumentation .....	9
Data Collection.....	9
Data Preparation and Analysis .....	14
<b>Survey Results .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Terminology .....	15
Tables .....	16
Sightseeing .....	18
Nature Activity .....	19
Fishing .....	22
Picnicking.....	24
Water Activity .....	25
Snow/Ice Activity.....	30
Air Activity .....	33
Walking and Hiking .....	34
Bicycle Riding .....	38
Equestrian Activity .....	39
Off-Road Vehicle Riding .....	41
Camping.....	43
Hunting and Shooting .....	47
Exercise and Sports.....	48
Indoor Community Facility Activities .....	57
2006 Activity Rankings .....	59
Comparison of 2002 and 2006 Survey Results .....	61
<b>Appendix A: Questionnaire.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Appendix B: Advance Letter .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Appendix C: Open-ended Responses.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Appendix D: Crosstabulations.....</b>	<b>64</b>

# Tables

Table 1: Regions Used for Sample Stratification .....	6
Table 2: Design Effect of Disproportionate Stratification by Region .....	7
Table 3: Interviews Completed for Region by Month .....	8
Table 4: Final Dispositions and Response Rates .....	13
Table 5: 2006 Annual Estimates for Sightseeing .....	18
Table 6: Significant Demographic Differences for Sightseeing .....	18
Table 7: Preference for Sightseeing .....	19
Table 8: 2006 Annual Estimates for Nature Activity .....	19
Table 9: Significant Demographic Differences for Nature Activity .....	20
Table 10: Preference for Nature Activity .....	21
Table 11: 2006 Annual Estimates for Fishing .....	22
Table 12: Significant Demographic Differences for Fishing .....	22
Table 13: Preference for Fishing .....	23
Table 14: 2006 Annual Estimates for Picnicking .....	24
Table 15: Significant Demographic Differences for Picnicking .....	24
Table 16: Preference for Picnicking .....	25
Table 17: 2006 Annual Estimates for Water Activity .....	25
Table 18: Significant Demographic Differences for Water Activity .....	27
Table 19: Preference for Water Activity .....	29
Table 20: 2006 Annual Estimates for Snow/Ice Activity .....	30
Table 21: Significant Demographic Differences for Snow/Ice Activity .....	31
Table 22: Preference for Snow/Ice Activity .....	32
Table 23: 2006 Annual Estimates for Air Activity .....	33
Table 24: Significant Demographic Differences for Air Activity .....	33
Table 25: Preference for Air Activity .....	34
Table 26: 2006 Annual Estimates for Walking and Hiking .....	35
Table 27: Significant Demographic Differences for Walking and Hiking .....	36
Table 28: Preference for Walking and Hiking .....	37
Table 29: 2006 Annual Estimates for Bicycle Riding .....	38
Table 30: Significant Demographic Differences for Bicycle Riding .....	38
Table 31: Preference for Bicycle Riding .....	39
Table 32: 2006 Annual Estimates for Equestrian Activity .....	40
Table 33: Significant Demographic Differences for Equestrian Activity .....	40
Table 34: Preference for Equestrian Activity .....	40
Table 35: 2006 Annual Estimates for Off-Road Vehicle Riding .....	41
Table 36: Significant Demographic Differences for Off-Road Vehicle Riding .....	42
Table 37: Preference for Off-Road Vehicle Riding .....	43
Table 38: 2006 Annual Estimates for Camping .....	44
Table 39: Significant Demographic Differences for Camping .....	45
Table 40: Preference for Camping .....	46
Table 41: 2006 Annual Estimates for Hunting/Shooting .....	47
Table 42: Significant Demographic Differences for Camping .....	47
Table 43: Preference for Hunting/Shooting .....	48
Table 44: 2006 Annual Estimates for Exercise and Sports .....	49
Table 45: Significant Demographic Differences for Exercise/Sports .....	51
Table 46: Preference for Exercise/Sports .....	55
Table 47: 2006 Annual Estimates for Indoor Community Facility Activities .....	57
Table 48: Significant Demographic Differences for Indoor Community Facility Activities .....	57
Table 49: Preference for Indoor Community Facility Activities .....	58
Table 50: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Peak Month Prevalence .....	59
Table 51: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Average Month Prevalence .....	59
Table 52: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Activity Frequency .....	60
Table 53: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Preference .....	60
Table 54: Ranking of Participation in Main Activity Categories by Survey Year .....	62

## Executive Summary

In the fall of 2005, the Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) contracted with Clearwater Research, Inc., (Clearwater) to perform questionnaire consultation, data collection, data preparation, data analysis, and reporting activities as part of a population-based research study on outdoor recreation in Washington. The Washington Outdoor Recreation Survey was designed to accurately measure the outdoor recreational activity among the Washington residents. Clearwater worked with the IAC to adapt the self-administered diary developed for the previous survey conducted in 1999–2000 for administration by computer-assisted interviewing (CATI) in 2006. The instrument was crafted to enable statistical analyses that would fulfill the IAC's goals for the survey project. The survey was programmed for administration with Clearwater's CATI system and approved by the IAC. Clearwater determined the sample size, sampling frame, and conducted data collection throughout 2006 for the survey. Clearwater cleaned the data by editing and verifying survey responses, correcting data entry errors, evaluating and correcting for out-of-range values, and other logic testing. The cleaned data were weighted to account for the complex sample design and to minimize the risk of nonresponse bias.

Clearwater provided prevalence estimates for outdoor recreational activity using software designed for estimation and statistical testing using weighted data from complex samples. The analyses addressed the research goals, which focused on producing survey results comparable to those published from the previous study in 2002. These included estimates for the prevalence and frequency of occurrence of recreational activities in 14 major areas, some divided into types or settings 14 major areas, based on data collected throughout the year. The results needed to be presentable for the entire state and for major demographic, regional, and seasonal groupings. In addition, the IAC wanted to collect data on recreation preferences (as distinct from participation). Finally, the 2006 survey results should be compared to the results of the previous survey to identify changes in outdoor recreation participation since 2002.

In 2006, the recreational activities in which the largest percentages of Washington residents participated included picnicking or cooking outdoors (78.4%), walking without a pet (67.2%), swimming or wading at a beach (58.4%), sightseeing (57.7%), and flower or vegetable gardening (52.0%). The most frequently mentioned activities that Washingtonians wanted to do more of in the 12 months following the survey interview included sightseeing (46.9%), picnicking or cooking outdoors (39.4%), hiking (33.5%), tent camping with a car or motorcycle (33.4%), and swimming or wading at a beach (28.4%). The most frequently occurring recreational activities in 2006 included walking without a pet (3.5 million times), observing or photographing wildlife or nature (3.1 million times), walking with a pet (2.7 million times), jogging or running (2.3 million times), and playground recreation (2.2 million times).

## Methodology

In 2005, the Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) contracted with Clearwater Research, Inc., (Clearwater) to conduct a survey to support its Outdoor Recreation Assessment (ORA) program. The survey would gather original, objective, statistically defensible data regarding participation in outdoor recreational activities in Washington. The results from the 2006 survey project needed to be comparable to those collected for the report titled *An Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007*, issued by the IAC in 2002.

The IAC had established several criteria for the ORA survey results. The collection method had to be based on a statistically valid sample that would support defensible conclusions for the state as a whole and for each of ten regions. The statewide survey results had to have a precision of plus or minus 5% at the 95% confidence level. Finally, the method had to minimize bias in the survey results.

To meet those criteria, Clearwater proposed a telephone survey method based on a stratified random-digit-dialing (RDD) sample design. The design would yield a minimum of 3,000 interviews with randomly selected residents of Washington. Compared with other sample frames, the RDD approach has the benefit of high coverage of the target population. Compared with other data collection modes, computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) has the benefits of relatively quick sample processing, repeated and timely contacts to complete an interview, and a high degree of accuracy and completeness in recording respondents' answers. Finally, stratification of the sample would achieve equitable precision in the survey estimates for each tourism region with the least cost.

Clearwater also proposed changing the sampling method from a longitudinal to a repeated cross-sectional design. The sample would be stratified proportionately by month and disproportionately by tourism region. That approach would collect the same number of interviews in each of the ten Washington tourism regions each month over a 12-month field period. The design would provide comparable precision (confidence intervals) for the survey results in each tourism region and in each season.

Clearwater designed a CATI questionnaire that collected data comparable to the data reported in 2002, which permitted analysis of changes in outdoor recreation participation. This included statistically defensible results for activities in the 14 major categories. The instrumentation permitted analysis of current participation by season of the year; frequency or activity occasion; setting or facility type used; and demographic characteristics, including age, gender, ethnicity, and income. Finally, the design measured recreation preferences, as distinct from actual participation.

## Sampling

For the 2006 Washington Outdoor Recreation Survey, a random-digit-dialing (RDD) method was used to sample a minimum of 300 Washington residents from each of ten regions. The RDD sample frame consisted of all telephone numbers in one-plus working banks with exchanges serving Washington households. A bank is a series of 100

telephone numbers from ending with 01 through 99 that start with the same area code, exchange, and first two digits of the line number. A one-plus bank contains a telephone number listed in a residential directory and is therefore likely to include telephone numbers that ring at residential households.

The sample was stratified by region—ten county groupings corresponding to the ten tourism regions of Washington State Tourism (Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development). Independent samples were drawn for each region so that the total number of completed interviews in each could be controlled. The stratification was disproportionate, such that roughly equal numbers of interviews (a minimum of 300) would be completed in each region. Clearwater estimated the necessary number of RDD records to generate for each region in order to achieve the required number of completed interviews. The generated sample records were divided into random subsamples of 30 records for processing. Replication provides a means of ensuring that the minimum number of records is called to achieve the desired number of completed interviews.

Before fielding, the sampled telephone numbers were processed by Marketing Systems Group (MSG) using their GENESYS-CSS (Comprehensive Sample Screening) service. The process identifies a large percentage of business, nonworking, and cell phone numbers that are drawn in RDD samples. Records identified as nonresidential lines in the CSS process were not called. Rather, they were sequestered and added to the calculation of final dispositions and response rates. All remaining RDD telephone numbers were called. In addition to running the CSS process, MSG was contracted to append mailing address information to those RDD records with telephone numbers of listed households. That information was used to mail advance letters.

The 2006 survey changed the sampling from a longitudinal to a repeated cross-sectional design. The 1999–2000 survey recruited a sample of households using random-digit-dialing (RDD) and sent out monthly diaries to be completed by each person in the household who agreed to be part of the study. This method resulted in significant attrition over the course of the 12-month field period. The diminishing sample sizes raised concerns about data quality issues such as variance inflation and increased risk of nonresponse bias. In addition, some of the data collection occurred at intervals greater than one month since the activity occurred, which led to concerns about decreasing accuracy of memory about participation in activities.

To address some of these data quality concerns for the 2006 survey, the IAC agreed to Clearwater's proposal to change from a longitudinal sample with a self-administered diary to a repeated cross-sectional sample design administered by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). Like the 1999–2000 survey, participants would be recruited by telephone using an RDD method. However, to minimize the effect of within household clustering, which can increase variance in the survey estimates, the interviewer would randomly select only one person in the household for the survey. If the sampled individual was available, the interview could be conducted during the recruitment call. Otherwise, the interviewer scheduled a convenient time to call back and conduct the interview.



Using CATI administration of independent monthly RDD samples for the 2006 survey, we expected to improve the response rate over the 1999–2000 survey overall and to spread the potential effects of nonresponse bias more evenly throughout the field period. CATI controls the number and timing of the call attempts made to each sampled telephone number. This provides each sampled household in the sample with multiple opportunities for being contacted, hearing about the research project, agreeing to participate, and providing data during each sample's one-month field period. The CATI method provided a lower burden on the household for effective participation in the study than the self-administered method used previously.

The sample plan involved twelve monthly RDD samples, one for each month in 2006. Each sample was stratified by region. The IAC approved use of the regional definitions used by Washington State Tourism, Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, for the survey. There are ten regions, each defined as a group of counties. The ten regions are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Regions Used for Sample Stratification**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Counties</b>	
Columbia River Plateau	Adams Douglas	Grant Lincoln
North Cascades	Chelan Kittitas Okanogan	Skagit Snohomish Whatcom
Olympic & Kitsap Peninsulas	Clallam Jefferson	Kitsap Mason
Rocky Mountain Gateway	Ferry Pend Oreille	Spokane Stevens
Seattle – King	King	
The Coast	Grays Harbor Pacific	Wahkiakum
The Islands	Island	San Juan
The Palouse	Asotin Columbia	Garfield Whitman
Volcano Country	Clark Cowlitz Klickitat Lewis	Pierce Skamania Thurston
Wine Country	Benton Franklin	Walla Walla Yakima

The IAC was interested in providing similar confidence interval sizes for each region. Because of the wide variation in the size of the regional populations, and because the size of confidence intervals is related to the size of the sample and to the size of the population, this required disproportionate stratification of the sample by region. Rather than applying a single sampling fraction to the entire state (proportionate stratification), which would have resulted in a wide variation in the regional sample sizes (and in the confidence intervals for the survey results from region to region), we calculated a sampling fraction for each region that would result in equal sample sizes across regions (disproportionate stratification).

Although disproportionate stratification would achieve equal size confidence intervals for each region, it would result in increased variance for statewide results due to the increased variation in the probabilities of selection. The amount of increased variance is reflected in the “design effect” value. The calculation of the design effect for the disproportionate stratification design we proposed to the IAC is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Design Effect of Disproportionate Stratification by Region**

Region	Population Estimate *	Population %	Sample Size	Sample %	Design Effect **	Sampling Error % ***
The Coast	74,593	1.6	300	10	0.0025	6.0
Columbia River Plateau	100,864	2.1	300	10	0.0046	6.0
The Islands	73,707	1.6	300	10	0.0024	6.0
North Cascades	815,472	17.3	300	10	0.2988	6.0
Olympic & Kitsap Peninsulas	300,292	6.4	300	10	0.0405	6.0
The Palouse	54,681	1.2	300	10	0.0013	6.0
Rocky Mountain Gateway	378,308	8.0	300	10	0.0643	6.0
Seattle – King County	1,395,333	29.6	300	10	0.8747	6.0
Volcano Country	1,165,793	24.7	300	10	0.6106	6.0
Wine Country	358,725	7.6	300	10	0.0578	6.0
Statewide	4,717,768	100.0	3,000	100	1.9576	2.5

\* July 1, 2004, estimate for resident total population age 18 years and over (U.S. Census Bureau)

\*\* Design effect due to variable sampling fractions across regions

\*\*\* 95% confidence half-interval for “worst case” binomial proportions (i.e., 50%-50% splits)

The overall sample size we proposed was 3,000, equally divided into the ten regions. The design effect due to the disproportionate stratification was about 2.0. For an overall sample size of 3,000 (300 per region) over the course of the one-year field period, the effective sample size would be about 1,500, giving a 95% confidence interval of  $\pm 2.5\%$  for the “worst case” binomial proportion of 50%. (Other factors relating to differences in the probability of selection, including number of household members and number of landline telephone numbers serving the household, also contribute to the design effect, but to a lesser extent.) Based on this analysis, the IAC deemed the overall sample size of 3,000 to be acceptable for the 2006 survey.

The RDD sample frame for each region consisted of the entire set of telephone exchanges (the area code and the first three digits of the seven-digit telephone number) serving the counties included in the region. For exchanges with telephone numbers that rang in more than one region, the exchange was assigned to the region with the plurality of listed households served by the exchange. We further refined the regional frames by removing banks (series of 100 consecutive telephone numbers from XXX-XXX-XX00 through XXX-XXX-XX99) that included no listed households. This technique improves the efficiency of the samples without introducing appreciable coverage bias.

Each month, we randomly generated enough sample records from each region’s frame to achieve the target number of completed interviews for the region during that month. We aimed to complete an average of 250 interviews (25 per region) per month, so that over the course of the year at least 300 interviews would be collected from each region. Because we processed the telephone number samples using calling rules for probability rather than quota samples, it was not possible to achieve exactly 25 interviews per region per month. During the first few months of 2006, we observed the productivity of each region’s sample frame and adjusted the number of telephone numbers sampled

for subsequent months. Table 3 shows the number of completed interviews in each region during each month of fielding.

**Table 3: Interviews Completed for Region by Month**

Region	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
The Coast	24	30	29	37	9	19	31	22	22	28	14	57	322
Columbia River Plateau	31	20	24	20	30	20	18	17	35	26	22	52	315
The Islands	24	28	38	27	11	23	33	21	18	27	29	41	320
North Cascades	26	25	25	27	25	16	44	19	31	32	24	13	307
Olympic & Kitsap Peninsulas	22	41	31	27	22	34	9	21	15	24	39	18	303
The Palouse	28	29	26	32	16	27	21	19	26	23	26	36	309
Rocky Mountain Gateway	26	31	24	32	16	21	30	23	25	32	23	28	311
Seattle - King	14	47	23	27	12	25	36	48	8	24	21	29	314
Volcano Country	22	38	28	37	8	17	27	24	18	23	34	51	327
Wine Country	29	24	24	27	26	23	16	28	23	23	31	33	307
Total	246	313	272	293	175	225	265	242	221	262	263	358	3135

There was significant variation in the number of interviews completed by region and by month. Left alone, this variation could have introduced bias into the overall 2006 survey results. Therefore, we included in the case weighting a factor that gave each month equal weight in the overall survey results. The variations in the size of the regional samples were accounted for in the weighting factor that scaled the sample weights up to the total population size of Washington. These adjustments are discussed below in the section on data preparation and analysis.

Following the calling rules, our interviewers contacted the households in the RDD sample. Once a household had been contacted, the questionnaire programming selected an individual in the household to take the survey. The questionnaire programming collected information about the number of household members in each of the following age groups: 18 years of age or older, at least 12 years of age but younger than 18, and less than 12 years of age. From that inventory of household members, the programming randomly picked one person for the survey. If the person was an adult, the interviewer attempted to complete the interview with that person. If someone 12 to 17 years old was sampled, the interviewer sought permission from a parent or guardian to conduct the interview with the young adult. If permission was not granted, the interviewer sought to collect the information about the young adult by proxy. For children under 12 years of age, the interviewer asked to speak with an adult familiar with the child's recreational activity and seek to have that adult take the survey as a proxy for the child. In no case was a second person sampled from a household if the

first person refused or was otherwise unavailable to participate during that month's field period.

The method used for the sampling 2006 Washington Outdoor Recreation Survey is referred to as a list-assisted, disproportionately stratified, random-digit-dialing design. "List-assisted" refers to the process of dropping telephone number banks that did not include a listed household. "Disproportionately stratified" refers to the region-by-region adjustment of the sampling fraction to produce equal numbers of completed interviews in each region. "Random-digit-dialing" refers to the technique of randomly selecting telephone numbers to include both listed and unlisted households in a probability sample of the general population.

### ***Instrumentation***

IAC provided Clearwater with self-administered survey instrument used for 1999–2000 survey. Clearwater worked with IAC to adapt the instrument to a telephone interview data collection mode. This included the addition of introduction, screening, and respondent selection sections. Demographic items were crafted that would enable statistical analysis of the research questions. Otherwise, great care was taken to avoid changes to question wordings and response categories that might affect the comparability of data collected in 2006 with those from the previous survey. We critically reviewed all items on the questionnaire to ensure they did not violate the basic rules of wording and scaling (no double-barreled questions, exhaustive and mutually exclusive response categories, etc.). The printable version of the questionnaire used to create the programming for the CATI system is provided in Appendix A.

We added one element that was not included on the 1999–2000 survey instrument. On the previous survey's questionnaire, no provision had been made for respondents to use an "other type or setting" category for items that were broken out into types or settings. This risked the failure to count recreational activities in types or settings that respondents did not see on the survey instrument. We added an "other" category to allow interviewers to tally the number of times that a respondent engaged in an activity when they would not choose one of the types or settings provided for the category. This category was not read to respondents and was only used by interviewers when the respondent insisted that the activity did not fit one of the types or settings read to them.

Advance letters were used to notify sampled household of their inclusion in the sample and to encourage participation. The letter was printed using IAC stationery and sent to listed households several days in advance of the first scheduled data collection shift for each monthly sample. Appendix B gives the text used for the advance letter.

### ***Data Collection***

Clearwater collected the data for the 2006 Washington Outdoor Recreation Survey using its in-house 110-station CATI system. Data collection ran from January 18, 2006, through January 7, 2007. Interviewers were thoroughly briefed prior to data collection, and they rehearsed the questionnaire before conducting actual interviews. Monitoring staff listened to a sampling of interviews throughout the fielding period to maintain data quality. Clearwater used computer-aided dialing, but not predictive dialing. Predictive dialing has the potential to annoy respondents by introducing a delay in connections

after respondents answer the telephone. This delay can lead to higher hang-up and refusal rates and a correspondingly lower response rate for the survey.

Calling protocols followed good practices for general population surveys sampled with RDD. We resolved each sample record by attempting the number 12 times during the calling period or until a final disposition code (such as “completed interview” or “disconnected/non-working number”) was assigned. The calling protocols required that the 12 attempts occur on no fewer than five calling occasions—each consisting of no more than three attempts at least one hour apart. Further, the 12 attempts should involve at least three weekday calls, three weeknight calls, and three weekend calls. The calling periods for the 2006 survey were 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. weekdays, 5:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. weeknights, 10 A.M. to 7:30 P.M. Saturdays, and 1 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. Sundays (Pacific Time).

The calling protocol required that respondents or potential respondents who initially refused to participate or who terminated the interview after beginning it be contacted again in an attempt to convert them to a participating respondent. The initial refusal could occur either at the household level (before a respondent had been selected) or at the respondent level (after a respondent had been selected and the selected respondent had refused). Adamant initial refusals were not included in the conversion effort.

During fielding, the survey data were entered and automatically consolidated by the CATI software as interviewers completed each questionnaire with a respondent. Interviewers and supervisors used project feedback and data change forms to document and communicate data collection errors or problems to the production manager in the data collection department. The production manager effected data changes using the CATI data editor. If a data change affected a skip pattern later in the questionnaire, the respondent was called back to collect any missing data.

The productivity of the sample was sufficient to achieve the minimum 3,000 completed interviews using 34,621 RDD telephone numbers. Clearwater completed 3,136 interviews for the 2006 survey. One of these cases was dropped in the final data set because of missing data on variables required for weighting. The weighted data set contains 3,135 cases.

Once the monthly sample records (random telephone numbers) had been generated, we used a service that marked identifiable business, nonworking, and cell phone numbers in the sampled telephone numbers prior to data collection. This technique improves the efficiency of RDD samples by identifying between 40% and 50% of the records as not reaching a household. Records identified as business, nonworking, or cell phones are not assigned to interviewers for calling. Instead, they were sequestered and assigned appropriate final disposition codes at the end of each monthly field period.

During the field period, replicates of the sample records not identified as nonresidential were loaded into the CATI system and distributed to interviewers for calling according to the probability sample protocol. Only enough replicates were loaded over the course of the field period to achieve the desired number of interviews. Interviewers resolved each

sample record loaded into CATI. A sample record was resolved by calling it until a final disposition code had been assigned or until the maximum number of call attempts (12) had been made during the period. These call attempts were made at various times during the three major calling periods—weekday, weekday evening, and weekend—over the course of the month-long field period in an effort to contact a person in every household reached by the RDD sample and to identify as many records as possible that definitely did not reach a household.

Occasionally interviewers make or identify an error in the data collected in the course of an interview. If the error could not be corrected during the interview, the interviewer recorded the problem on a special data change form and submitted it to a supervisor. The supervisor reviewed the problem, made changes to the collected data in the CATI system as appropriate, and initialed the form with a note about how the problem was resolved. Data changes occasionally create a situation where questions that should have been asked were skipped during the interview. When that occurred, the supervisor scheduled a call to the household in question to collect the missing data.

At the end of the final monthly field period, the call histories for each of the twelve monthly samples were exported from the CATI system. Using in-house programming, an analyst calculated the final disposition for each record in each sample. We use the system of final dispositions developed for RDD telephone surveys by the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)<sup>1</sup>. The AAPOR final disposition code is used to calculate various rates that reflect different aspects of sample quality. The final dispositions for the 2006 survey are shown in Table 4.

For the 2006 survey, we used the method of response rate calculation codified by the AAPOR. Specifically, we calculated AAPOR Response Rate 3 (RR3). This rate reflects the percentage of completed interviews achieved after fully processing all attempted sample records in worked replicates according to the prescribed sample management rules. It also estimates the number of eligible households from the total number of phone numbers of unknown status. To calculate RR3, the IPPS final dispositions are summarized into seven categories, shown in Table 4.

The formula for RR3 is:

$$RR3 = (I)/((I)+(R+NC+O)+e(UH+UO))$$

For this calculation, we set the value of e to 0.30. This represents our estimate of the proportion of known households in the group of sample records whose eligibility status was able to be determined, based on our experience with similar samples on other projects.

The regional response rates for the 2006 Washington Outdoor Recreation survey range from a low of 40% in Seattle–King to a high of 57% in the Palouse. These rates are consistent with ones we have achieved on other surveys with similar RDD sample

---

<sup>1</sup> The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2006. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 3rd edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR.

designs. The weighted response rate for the statewide sample is 45%, which takes into account the regional differences in population size.

**Table 4: Final Dispositions and Response Rates**

	AAPOR Final Disp.	The Coast	Columbia River Plateau	The Islands	North Cascades	Olympic & Kitsap Peninsulas	The Palouse	Rocky Mountain Gateway	Seattle - King	Volcano Country	Wine Country	Total
Complete	1.1	320	331	320	291	301	309	310	317	328	309	3,136
Household-level refusal	2.111	13	22	12	17	14	11	14	19	22	15	159
Known-respondent refusal	2.112	86	70	50	51	55	51	63	68	84	65	643
Break off	2.12	44	28	28	22	28	20	37	29	43	45	324
Non-contact	2.2	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	5
Respondent never available	2.21	10	10	10	12	7	10	14	11	17	8	109
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Deceased respondent	2.31	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.32	2	5	2	2	3	4	3	2	2	3	28
Household-level language problem	2.331	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Respondent language problem	2.332	0	5	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	10	28
Miscellaneous	2.35	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unknown if housing unit	3.1	461	510	413	441	349	245	360	592	447	459	4,277
Always busy	3.12	16	16	8	29	10	17	27	40	21	11	195
No answer	3.13	142	124	129	142	105	95	117	266	123	125	1,368
Answering machine-don't know if household	3.14	103	88	156	143	104	84	87	223	123	93	1,204
Call blocking	3.15	4	2	3	7	5	2	6	11	7	8	55
Technical phone problems	3.16	3	0	3	2	2	4	2	5	2	1	24
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	3.2	44	46	28	44	43	34	33	58	66	43	439
Out of sample - other strata than originally coded	4.1	2	2	2	4	3	3	2	1	1	2	22
Fax/data line	4.2	93	147	115	120	92	82	106	207	154	108	1,224
Non-working/disconnect	4.3	120	270	153	106	99	71	151	164	115	117	1,366
Non-working number (prescreened)	4.31	1,490	2,002	1,748	1,352	835	2,165	1,049	2,264	1,294	1,389	15,588
Number changed	4.41	7	4	5	1	2	3	3	6	2	8	41
Cell phone	4.42	7	9	6	10	9	4	5	12	15	4	81
Cell phone (prescreened)	4.421	20	2	9	7	0	3	7	5	4	4	61
Nonresidence	4.5	104	120	112	123	109	80	91	210	111	116	1,176
Business, other organizations (prescreened)	4.51	290	272	245	275	233	201	276	545	326	319	2,982
No eligible respondent	4.7	10	10	3	14	8	3	6	11	9	7	81
Other	4.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total telephone numbers sampled		3,391	4,096	3,562	3,218	2,421	3,503	2,772	5,069	3,319	3,270	34,621
I=Complete Interviews (1.1)		320	331	320	291	301	309	310	317	328	309	3,136
P=Partial Interviews (1.2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R=Refusal and break off (2.1)		143	120	90	90	97	82	114	116	149	125	1,126
NC=Non Contact (2.2)		10	10	11	12	9	10	15	11	18	9	115
O=Other (2.0, 2.3)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e=estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible		0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
UH=Unknown household (3.1)		729	740	712	764	575	447	599	1,137	723	697	7,123
UO=Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)		44	46	28	44	43	34	33	58	66	43	439
AAPOR Response Rate #3		0.45	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.51	0.57	0.49	0.40	0.45	0.46	0.47



## ***Data Preparation and Analysis***

The data collected from the twelve monthly samples were exported from the CATI system and imported into SPSS, a statistical analysis software package. There, variable and value labels were added. Changes to the data made during fielding by data collection supervisors were reviewed. Analysts reviewed the numeric and text data, checked them for consistency, and cleaned them to eliminate typographic errors made by interviewers and stray data collected in error. We worked with the IAC to develop an analysis plan that would fulfill the goals of the research. New, recoded versions of the variables in the data set were created as necessary to format the data for analysis or presentation in the research report.

Analysts examined the open-ended responses collected for the “Other” categories of activity preference and drafted a coding plan. Working with the IAC, Clearwater finalized the coding plan. The open-ended data were coded by one analyst and reviewed by a second analyst. The analysts resolved any discrepancies in the coding through discussion. The open-ended responses that remained in the “Other” categories after this process are presented in Appendix C.

Case weights were developed for the analysis of the survey data for several reasons. First, the data did not come from a simple random sample of Washingtonians, so there was variation in the probabilities with which individuals were selected to participate in the survey. The case weights included a factor to account for these differences. Second, the response rate indicated that there could be a risk of nonresponse bias in the data coming from the achieved sample. The case weights included a poststratification factor to account for differential nonresponse by region, gender, and age and to scale the case weights up so they summed to the population size. Third, the variation in the numbers of completed interviews collected for each region and each month could have introduced a seasonal bias into the survey results. A raking technique was used to adjust the case weights so that each monthly sample was equally weighted in the analysis.

Some compromises were made in developing the weighting scheme for the 2006 survey. After applying all adjustment factors, it appeared that the case weights varied in magnitude so much variance was inflated beyond expectations. In order to control the variance, the base weights (which account for the differences in probability of selection) were trimmed such that, within region, the largest weight was no greater than six times the smallest weight. Thus the disproportionate stratification was correctly adjusted, but the range of the household-level probabilities of selection was constrained.

Another compromise related to the demographic dimensions used in the poststratification adjustment. In poststratification, cases were weighted to sum to the county-level population estimates for July 1, 2005 issued by the US Census.<sup>2</sup> Best

---

<sup>2</sup> "County estimates by demographic characteristics - age, sex, race, and Hispanic Origin". The data sets were "CC-EST2005-agesex-36: Annual Estimates of the Population by Selected Age Groups and Sex for Counties in New York: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2005" and "CC-EST2005-alldata-36: County Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2005." The Web link for these data sets is <http://www.census.gov/popest/datasets.html>.

practices for weighting include keeping a minimum of 20 cases in each weighting cell. Given the overall sample size of 3,000, we planned to use region, gender, and age for poststratification. Age needed to be grouped into ranges to create the weighting cells. Initially we tried the six age ranges used for displaying the data in the 2002 survey report. However, the 2006 sampling yielded fewer than 20 cases in the 10–19 year old range. Through experimentation, we ended up using five age ranges in the poststratification process: 0–19, 20–44, 45–54, 55–64, and 65+. Thus the marginal weighted distributions of region, gender, and the five-range age variable in the survey results will reflect the US Census estimates.

The variables that were not weighted through poststratification include race-ethnicity, income, and the six-range age grouping. Therefore, the marginal distributions for those variables will not exactly match the US Census estimates. For analyses of prevalence between demographic groups in terms of percentages of participants, these discrepancies are not important. However, the analyses of numbers of persons participating in an activity or of numbers of times an activity occurred by the six-range age grouping, income, and race/ethnicity do reflect those discrepancies. For future analysis of the survey data, it would be useful to explore creating a new set of case weights—one set each for age, income, and race/ethnicity—that are raked to the US Census estimates. These weights would be applied to the data for weighted estimates of participant and activity counts that more accurately reflect the population characteristics of Washington residents in terms of the age, income, and race/ethnicity groupings of interest.

We used a specialized analysis module of SPSS called Complex Samples for the analysis of the weighted survey results. This program calculates not only correct point estimates (such as percentages and counts) but also correct variance estimates (such as standard errors) using weighted data from complex samples. Correct variance estimates are important for calculating the correct confidence intervals and producing correct statistics in the analysis of differences related to demographic characteristics, region, and season. Analysts used the case weights and SPSS Complex Samples for all analyses reported in the next section.

## **Survey Results**

The results of the 2006 Washington Outdoor Recreation Survey are presented on the following pages. First, the results for each major activity area are presented. For each major area, three tables are given showing the survey results for each category, broken out by type or setting, as applicable. Because of the large set of survey results, only highlights are mentioned in the discussion of the tables. All survey results are given in the tables accompanying the text or in the report appendices. Second, an overview of the top recreation activities is given, considering all activities areas combined. The discussion of survey results concludes with a comparison of the results from the present survey with those from the 2002 report of the 1999–2000 survey.

## ***Terminology***

In the pages that follow, some specialized terminology is used. It is important to understand how the words “significance,” “prevalence,” “participation,” and “frequency”

are used in the discussion of the survey results to draw the correct conclusions from the presentation.

“Significance” refers to statistical significance, not necessarily substantive (or practical) significance. Statistically significant differences and confidence intervals for the population estimates were calculated at the 95% confidence level. That means that we would expect to see very similar survey results 19 times out of 20 if the population of Washington had been sampled independently many times during the same period using the same sampling design and method. Any differences between demographic groups, regions, or seasons mentioned in the text are based on significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) found with the Pearson chi-square test. In general, the smaller the number of respondents who participated in a given activity, the larger the confidence interval for the population estimate and the less likely an observed difference based on demographics, region, or season will be statistically significant. The sample size associated with each survey estimate is included on the crosstabulations in Appendix D.

“Prevalence” refers to the percentage (or to the number of members) of the Washington population that participated in a given activity. Because of the repeated cross-sectional design of the survey sample, annual prevalence cannot be directly calculated. Instead, we used the peak month and average month prevalence estimates to make inferences about annual prevalence. Peak month prevalence entails larger confidence intervals than average month prevalence because of the much smaller sample size (approximately one-twelfth of the entire sample) used for the calculations. We present it as a lower-bound estimate of annual prevalence because it does not account for that segment of the population that participated in the activity during 2006, but not in the peak month for the activity. Annual estimates from peak month data are therefore presented with the words “at least \_\_\_\_\_%.” In the discussion, “participation” in an activity means the same thing as “prevalence” of the activity in the population. It refers to the estimated percentage of the Washington population or to the estimated number of Washington residents who participated in the activity.

Finally, we use the term “frequency” to mean the number of times the activity was performed by individual members of the population in Washington. Note that a single instance of an activity that involves more than one person is counted not as one activity but as one activity for each person involved in it. For example, a picnic involving four persons would be tallied with a frequency of four (4) rather than with a frequency of one (1). Dividing the estimated frequency of the activity by the estimated number of participants in the activity would yield the annual average number of times that participants engaged in the activity in 2006.

## **Tables**

In each section discussion a major activity area, the first table gives the estimated peak month prevalence of the activity in the Washington population in 2006 in terms of percentage and number of residents, both given with 95% confidence intervals. Because the data for these estimates come from the respondents in the peak month for the activity, the confidence intervals are relatively large. In the cases of particularly low estimated percentages, the confidence interval may reach below zero (and the estimated number of participants in the population may be negative). In those cases,

the lower bound can be reset to the unweighted number of respondents in the sample who participated in the activity, which are provided in the crosstabulations in Appendix D. The first table also gives the estimated frequency of the activity in Washington in 2006 along with the 95% confidence interval.

The second table gives the estimated prevalence of the activity in the Washington population in terms of percentage and number of residents for the average month in 2006. These estimates give a sense of the overall relative prevalence of the activity in 2006 by averaging the monthly peaks and lows. Because all cases in the sample are used in the calculation of the average month prevalence, the confidence intervals are much smaller than the peak month confidence intervals provided in the first table. However, the average month estimates of percentage and number of participants in the population will by definition be smaller than the peak month estimates. The average month estimate are provided primarily for the analysis of group differences based on demographic characteristics, region, and season. The group differences were analyzed statistically using the Pearson chi-square test ( $p < .05$ ) and calculating standardized residuals for each cell in the crosstabulation tables presented in Appendix D. Statistically significant differences among demographic, regional, and seasonal groups in the entire sample are noted in the second table.

The third table gives the estimated preference for the activity in the Washington population in the average month in 2006. Preference was operationalized and measure on the questionnaire as whether or not the respondent would like to do the activity more in the next 12 months. This allowed a single item to measure preference for both those respondents who said they had done the activity in the last 30 days and those who did not. Early examination of the distribution of preference showed a pattern of higher interest in the off-season and lower interest when the activity was in season for the month the interview was conducted. Because of this variation, and in order to take advantage of the information in the full sample, average month estimates were used for comparing preference across activities. In addition to the estimated average month percentages and numbers in the Washington population (along with confidence intervals), the third table shows statistically significant differences among demographic, regional, and seasonal groups in the entire sample.

The final sections of the presentation of survey results include tables similar in structure and format to those discussion the main recreation activity areas. The comparison of the 1999–2000 survey results with those from the present survey is illustrated with a simple table showing the relative rankings of activity prevalence side-by-side for each survey.

## Sightseeing

Sightseeing in several settings was included on the survey questionnaire. During 2006, at least 57.7% of Washington residents participated in sightseeing (Table XX).

Together, Washingtonians went sightseeing over 12 million times during the year. The most prevalent setting for sightseeing setting was scenic areas (at least 41.7% of residents).

**Table 5: 2006 Annual Estimates for Sightseeing**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Sightseeing	August	57.7	10.0	3,635,404	953,693	12,024,908	1,799,523
Public facility	September	18.9	8.9	1,183,209	620,779	1,974,128	510,660
Cultural or historical facility	September	23.6	10.4	1,478,047	774,978	2,873,122	1,079,869
Scenic area	August	41.7	10.1	2,629,408	832,893	5,584,777	771,247
Other	August	7.3	5.5	460,835	362,943	1,592,881	651,995

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

In an average month in 2006, 42.7% of Washington residents went sightseeing. For sightseeing in general, residents in Seattle-King County participated at a higher rate (48.1%) than those in Rocky Mountain Gateway (34.9%) and in Wine Country (34.7%). Significantly more sightseeing was done in summer (54.7%) than in fall (34.2%).

**Table 6: Significant Demographic Differences for Sightseeing**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Sightseeing	42.7	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (48.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Rocky Mt Gateway (34.9%), Wine Country (34.7%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (54.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (34.2%)</li> </ul>
Public facility	9.5	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (5.3%), Volcano Country (6.1%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (12.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$25K-&lt;\$35K (3.0%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (14.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Cultural or historical facility	16.1	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (6.7%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (9.4%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (6.1%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (21.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (12.5%)</li> </ul>
Scenic area	27.8	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (37.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (20.8%)</li> </ul>
Other	4.5	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, 46.9% Washington residents wanted to do more sightseeing in general in the next 12 months (Table XX). Females expressed this desire more frequently (50.7%) than did males (43.1%). Residents 50 to 64 years old wanted to do more sightseeing (in general) at a significantly higher rate (34.9%) than did those under 20 (18%). Just over one quarter of Washingtonians (26.9%) mentioned wanting to do more of a specific type of sightseeing.

**Table 7: Preference for Sightseeing**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Sightseeing in General	46.9	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: &gt;avg Female (50.7%); &lt;avg Male (43.1%)</li> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 50-64 (34.9%); &lt;avg 0-9 (18.1%), 10-19 (18.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: &gt;avg Spring (52.4%); &lt;avg Summer (38.1%)</li> </ul>
Sightseeing – Specific Type	26.9	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: &gt;avg Seattle-King (33.2%); &lt;avg N Cascades (20.3%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 (“NS” = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Nature Activity

Four categories of recreational nature activity—each divided into several types or settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were visiting nature or interpretive centers, observing or photographing wildlife or nature, gathering or collecting things in a nature setting, and gardening. During 2006, the category that the highest percentage Washington residents (at least 52.9%) participated in was flower or vegetable gardening (Table XX). These individuals gardened nearly 19 million times during the year. However, the most frequent activity (over 35 million times) was observing or photographing wildlife or nature, performed by at least 39.0% of Washingtonians.

**Table 8: 2006 Annual Estimates for Nature Activity**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Nature/interpretive center	November	15.9	9.1	999,287	649,075	1,141,213	259,581
Individual, family, or informal group	September	13.4	8.3	842,363	570,655	910,099	222,530
Organized club, scouting group, or school	June	5.0	4.9	316,514	316,092	201,333	95,234
Other	November	1.9	3.7	121,675	238,483	29,782	24,697
Observe/photograph wildlife/nature	April	39.0	8.9	2,453,243	714,497	35,212,304	5,745,884
Plants	June	24.5	9.4	1,543,159	684,168	10,806,270	2,206,092
Birds	June	26.5	9.2	1,667,548	662,174	11,353,802	2,036,472
Land animals	June	29.2	9.7	1,835,988	722,899	10,226,427	2,378,572
Marine life	October	10.3	6.1	647,711	407,570	2,315,535	594,289
Other	February	2.9	3.3	182,327	209,238	510,270	608,630
Gather or collect	June	21.3	8.6	1,338,709	605,549	7,171,584	1,490,376
Berries or mushrooms	September	11.8	7.2	742,512	481,462	1,314,800	428,649
Shells, rocks, or vegetation	June	18.2	8.1	1,143,183	562,299	5,006,007	1,244,405
Firewood	July	9.3	6.2	583,507	410,503	720,385	251,828
Cut down a Christmas tree	December	3.4	2.9	216,138	187,215	31,108	22,724
Other	September	1.7	2.2	106,426	136,456	99,283	60,098
Flower or vegetable gardening	June	52.9	10.6	3,327,473	911,012	18,787,038	2,089,589
In the yard at home	June	52.9	10.6	3,327,473	911,012	18,369,717	2,077,666

In a community/pea patch garden	July	3.7	3.7	230,879	235,386	279,895	138,594
Other	August	1.6	2.8	97,788	175,193	137,426	153,208

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

In an average month in 2006, about the same numbers of Washington residents gardened (32.1%) as observed or photographed wildlife or nature (31.2%). Considering all types and settings, gardening was significantly more prevalent among females and among ages 35 and older. The only significant demographic difference for observing or photographing wildlife or nature for all types and settings combined was age, with the largest prevalence (41.7%) seen for Washingtonians 50 to 64 years old.

**Table 9: Significant Demographic Differences for Nature Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Nature/interpretive center	10.4	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (4.7%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (15.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (6.6%), Columbia Riv Plat (4.0%), N Cascades (6.9%), Rocky Mt Gateway (4.9%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> %75K+ (15.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (2.4%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (5.7%), DK/REF (4.6%)</li> </ul>
Individual, family, or informal group	8.5	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (12.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (2.1%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (5.0%), DK/REF (3.7%)</li> </ul>
Organized club, scouting group, or school	2.0	0.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (5.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (0.4%), DK/REF (0.4%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.4	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Observe/photograph wildlife/nature	31.2	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (41.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (24.6%)</li> </ul>
Plants	17.5	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (24.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (11.6%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (25.3%), Seattle-King (22.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (10.0%), Volcano Country (12.3%), Wine Country (11.8%)</li> </ul>
Birds	18.8	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (28.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (10.9%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (35.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Land animals	19.6	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (27.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (14.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (13.7%)</li> </ul>
Marine life	7.8	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (14.6%), Islands (18.5%), Seattle-King (11.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (1.3%), Palouse (3.4%), Rocky Mt Gateway (4.6%), Volcano Country (4.6%), Wine Country (4.5%)</li> </ul>
Other	1.3	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Gather or collect	16.2%	2.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (36.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (10.1%), 65+ (8.5%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (28.9%), Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (24.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Wine Country (11.4%)</li> </ul>
Berries or mushrooms	4.4	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (8.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.0%)</li> </ul>
Shells, rocks, or vegetation	13.5	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (33.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (8.2%), 50-64 (9.5%), 65+ (5.4%)</li> </ul>
Firewood	3.4	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (6.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (1.6%), 65+ (1.2%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (6.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$75K+ (1.4%), DK/REF (1.2%)</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (6.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Cut down a Christmas tree	0.4	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.7	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Flower or vegetable gardening	32.1	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (35.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (29.3%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (37.5%), 50-64 (44.0%), 65+ (40.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (14.3%), 20-34 (20.9%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (34.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Hispanic (19.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (43.2%), Summer (41.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (15.5%)</li> </ul>
In the yard at home	31.1	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (34.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (28.2%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (36.7%), 50-64 (42.8%), 65+ (39.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (14.0%), 20-34 (20.6%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (33.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (22.7%), Hispanic (19.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (42.6%), Summer (39.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (14.5%)</li> </ul>
In a community/pea patch garden	1.3	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.4	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

As shown in Table (XX), on average in 2006, about the same number of Washington residents wanted to do more observing or photographing of wildlife or nature in the next 12 months (25.8%) as wanted to do more flower or vegetable gardening (25.2%). Females wanted to visit nature or interpretive centers more and do more gardening at higher rates than males. Parents of children under 10 indicated their children would like to do more visiting or nature or interpretive centers, gathering or collecting things in nature settings, and nature activities in general at rates higher than older residents indicated for themselves. Washingtonians between 35 and 65 showed the highest rates of interest in doing more gardening in the next 12 months.

**Table 10: Preference for Nature Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Visit Nature/Interpretive Center	13.9	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (16.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (11.1%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (19.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (9.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (18.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (10.0%)</li> </ul>
Observe/Photograph Wildlife/Nature	25.8	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (30.2%), Fall (31.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (17.4%)</li> </ul>
Gather/Collect Things in Nature Setting	12.0	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (22.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (9.0%), 65+ (6.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (18.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (6.8%)</li> </ul>
Flower/Vegetable Gardening	25.2	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (29.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (21.0%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (30.5%), 50-64 (30.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (18.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (15.0%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (17.8%)</li> </ul>



Nature Activities in General	17.7	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (28.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (24.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (11.3%)</li> </ul>
Nature Activities – Other	0.8	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 (“NS” = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Fishing

Four categories of recreational fishing—three of them divided into settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were fishing for shellfish; fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty; fishing from a private boat; and fishing with a guide or charter. During 2006, roughly equivalent percentages of Washington residents (at least 17%) participated in fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty and fishing from a private boat (Table XX). However, fishing was performed more frequently from a bank, dock, or jetty (over 2.3 million times) than from a private boat (over 1.4 million times).

**Table 11: 2006 Annual Estimates for Fishing**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Fishing for shellfish	July	9.0	6.5	563,015	430,974	611,703	239,327
Fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty	July	17.0	8.0	1,067,520	567,072	2,318,089	851,891
Saltwater	July	6.9	5.5	435,708	358,036	457,203	251,025
Freshwater	June	13.6	7.6	853,534	513,352	1,860,886	769,558
Fishing from a private boat	July	17.1	7.9	1,074,245	556,607	1,438,952	430,690
Saltwater	July	10.1	7.0	638,006	472,821	528,032	179,196
Freshwater	August	10.8	6.3	681,802	421,646	908,609	368,853
Other	April	0.0	0.1	2,773	5,435	2,311	4,529
Fishing with a guide/charter	May	1.9	3.6	116,816	225,297	67,339	49,336
Saltwater	May	1.8	3.6	114,932	225,267	47,460	43,071
Freshwater	July	1.0	1.7	60,631	105,317	19,879	21,068

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

In an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, males engaged in fishing more frequently than females, and the peak season was summer (Table XX). (For freshwater fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty, spring was also a peak season.)

**Table 12: Significant Demographic Differences for Fishing**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Fishing for shellfish	4.4	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.5%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (7.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.1%)</li> </ul>
Fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty	8.7	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (12.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.0%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (5.3%), 65+ (2.8%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (14.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (3.7%), Fall (4.6%)</li> </ul>
Saltwater	2.3	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (3.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.9%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (4.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Freshwater	7.1	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (10.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.2%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (4.0%), 65+ (1.6%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (11.0%), Summer (11.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b></li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winter (2.3%), Fall (3.6%)</li> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Fishing from a private boat	7.4	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (11.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.6%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (15.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (4.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (14.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.6%), Fall (4.5%)</li> </ul>
Saltwater	3.5	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (5.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.2%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (0.5%), Palouse (0.2%), Rocky Mt Gateway (0.2%), Wine Country (0.8%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (6.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (0.7%), \$50K-&lt;\$75K (1.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (7.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.4%)</li> </ul>
Freshwater	5.0	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (7.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.5%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (2.8%), 20-34 (3.1%), 65+ (3.1%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (11.0%), Columbia Riv Plat (11.4%), Wine Country (9.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (2.8%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (10.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.5%), Fall (3.0%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Fishing with a guide/charter	0.6	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.1%)</li> </ul>
Saltwater	0.5	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (0.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.1%)</li> </ul>
Freshwater	0.2	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (0.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.0%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

As shown in Table (XX), on average in 2006, about the same number of Washington residents wanted to do more fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty in the next 12 months (18.7%) as wanted to do more fishing from a private boat (18.5%). With the exceptions of fishing for shellfish and fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty, males showed greater levels of interest in doing more fishing than females. Compared to other regions, residents in the Islands showed the greatest interest in doing more fishing for shellfish (28.1%), those in the Palouse for doing more fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty (29.7%), and those in the Columbia River Plateau for fishing in general (22.4%).

**Table 13: Preference for Fishing**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Fishing for Shellfish	13.7	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (28.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (7.4%), Palouse (5.9%), Rocky Mt Gateway (5.6%), Wine Country (7.3%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (18.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (9.7%), DK/REF (7.6%)</li> </ul>
Fishing from a Bank, Dock, or Jetty	18.7	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (26.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (14.8%), 65+ (8.4%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Palouse (29.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (12.8%)</li> </ul>
Fishing from a Private Boat	18.5	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (22.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (14.6%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (12.9%)</li> </ul>
Fishing with Guide/Charter	6.1	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (7.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.5%)</li> </ul>

Fishing in General	14.9	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (17.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (12.1%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (22.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (8.3%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Fishing – Other	4.8	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.2%)</li> </ul>
Salmon Fishing	2.1	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (3.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.0%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (4.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (0.7%), 20-34 (0.1%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (4.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.1%), Fall (0.9%)</li> </ul>
Trout Fishing	1.8	0.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Steelhead Fishing	0.6	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.0%)</li> </ul>
Catfish Fishing	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Halibut Fishing	0.1	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Exotic/Other Species Fishing	0.8	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.1%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (1.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.1%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Picnicking

Picnicking, barbecuing, and cookouts in several settings were included on the survey questionnaire. During 2006, at least 78.4% of Washington residents participated in a picnic, barbecue, or cookout (Table XX). Most residents participated at a location not specifically designated for picnicking activity (at least 63.2%). Considering all settings, Washingtonians had a picnic, barbecue, or cookout over 14 million times during 2006.

**Table 14: 2006 Annual Estimates for Picnicking**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout	July	78.4	7.0	4,927,720	1,071,600	14,560,258	1,672,968
Location not specifically designated	July	63.2	8.9	3,976,276	982,028	10,699,305	1,366,106
Site specifically designated	July	42.2	9.6	2,653,464	820,198	2,591,787	485,174
Group picnic facility	July	22.5	8.7	1,412,253	640,130	1,026,857	252,761
Other	May	2.7	3.6	170,019	228,860	242,309	248,453

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, the peak seasons for picnicking were summer (75.0%) and spring (59.6%). The oldest Washington residents (65+) and those with the lowest incomes (less than \$15,000) were significantly less likely than others to participate in picnics, barbecues, or cookouts.

**Table 15: Significant Demographic Differences for Picnicking**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout	48.5	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (36.8%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (25.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (59.6%), Summer (75.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (25.3%), Fall (34.2%)</li> </ul>
Location not specifically	37.0	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (45.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (26.6%)</li> </ul>

designated			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (44.7%), Summer (55.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (20.4%), Fall (27.0%)</li> </ul>
Site specifically designated	17.6	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (25.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (11.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (22.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (9.5%), DK/REF (11.9%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (36.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (5.2%), Fall (10.9%)</li> </ul>
Group picnic facility	9.5	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (18.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.3%), Fall (5.7%)</li> </ul>
Other	1.1	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.4%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, about one-quarter of Washington residents wanted to do more picnicking, barbecues, or cookouts in the next 12 months in locations not specifically designated for the activity (25.7%) or in a site specifically designed for it (25.6%).

**Table 16: Preference for Picnicking**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Location Not Specifically Designated	25.7	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (33.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (17.7%)</li> </ul>
Site Specifically Designated	25.6	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (32.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (16.7%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (30.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (17.0%), Rocky Mt Gateway (16.1%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (32.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (15.7%), DK/REF (18.9%)</li> </ul>
Group Picnic Facility	14.4	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (16.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (11.9%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Rocky Mt Gateway (9.5%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (24.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (12.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (20.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (7.9%)</li> </ul>
Picnicking in General	39.4	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (49.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (29.1%)</li> </ul>
Picnicking – Other	0.5	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Water Activity

Twelve categories of recreational water activity—most of them divided into settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. These main categories were beachcombing, swimming or wading at a beach, surfboarding, wind surfing, inner tubing or floating, white water rafting, hand-powered boating, sail boating, personal watercraft, motor boating, water skiing, and scuba or skin diving. As shown in Table (XX), the category that the highest percentage of Washington residents participated in during 2006 was swimming or wading at a beach (at least 58.4%). Most residents (at least 44.7%) went swimming or wading at freshwater beaches. Considering all settings, Washingtonians went swimming or wading at beaching over 5.1 million times during 2006.

**Table 17: 2006 Annual Estimates for Water Activity**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Beachcombing	July	34.0	9.0	2,136,092	680,029	3,792,193	582,808
Swimming/wading at a beach	July	58.4	9.1	3,675,934	973,508	5,173,350	973,477
Saltwater	July	31.3	9.2	1,968,138	714,827	2,121,306	528,904
Freshwater	July	44.7	9.7	2,813,883	889,745	3,027,913	731,486
Other	July	1.0	1.6	65,520	100,514	24,131	33,615
Surfboarding	September	1.3	2.5	80,012	156,823	54,199	38,657
Wind surfing	July	0.8	1.7	53,220	104,311	96,986	174,104
Saltwater	March	0.1	0.2	5,758	11,285	2,158	3,008
Freshwater	July	0.8	1.7	53,220	104,311	94,828	174,078
Inner tubing or floating	August	19.3	8.8	1,214,062	631,603	1,293,370	446,035
White water rafting	July	3.4	3.4	210,953	214,230	76,247	53,380
Canoeing, kayaking, row boating, other hand-powered boating	July	18.0	7.3	1,131,100	502,680	1,259,378	358,447
Saltwater	September	4.5	5.9	279,710	383,865	338,927	135,372
Freshwater	July	16.2	7.1	1,019,678	488,730	920,451	312,113
Sail boating	September	8.1	8.2	508,007	551,807	189,335	105,559
Saltwater	September	6.6	8.0	417,225	532,871	121,363	66,113
Freshwater	September	3.5	4.5	219,561	290,976	67,972	76,553
Personal watercraft, such as a Jet Ski	July	7.7	5.9	483,876	392,914	541,629	271,280
Saltwater	October	2.6	3.2	165,241	206,381	58,257	38,071
Freshwater	July	7.7	5.9	483,876	392,914	482,934	266,087
Other	February	0.0	0.1	2,631	5,156	438	859
Motor boating	July	26.7	9.1	1,676,747	686,082	2,407,395	589,910
Saltwater	July	12.7	7.5	801,699	514,953	637,324	207,675
Freshwater	July	19.1	8.3	1,202,793	590,478	1,765,009	514,281
Other	July	0.5	0.9	30,373	59,530	5,062	9,922
Water skiing	July	7.6	6.2	477,276	410,416	423,628	224,601
Saltwater	July	0.1	0.2	6,710	13,152	559	1,096
Freshwater	July	7.6	6.2	477,276	410,416	423,069	224,588
Scuba or skin diving	May	4.9	6.7	304,764	435,190	235,826	151,136
Saltwater	May	4.9	6.7	304,764	435,190	212,426	148,997
Freshwater	March	1.5	2.9	93,332	182,930	23,400	22,384

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, the water activities with the greatest prevalence in the Washington population were beachcombing (19.9%) and swimming or wading at a beach (18.6%). The peak season for both categories was summer (30.6% and 45.4%, respectively). Residents with the highest incomes (\$75,000 or more) showed higher prevalence for both activities (26.9% and 25.1%, respectively) than those with the lowest incomes (under \$15,000). Beachcombing was most prevalent on the Coast (36.8%), the Islands (48.7%), and the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas (28.7%). Beachcombing was the most prevalent among those under 10 years (29.5%), and swimming or wading at a beach was the most prevalent among those 10 to 19 (28.6%). Swimming or wading at beaches was least prevalent on the Columbia River Plateau (11.5%), the Palouse (12.5%), Volcano Country (12.9%), and Wine Country (12.9%).

Looking at other water activities, males showed higher prevalence levels than females for sail boating (2.7%), personal watercraft (4.0%), motor boating (15.5%), water skiing

(3.0%), and scuba or skin diving (2.5%). Tweens and teens were the most likely to participate in inner tubing or floating (16.3%) and in freshwater hand-powered boating (10.4%). Washingtonians in the Islands showed the greatest prevalence of beachcombing (48.7%), saltwater hand-powered boating (8.7%), and saltwater motor boating (13.9%). Residents in the Rocky Mountain Gateway were the most likely to go swimming or wading at freshwater beaches (17.9%) and freshwater motor boating (17.7%).

**Table 18: Significant Demographic Differences for Water Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Beachcombing	19.9	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (29.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (36.8%), Islands (48.7%), Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (28.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (6.6%), Palouse (8.1%), Rocky Mt Gateway (10.0%), Wine Country (8.9%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (26.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (10.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (30.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (12.8%), Fall (14.6%)</li> </ul>
Swimming/wading at a beach	18.6	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (28.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (14.7%), 65+ (7.5%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (11.5%), Palouse (12.5%), Volcano Country (12.9%), Wine Country (12.9%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (25.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (9.1%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (12.8%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (45.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (5.1%), Fall (7.8%)</li> </ul>
Saltwater	11.3	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (8.2%), 65+ (5.7%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (20.2%), Islands (19.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (3.6%), Palouse (4.2%), Rocky Mt Gateway (6.1%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (8.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (3.2%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (5.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (24.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (4.5%), Fall (5.8%)</li> </ul>
Freshwater	12.1	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (22.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (3.0%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Rocky Mt Gateway (17.9%), Seattle-King (15.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (7.2%), Islands (5.8%), Volcano Country (6.8%), Wine Country (7.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (31.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.8%), Fall (3.7%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.1	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Surfboarding	0.3	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Wind surfing	0.2	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Saltwater	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Freshwater	0.2	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Inner tubing or floating	6.7	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (16.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.1%), 65+ (0.9%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Volcano Country (2.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (17.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.6%), Fall (2.3%)</li> </ul>
White water rafting	0.8	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Canoeing, kayaking, row boating, other hand-powered boating	7.0	1.5	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (13.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (4.2%), Fall (3.8%)
Saltwater	2.4	0.9	• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (8.7%), Olympic & Kitsap Pen (6.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (0.4%), Rocky Mt Gateway (0.2%), Wine Country (0.2%)
Freshwater	5.4	1.3	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (10.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (1.2%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (11.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.5%), Fall (2.4%)
Sail boating	1.6	0.9	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.6%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (5.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.3%), Spring (0.6%), Fall (0.5%)
Saltwater	1.4	0.9	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.4%)
Freshwater	0.5	0.4	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (0.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.1%)
Personal watercraft, such as a Jet Ski	2.6	0.9	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (4.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.2%) • AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.6%), 65+ (0.9%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Palouse (0.7%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (6.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.7%)
Saltwater	0.6	0.4	• No significant differences
Freshwater	2.1	0.8	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (3.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.8%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (6.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.5%), Fall (0.7%)
Other	0.0	0.0	• No significant differences
Motor boating	11.4	1.9	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (15.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (7.3%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Rocky Mt Gateway (17.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Volcano Country (6.8%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (23.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (4.4%), Fall (5.0%)
Saltwater	4.5	1.3	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (7.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.0%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (13.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (1.4%), Palouse (1.0%), Rocky Mt Gateway (0.2%), Volcano Country (2.6%), Wine Country (0.6%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (8.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (2.6%)
Freshwater	8.5	1.6	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (10.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (6.1%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Rocky Mt Gateway (17.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Islands (3.1%), Volcano Country (5.4%) • RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (9.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (2.8%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (18.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.8%), Fall (3.6%)
Other	0.0	0.1	• No significant differences
Water skiing	2.0	0.9	• Gender: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (3.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.0%) • Season: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (5.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.5%), Fall (0.6%)
Saltwater	0.0	0.0	• No significant differences
Freshwater	2.0	0.9	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (3.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.0%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (5.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.5%), Fall (0.6%)
Scuba or skin diving	1.5	0.8	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.5%) • AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.3%), 10-19 (0.5%), 65+ (0.4%)
Saltwater	1.3	0.8	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.4%)
Freshwater	0.2	0.3	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, 28.4% of Washington residents wanted to do more swimming or wading at a beach in the next 12 months. They were more likely to be female (35.1%) and to be children (47.5%) or tweens or teens (39.9%). The next highest levels of interest were expressed for motor boating (23.6%) and for beachcombing (21.6%). Tweens and teens showed the highest levels of interest in doing more surfboarding (13.4%), wind surfing (8.1%), inner tubing or floating (20.2%), personal watercraft (22.1%), and water skiing (18.0%). Residents in the Islands were the most interested in doing more sail boating (13.9%), whereas those in the Columbia River Plateau were the most interested in more motor boating (38.0%).

**Table 19: Preference for Water Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Beachcombing	21.6	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (26.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (17.1%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (27.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (13.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (26.1%), Fall (27.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (12.5%)</li> </ul>
Swimming/Wading at Beach	28.4	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (35.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (21.8%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (47.5%), 10-19 (39.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (22.1%), 65+ (15.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (21.8%)</li> </ul>
Surfboarding	3.4	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (13.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.0%), 65+ (0.5%)</li> </ul>
Wind Surfing	2.5	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (8.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.9%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (0.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (1.0%)</li> </ul>
Inner Tubing/Floating	10.2	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (20.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (6.7%), 65+ (2.4%)</li> </ul>
Whitewater Rafting	7.1	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (3.3%), 65+ (3.0%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Wine Country (12.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> N Cascades (4.2%)</li> </ul>
Canoeing, Kayaking, Row Boating, Other Hand-Powered Boating	17.4	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (11.2%)</li> </ul>
Sail Boating	8.2	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (13.9%), Seattle-King (12.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (2.4%), Volcano Country (4.2%)</li> </ul>
Personal Watercraft/Jet Ski	10.0	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (22.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (5.0%), 50-64 (4.7%), 65+ (2.1%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (14.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (6.6%)</li> </ul>
Motor Boating	23.6	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (38.0%), Rocky Mt Gateway (32.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (16.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (16.7%)</li> </ul>
Water Skiing	10.3	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (18.0%), 20-34 (17.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (4.8%), 50-64 (7.1%), 65+ (2.6%)</li> </ul>



Scuba or Skin Diving	7.1	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.5%), 65+ (2.6%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (10.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (4.1%)</li> </ul>
Water Activities in General	9.3	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (5.4%), 65+ (3.3%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (12.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (3.8%)</li> </ul>
Water Activities – Other	2.7	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (3.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (1.8%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (1.3%), Fall (1.2%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Snow/Ice Activity

Seven categories of recreational water activity—three of them divided into types or settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were snowshoeing; sledding, inner tubing, or other snow play; snowboarding; skiing; snowmobiling; ATV riding; and ice skating. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was sledding, inner tubing, or other snow play (at least 38.1%), doing it over 1.2 million times (Table XX). The next most prevalent snow or ice activities among Washingtonians were skiing (at least 14.1%) and ATV riding (at least 10.3%).

**Table 20: 2006 Annual Estimates for Snow/Ice Activity**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Snowshoeing	March	3.7	4.0	230,916	256,321	133,080	72,189
Sledding, inner tubing, other snow play	December	31.8	9.1	2,003,681	727,453	1,209,028	272,209
Snowboarding	February	8.6	5.8	541,005	384,427	435,061	223,547
Site/location not specifically designated	February	2.2	3.2	137,893	203,576	52,295	52,306
Downhill facility	February	8.6	5.8	538,668	384,400	318,400	174,952
Other	January	3.2	4.5	201,368	290,238	64,366	80,491
Skiing	March	14.1	7.7	886,129	525,348	904,529	302,237
Cross-country or back-country	January	3.1	2.8	192,319	178,282	237,738	170,415
Downhill	March	13.6	7.7	856,791	524,141	666,791	240,162
Snowmobiling	April	4.8	4.7	301,876	305,190	183,997	104,763
ATV riding	January	10.3	6.7	649,109	449,367	884,970	516,666
Ice skating	December	7.8	6.9	493,238	463,966	418,258	190,477
Outdoors	February	2.8	3.0	175,841	193,458	46,855	34,274
Indoors	December	6.3	6.8	397,895	448,510	363,359	184,696
Other	February	0.8	1.5	48,265	94,599	8,044	15,766

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, the prevalence of the top snow or ice activities follow the same order: Sledding, inner tubing, and other snow play (8.3%), skiing (4.4%), and ATV riding (3.6%). Children under 10 showed the greatest prevalence of sledding, inner tubing, and other snow play (19.8%), tweens and teens of ATV riding (7.8%) and ice skating (14.9%), and residents 35 to 49 of skiing (7.4%). Males were the more likely to participate in snowboarding

(4.1%), downhill skiing (4.9%), and ATV riding (5.1%), whereas females were more likely to go ice skating (4.5%). With the exception of ice-skating, snow and ice activities were significantly more likely to be done in winter than in other seasons.

**Table 21: Significant Demographic Differences for Snow/Ice Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Snowshoeing	1.2	0.6	• No significant differences
Sledding, inner tubing, other snow play	8.3	1.7	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (19.8%), 10-19 (14.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (5.3%), 50-64 (2.3%), 65+ (0.4%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (15.9%), Fall (12.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (4.2%), Summer (1.2%)
Snowboarding	2.6	1.1	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (4.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.2%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (7.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.3%), Fall (0.5%)
Site/location not specifically designated	0.4	0.4	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (0.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.0%)
Downhill facility	2.2	1.0	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (5.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.3%), Fall (0.5%)
Other	0.3	0.4	• No significant differences
Skiing	4.4	1.2	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (7.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.9%), 65+ (0.9%) • RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (4.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (2.0%), Hispanic (0.4%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (10.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.7%), Fall (2.3%)
Cross-country or back-country	1.0	0.5	• No significant differences
Downhill	3.6	1.1	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (4.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.3%) • AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (6.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (0.7%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (8.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.7%), Fall (1.3%)
Snowmobiling	1.3	0.7	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (2.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.1%), Fall (0.6%)
ATV riding	3.6	1.1	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (5.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.2%) • AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (7.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (1.6%), 65+ (0.4%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (0.3%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> ; <b>&lt;avg</b>
Ice skating	3.3	1.1	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (4.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (2.0%) • AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (14.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (1.5%), 50-64 (0.3%), 65+ (0.4%)
Outdoors	0.6	0.4	• No significant differences
Indoors	2.8	1.1	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (12.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (1.1%), 50-64 (0.1%), 65+ (0.4%)
Other	0.1	0.1	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, the most frequently mentioned snow or ice activity mentioned by Washington residents as the one they would like to do more of in the next 12 months was skiing (23.9%), followed by sledding, inner tubing, and other snow play (20.6%). The greatest levels of interest in more skiing were expressed by residents in Seattle-

King County (30.5%), Washingtonians 35 to 49 years old (33.1%), and those with incomes of \$75,000 or more (38.9%).

Females were more interested than males in doing more sledding, inner tubing, and other snow play (23.9%) and more ice skating (16.9%), whereas males were more interested than females in doing more snowboarding (15.9%) and more snowmobiling (9.3%). Parents of children under 10 expressed the greatest level of interest in more sledding, inner tubing, and other snow play for their children (47.8%). Tweens and teens expressed the highest level of interest in more snowboarding (33.0%) and more ice skating (22.6%), whereas residents 35 to 49 were the most interested in doing more snowshoeing (10.6%), skiing (33.1%), and snowmobiling (11.4%). Residents in Seattle-King County were the most interested in doing more skiing (30.5%), whereas those in Wine Country were the most interested in doing more ATV riding (8.6%).

They were more likely to be female (35.1%) and to be children (47.5%) or tweens or teens (39.9%). The next highest levels of interest were expressed for motor boating (23.6%) and for beachcombing (21.6%). Tweens and teens showed the highest levels of interest in doing more surfboarding (13.4%), wind surfing (8.1%), inner tubing or floating (20.2%), personal watercraft (22.1%), and water skiing (18.0%). Residents in the Islands were the most interested in doing more sail boating (13.9%), whereas those in the Columbia River Plateau were the most interested in more motor boating (38.0%).

**Table 22: Preference for Snow/Ice Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Snowshoeing	6.9	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (10.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (3.6%), 65+ (2.4%)</li> </ul>
Sledding, Inner tubing, Other Snow Play	20.6	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (23.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (17.3%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (47.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (7.3%), 65+ (3.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (30.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (15.0%)</li> </ul>
Snowboarding	12.8	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (15.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (9.7%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (33.0%), 20-34 (29.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (4.3%), 50-64 (2.3%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (24.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (11.1%)</li> </ul>
Skiing	23.9	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (33.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (17.9%), 65+ (11.0%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (30.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (13.8%), Volcano Country (19.2%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (38.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (11.3%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (13.8%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (15.8%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (16.5%), \$50K-&lt;\$75K (19.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (29.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (19.1%)</li> </ul>
Snowmobiling	7.6	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (9.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (6.0%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (11.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (2.9%), 50-64 (5.2%), 65+ (2.0%)</li> </ul>
ATV Riding on Snow or Ice	3.7	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.6%), 50-64 (1.6%), 65+ (1.5%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Wine Country (8.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (1.5%), Palouse (1.3%), Rocky Mt Gateway (0.6%), Seattle-King (1.0%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (6.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (2.1%)</li> </ul>
Ice Skating	11.9	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (16.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (7.0%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (18.7%), 10-19 (22.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (5.7%),</li> </ul>

			65+ (3.1%)
Snow/Ice Activities in General	5.5	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: &gt;avg NS; &lt;avg 50-64 (2.8%), 65+ (0.9%)</li> <li>SEASON: &gt;avg Fall (8.5%); &lt;avg Spring (2.5%)</li> </ul>
Snow/Ice Activities – Other	0.5	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Air Activity

Five categories of recreational air activity—one of them divided into types—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were bungee jumping; paragliding or hang gliding; hot air ballooning; sky diving or parachuting; and flying gliders, ultralights, aircraft, or other air vehicles. Table XX shows that the category that the greatest percentage of Washington residents participated in during 2006 was flying air vehicles (at least 6.6%), primarily aircraft (at least 5.9%). Washingtonians participated in flying gliders, ultralights, aircraft, or other air vehicles over 760,000 times in 2006.

**Table 23: 2006 Annual Estimates for Air Activity**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Bungee jumping	May	1.7	3.3	105,385	206,554	22,863	29,520
Paragliding, hang gliding	October	0.2	0.4	12,204	23,920	1,017	1,993
Hot air ballooning	April	0.6	1.1	36,527	71,593	3,435	5,991
Sky diving or parachuting	October	0.9	1.4	57,495	86,971	9,646	14,486
Flying vehicles	February	6.6	4.8	412,377	313,857	793,219	394,961
Gliders	June	0.8	1.6	49,986	97,973	4,166	8,164
Ultralights	February	2.2	3.2	136,574	202,504	22,762	33,751
Aircraft	February	5.9	4.6	370,056	302,822	763,437	388,679
Other	April	0.5	1.0	30,629	60,033	2,854	5,038

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

In an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, the prevalence of participation in flying gliders, ultralights, aircraft, or other air vehicles was 3.7% (Table XX). The greatest level of participation was found among residents of Seattle-King County (6.8%).

**Table 24: Significant Demographic Differences for Air Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Bungee jumping	0.2	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Paragliding, hang gliding	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Hot air ballooning	0.1	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Sky diving or parachuting	0.1	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Flying vehicles	3.7	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: &gt;avg Seattle-King (6.8%); &lt;avg Coast (0.8%), Columbia Riv Plat (1.3%), Palouse (0.6%), Volcano Country (2.3%), Wine Country (1.8%)</li> </ul>
Gliders	0.1	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

Ultralights	0.2	0.3	• No significant differences
Aircraft	3.6	1.2	• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (6.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (0.8%), Columbia Riv Plat (1.3%), Palouse (0.6%), Volcano Country (2.1%), Wine Country (1.0%)
Other	0.0	0.1	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, Washington residents expressed about equal levels of desire to do more flying of gliders, ultralights, aircraft and other air vehicles (8.1%) and more hot air ballooning (8.0%). Bungee jumping received the highest level of interest from tweens and teens (12.6%) and from residents 20 to 34 (9.1%). Males expressed higher levels of interest than females in doing more paragliding or hang gliding (6.2%), sky diving or parachuting (8.0%), and for more air activities in general (3.1%). Residents in the North Cascades expressed the highest level of interest in paragliding or hand gliding (9.3%).

**Table 25: Preference for Air Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Bungee Jumping	4.2	1.2	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (12.6%), 20-34 (9.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (2.2%), 50-64 (0.4%), 65+ (1.1%)
Paragliding or Hang Gliding	4.5	1.3	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.8%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> N Cascades (9.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (1.9%), Rocky Mt Gateway (2.1%), Seattle-King (2.0%)
Hot Air Ballooning	8.0	1.6	• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (3.3%), Islands (4.5%), Volcano Country (3.5%)
Sky Diving or Parachuting	5.6	1.5	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (8.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.3%) • RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (13.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS
Flying Gliders, Ultralights, Aircraft	8.1	1.6	• No significant differences
Air Activities in General	3.1	1.0	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (4.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.1%) • REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (1.6%), Seattle-King (1.0%)
Air Activities – Other	0.5	0.4	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## ***Walking and Hiking***

Four categories of recreational walking or hiking activity—all of them divided into types or settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were walking with a pet, walking without a pet, hiking, and climbing or mountaineering. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was walking without a pet (at least 67.2%), doing it over 81.8 million times (Table XX). The most prevalent settings for walking without a pet were sidewalks (at least 57.3%), park or trail settings (at least 47.8%), and roads or streets (at least 42.4%). At least 47.4 % of Washingtonians walked with a pet in 2006, at least 30.9% hiked, and at least 9.9% participated in climbing or mountaineering.

**Table 26: 2006 Annual Estimates for Walking and Hiking**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Peak Month</b>	<b>Pop. %*</b>	<b>± %</b>	<b>Pop. N*</b>	<b>± N</b>	<b>Activity N</b>	<b>± N</b>
Walked with a pet	March	47.4	10.4	2,980,256	954,741	28,158,139	3,800,209
Site/location not specifically designated	August	31.1	10.0	1,961,279	788,227	1,961,279	788,227
On-leash in a park	August	25.9	9.4	1,629,377	693,575	1,629,377	693,575
Off-leash in park for dogs	October	11.1	6.7	696,521	447,979	696,521	447,979
Other	February	7.2	4.7	455,609	307,956	455,609	307,956
Walked without a pet	June	67.2	9.8	4,224,902	1,083,286	81,833,921	8,906,453
Sidewalks	June	57.3	10.2	3,601,109	1,053,084	33,480,637	4,100,718
Roads or streets	April	42.4	9.2	2,665,359	800,108	26,176,954	3,203,717
Park or trail setting	June	47.8	10.5	3,002,421	902,754	13,513,508	1,731,447
Indoor facility	November	19.5	8.8	1,225,561	632,779	8,240,682	2,179,772
Other	February	2.7	3.3	172,204	213,346	422,140	259,700
Hiked	July	30.9	9.1	1,942,715	693,370	9,440,171	1,647,034
Urban trail	September	12.2	8.4	763,346	573,733	3,009,433	897,376
Rural trail system	September	15.0	8.6	941,208	591,504	2,125,099	553,339
Mountain or forest trail	July	24.6	8.5	1,549,613	617,326	2,388,400	515,468
Area with no established trail	October	14.5	6.7	910,418	452,513	1,867,072	516,443
Other	December	1.6	2.1	98,186	130,480	50,167	45,256
Climbing or mountaineering	October	9.9	6.2	621,729	410,808	533,812	231,260
Alpine areas snow or ice	October	4.3	4.2	271,325	273,456	241,671	156,066
Rock climbing outdoors	October	6.1	5.2	386,334	337,606	137,110	76,021
Rock climbing indoors	January	2.8	2.6	174,938	163,451	124,484	130,649
Other	May	1.6	3.0	97,556	191,209	30,546	28,475

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, walking without a pet and walking with a pet were the two most prevalent walking or hiking activities (55.2% and 36.4%, respectively). Walking without a pet was most likely to be done by residents in the Islands (63.1%) and in Seattle-King County (62.9%), and by females (60.1%). Females (39.4%), White Non-Hispanic residents (38.9%), and those with incomes of \$75,000 or more (43.3%) were more likely than others to walk with a pet.

Females were more likely than males to walk with a pet (39.4%) and without a pet (50.4%), whereas males were more likely than females to hike on mountain or forest trails (14.7%), hike in areas with no established trails (7.8%), and to do climbing or mountaineering (9.6%). Children under 10 were the most likely to walk without a pet on sidewalks (48.3%), tweens and teens to walk with a pet (46.0%), and residents age 20 to 34 to walk without a pet in an indoor facility (16.6%). Residents in Seattle-King County showed the highest prevalence of walking with a pet on-leash in a park (21.0%) and off-leash in a park for dogs (9.0%). They were also the most likely to walk without a pet on sidewalks (49.6%), in a park or trail setting (46.1%), or in an indoor facility (15.4%). Residents in the Islands and in Seattle-King County were the most likely to walk without a pet regardless of setting (63.1% and 62.9%, respectively).

Washingtonians with incomes of \$75,000 or more had the highest prevalence of walking with a pet regardless of setting (43.3%) and of hiking regardless of setting (25.1%).

**Table 27: Significant Demographic Differences for Walking and Hiking**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Walked with a pet	36.4	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (39.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (33.4%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (46.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (19.6%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> WO (38.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> ORNH (23.9%), Hisp (19.8%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> 75K+ (43.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> DK-REF (29.7%)</li> </ul>
Site/location not specifically designated	23.0	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (26.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (19.6%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (10.4%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (24.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (12.0%), Hispanic (13.7%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (29.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> DK/REF (16.4%)</li> </ul>
On-leash in a park	16.0	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (6.7%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (21.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (9.5%), N Cascades (11.3%), Wine Country (11.2%)</li> </ul>
Off-leash in park for dogs	5.6	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (2.7%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (9.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (1.9%), Columbia Riv Plat (1.0%), Palouse (2.0%), Rocky Mt Gateway (2.4%), Wine Country (2.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> \$25K-&lt;\$35K (4.1%)</li> </ul>
Other	3.0	0.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (5.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (1.4%), Fall (1.6%)</li> </ul>
Walked without a pet	55.2	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (60.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (50.4%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (48.1%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (63.1%), Seattle-King (62.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Wine Country (47.7%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (36.4%), \$15-&lt;\$25K (43.7%)</li> </ul>
Sidewalks	39.5	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (44.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (34.2%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (48.3%), 20-34 (46.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (33.4%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (49.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (32.5%), Columbia Riv Plat (30.3%)</li> </ul>
Roads or streets	34.4	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Islands (44.0%), Seattle-King (41.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Volcano Country (27.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (21.3%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (22.8%)</li> </ul>
Park or trail setting	35.2	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (39.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (31.1%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (26.9%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (46.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (23.2%), Wine Country (27.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (28.1%)</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	10.8	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (13.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (8.5%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (16.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (7.2%), 50-64 (7.3%), 65+ (7.0%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (15.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (5.1%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.8	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Hiked	20.5	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (9.3%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (25.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15-&lt;\$25K (11.5%), \$35-&lt;\$50K (14.2%)</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Urban trail	8.9	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (28.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (14.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (12.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (5.2%)</li> </ul>
Rural trail system	9.1	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (12.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (4.1%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (3.4%)</li> </ul>
Mountain or forest trail	12.7	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (14.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (10.7%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (3.7%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (21.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (8.0%)</li> </ul>
Area with no established trail	6.2	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (7.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (9.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Other	0.3	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Climbing or mountaineering	4.2	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (5.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.6%)</li> </ul>
Alpine areas snow or ice	1.4	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.6%)</li> </ul>
Rock climbing outdoors	1.4	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Rock climbing indoors	0.6	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.3	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, of the various walking and hiking activities, Washington residents expressed the greatest interest in doing more hiking (33.5%) in the next 12 months. Of all age groups, parents of children under 10 expressed the highest level of interest in the child doing more hiking (41.4%) and more walking and hiking in general (25.6%). Females showed higher levels of interest than males in doing more walking with (18.5%) or without pets (31.9%). Males were more likely than females to want to do more climbing or mountaineering (9.6%). Washingtonians 50 and older were the most likely to express an interest in doing more walking without a pet (29.2% of those 50 to 64 and 33.8% of those 65 or older).

**Table 28: Preference for Walking and Hiking**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Walking with a Pet	15.5	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (18.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (12.4%)</li> </ul>
Walking without a Pet	24.3	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (31.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (16.7%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (29.2%), 65+ (33.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (11.8%), 35-49 (20.1%)</li> </ul>
Hiking	33.5	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (41.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (16.6%)</li> </ul>
Climbing or Mountaineering	7.8	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (9.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (6.1%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (2.3%)</li> </ul>
Walking and Hiking in General	25.6	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (33.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (16.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (32.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (18.0%)</li> </ul>
Walking and Hiking – Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)



## Bicycle Riding

Two categories of bicycle riding—both of them divided into types or settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were bicycle riding and bicycle touring. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was bicycle riding (at least 41.6%), doing it over 18.8 million times (Table XX). The most prevalent setting for bicycle riding was roads or streets (at least 35.9%). At least 18.7 % of Washingtonians rode a bicycle on an urban trail, and at least 10.7% rode a bicycle on a rural trail system.

**Table 29: 2006 Annual Estimates for Bicycle Riding**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Bicycle riding	July	41.6	9.6	2,618,693	807,427	18,805,879	3,008,509
Roads or streets	June	35.9	10.6	2,254,509	874,650	11,865,713	1,900,226
Urban trail	September	18.7	10.2	1,170,798	732,686	2,876,548	871,186
Rural trail system	September	10.7	7.3	671,723	484,417	1,589,353	794,879
Mountain or forest trail	September	8.8	7.2	552,331	477,162	623,172	256,209
No established trails	July	3.8	3.7	237,096	239,333	1,030,271	668,949
Race/course	February	1.5	2.9	94,252	184,735	121,168	116,023
Velodrome	June	2.4	4.6	150,834	295,635	87,548	101,975
Other	June	2.4	4.0	150,670	258,357	612,106	388,900
Bicycle touring on roads or highways	June	1.7	2.1	107,886	129,905	174,697	107,019
Day trip	March	1.0	2.0	64,239	125,908	105,383	84,029
Overnight excursion	March	0.5	0.9	28,347	55,560	16,223	20,471
Other	February	0.8	1.6	51,283	100,515	53,091	61,287

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, bicycle riding was the most prevalent bicycle activity (32.6%). Roads and streets was the most prevalent setting for bicycle riding (24.6%), followed by urban trails at about half the prevalence of roads and streets (12.1%). Bicycle riding considering all types and settings was most prevalent among children (63.5%) and among tweens and teens (57.7%), among those with incomes of \$75,000 or more, and in the summer (40.4%).

**Table 30: Significant Demographic Differences for Bicycle Riding**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Bicycle riding	32.6	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 0-9 (63.5%), 10-19 (57.7%); &lt;avg 20-34 (25.5%), 50-64 (15.5%), 65+ (11.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: &gt;avg \$75K+ (39.6%); &lt;avg DK/REF (20.2%)</li> <li>SEASON: &gt;avg Summer (40.4%); &lt;avg Winter (26.1%)</li> </ul>
Roads or streets	24.6	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 0-9 (48.7%), 10-19 (48.0%); &lt;avg 50-64 (12.7%), 65+ (6.2%)</li> </ul>
Urban trail	12.1	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: &gt;avg NS; &lt;avg 50-64 (6.4%), 65+ (4.6%)</li> <li>REGION: &gt;avg Seattle-King (18.3%); &lt;avg Coast (6.1%), Columbia Riv Plat (6.9%), Islands (6.1%)</li> <li>INCOME: &gt;avg \$75K+ (17.9%); &lt;avg DK/REF (5.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: &gt;avg Summer (17.7%); &lt;avg NS</li> </ul>
Rural trail system	5.4	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: &gt;avg NS; &lt;avg 65+ (1.0%)</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (9.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (1.5%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (1.7%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (3.1%), DK/REF (2.4%)</li> </ul>
Mountain or forest trail	3.8	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
No established trails	2.1	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (6.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (0.9%), 50-64 (0.5%), 65+ (0.8%)</li> </ul>
Race/course	0.3	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Velodrome	0.5	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	1.0	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Bicycle touring on roads or highways	0.8	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Day trip	0.4	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Overnight excursion	0.1	0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.2	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, Washington residents expressed the greatest interest in doing more bicycle riding in general (27.1%), which included both bicycle riding and bicycle touring, in the next 12 months. The next most prevalent category was bicycle riding (not including bicycle touring), at 24.2%. Females expressed more interest than males doing more bicycle riding (27.1%), whereas males expressed a greater interest than females in doing more mountain or trail biking (8.2%). Washingtonians with incomes of \$75,000 or more were the most likely to say they would like to do more bicycle riding (29.0%).

**Table 31: Preference for Bicycle Riding**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Bicycle Riding	24.2	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (27.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (21.3%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (31.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (19.2%), 65+ (14.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (29.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$25K-&lt;\$35K (17.4%), DK/REF (16.3%)</li> </ul>
Bicycle Touring	4.6	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (8.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall 2.9</li> </ul>
Bicycle Riding in General	27.1	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (40.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (21.9%), 65+ (12.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (35.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Bicycle Riding – Other	0.4	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Mountain/Trail Biking	6.6	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (8.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.9%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (1.0%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (3.3%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## ***Equestrian Activity***

Horseback riding in several settings was included on the survey questionnaire. During 2006, at least 7.5% of Washington residents participated in horseback riding (Table XX). Most residents participated at a location not specifically designated for picnicking activity (at least 4.3%). Considering all settings, Washingtonians rode horses over 2.2 million times during 2006.

**Table 32: 2006 Annual Estimates for Equestrian Activity**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Horseback riding	November	7.5	6.0	469,507	395,638	2,203,020	954,095
Stables or grounds	November	4.3	4.4	267,340	282,343	803,717	369,802
Roads or streets	February	2.8	3.7	173,766	234,283	366,096	339,374
Urban trail	November	2.9	4.3	183,052	276,659	190,026	181,004
Rural trail system	July	2.4	2.6	150,998	167,926	376,578	342,640
Mountain or forest trail	February	2.7	3.7	168,705	234,124	220,281	144,004
No established trails	April	2.9	3.2	181,637	205,649	237,905	106,414
Other	June	0.6	1.1	34,666	67,946	8,418	11,513

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, the age groups with the highest prevalence of horseback riding were children under 10 (9.0%) and tweens and teens (8.3%).

**Table 33: Significant Demographic Differences for Equestrian Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Horseback riding	4.3	1.1	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (9.0%), 10-19 (8.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (2.1%), 65+ (0.9%)
Stables or grounds	2.6	0.9	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (7.3), 10-19 (6.2); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (0.5), 65+ (0.0)
Roads or streets	0.8	0.4	• No significant differences
Urban trail	0.9	0.5	• No significant differences
Rural trail system	1.2	0.5	• No significant differences
Mountain or forest trail	1.1	0.5	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (0.4), Fall (0.4)
No established trails	1.4	0.6	• No significant differences
Other	0.1	0.1	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, nearly one-quarter of Washington residents wanted to do more horseback riding in general in the next 12 months (23.7%). This interest was more prevalent among females (27.0%) than among males. It was also more prevalent among children under 10 (30.7%) and tweens and teens (33.2%) than among older Washingtonians.

**Table 34: Preference for Equestrian Activity**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Equestrian Activities in General	23.7	2.6	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (27.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (20.4%) • AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (30.7%), 10-19 (33.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (18.4%), 65+ (7.7%)
Equestrian Activities – Other	3.9	1.1	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (7.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 10-19 (2.0%)

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Off-Road Vehicle Riding

Three categories of off-road vehicle riding—each one divided into settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were motorcycle, ATV or dune buggy, and 4-wheel drive riding. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was 4-wheel drive riding (at least 18.5%), doing it over 7.1 million times (Table XX). The most prevalent setting for 4-wheel drive riding was roads or streets (at least 10.7%), followed by mountain or forest trails (at least 9.5%) and by no established trails (at least 7.6%). At least 12.1 % of Washingtonians drove an ATV or dune buggy off-road, and at least 9.1% drove a motorcycle off-road.

**Table 35: 2006 Annual Estimates for Off-Road Vehicle Riding**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Motorcycle	June	9.1	6.5	574,828	429,610	1,795,840	617,017
Off-road vehicle facility	April	3.7	4.3	229,996	278,326	220,342	116,996
Roads/streets	May	5.7	7.1	360,399	463,273	492,940	268,363
Urban trail	April	2.9	4.0	182,590	257,981	209,828	161,797
Rural trail	February	4.4	4.1	276,094	262,806	238,951	173,997
Mountain/forest trail	January	3.4	3.2	215,476	204,743	284,872	179,900
No established trails	September	3.7	5.7	233,185	366,870	291,061	187,857
Other	June	4.0	5.5	253,488	357,606	57,847	49,992
ATV or dune buggy	September	12.1	7.5	760,241	502,104	2,625,465	768,856
Off-road vehicle facility	January	3.8	4.6	238,485	294,204	312,171	167,170
Roads/streets	October	3.2	3.0	201,791	192,474	179,721	127,460
Urban trail	April	3.0	4.1	189,136	261,733	184,959	124,299
Rural trail	April	3.3	4.1	210,755	262,711	355,404	159,020
Mountain/forest trail	September	4.8	3.7	302,728	233,743	559,414	228,483
No established trails	August	3.4	3.2	211,662	205,133	866,485	495,991
Other	August	2.5	3.3	157,511	210,698	167,311	124,830
4-wheel drive vehicle	January	18.5	7.9	1,159,995	545,119	7,141,456	1,835,469
Off-road vehicle facility	January	2.9	4.1	181,052	260,084	269,531	225,663
Roads/streets	October	10.7	6.3	672,400	419,143	4,238,159	1,328,437
Urban trail	October	2.2	3.3	141,390	211,586	177,471	112,385
Rural trail	October	4.9	4.5	309,887	290,057	549,888	241,335
Mountain/forest trail	October	9.5	5.5	594,744	359,891	1,234,262	402,268
No established trails	October	7.6	6.3	479,604	418,676	664,100	320,293
Other	April	0.4	0.8	25,253	49,495	8,045	9,024

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, 4-wheel drive riding was the most prevalent off-road vehicle activity (13.0%). Roads and streets are the most prevalent setting for recreational 4-wheel driving (6.5%), followed by mountain or forest trails (5.6%). The average month prevalence of ATV or dune buggy riding (7.3%) and of motorcycle riding (5.5%) follows that of 4-wheel driving.

Males are more likely than females to engage in off-road vehicle riding using motorcycles (7.9%) and ATVs or dune buggies (9.3%). Tweens and teens show a higher prevalence of ATV or dune buggy riding (13.8%) than other age groups. Motorcycle riding off-road is most prevalent among residents on the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas (13.0%), ATV or dune buggy riding off-road has the highest levels of participation among residents in the Palouse (18.4%) and Volcano Country (11.2%),

and 4-wheel drive riding off-road is most likely among residents on the Coast (25.1%) and in the Palouse (20.6%). Washingtonians with incomes of \$35,000 up to \$50,000 showed a higher prevalence of ATV or dune buggy riding on mountain or forest trails than those in other income ranges.

**Table 36: Significant Demographic Differences for Off-Road Vehicle Riding**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Motorcycle	5.5	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (7.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.2%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.5%), 65+ (1.8%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (13.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (1.9%)</li> </ul>
Off-road vehicle facility	1.3	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Roads/streets	1.9	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (0.3%), 65+ (0.4%)</li> </ul>
Urban trail	0.9	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Rural trail	1.4	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Mountain/forest trail	1.9	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (6.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (0.7%), Islands (0.2%), Seattle-King (0.1%)</li> </ul>
No established trails	1.4	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.6	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.0%)</li> </ul>
ATV or dune buggy	7.3	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (9.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.3%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (13.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.7%), 65+ (2.5%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Palouse (18.4%), Volcano Country (11.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (1.2%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (8.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (1.7%)</li> </ul>
Off-road vehicle facility	1.6	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.7%)</li> </ul>
Roads/streets	0.8	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.4%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (2.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (0.4%), Summer (0.2%)</li> </ul>
Urban trail	1.0	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Rural trail	2.1	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (0.4%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (0.6%), DK/REF (0.9%)</li> </ul>
Mountain/forest trail	2.6	0.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (0.9%), Seattle-King (0.4%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (5.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (0.6%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (1.1%), \$50K-&lt;\$75K (0.7%)</li> </ul>
No established trails	2.2	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (5.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (0.8%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Palouse (7.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (0.2%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.9	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.2%)</li> </ul>
4-wheel drive vehicle	13.0	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (8.5%), 65+ (5.5%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (25.1%), Palouse (20.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (8.2%)</li> </ul>
Off-road vehicle facility	1.1	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.4%), Fall (0.5%)</li> </ul>
Roads/streets	6.5	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (2.4%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Coast (11.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Volcano Country (4.2%)</li> </ul>
Urban trail	1.0	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Rural trail	2.4	0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Mountain/forest	5.6	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (10.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (1.0%)</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
trail			
No established trails	2.9	1.0	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (7.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (0.7%)
Other	0.1	0.1	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, Washington residents expressed the greatest interest in doing more ATV or dune buggy riding (15.0%) in the next 12 months. Lower levels of preference were shown for more 4-wheel drive riding (9.9%) and more motorcycle riding (8.3%). Males showed higher levels than females of preference for more off-road motorcycle (11.1%) and ATV or dune buggy riding (16.5%). Residents of ages from 10 to 34 showed the highest levels of interest in more motorcycle (14.5% of tweens and teens and 14.7% of residents 20 to 34) and 4-wheel drive riding (16.5% of tweens and teens and 20.3% of residents 20 to 34). Interest in more ATV or dune buggy riding was most prevalent among tweens and teens (24.4%) and residents age 35 to 49 (20.4%). The highest level of interest in more off-road vehicle riding in general was expressed by Washingtonians age 20 to 34 (12.3%).

**Table 37: Preference for Off-Road Vehicle Riding**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Motorcycle	8.3	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (11.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.6%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (14.5%), 20-34 (14.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (4.0%), 50-64 (5.2%), 65+ (1.6%)</li> </ul>
ATV or Dune Buggy	15.0	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (17.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (12.7%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (24.4%), 35-49 (20.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (9.4%), 50-64 (8.5%), 65+ (4.0%)</li> <li>• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (9.8%), Seattle-King (9.6%)</li> </ul>
4-Wheel Drive Vehicle	9.9	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (16.5%), 20-34 (20.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (4.6%), 65+ (1.9%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (28.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Off-Road Vehicle Riding in General	6.1	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (12.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (2.0%)</li> <li>• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (2.7%)</li> </ul>
Off-Road Vehicle Riding – Other	0.4	0.4	• No significant differences

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Camping

Six categories of camping—each one divided into types or settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were camping with a kayak or canoe, camping in a boat, backpacking at a primitive location, bicycle camping, tent camping with a car or motorcycle, and recreational vehicle camping. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was tent camping with a car or motorcycle (at least 24.6%), doing it over 1.1 million times (Table XX). The next most prevalent camping activity was recreational vehicle camping (at least 20.3%), which was

done about the same number of times as tent camping with a car or motorcycle. The most prevalent setting for tent camping with a car or motorcycle was campgrounds (at least 17.4%). With a prevalence of at least 10.2%, camping in a boat showed the third highest participation of Washingtonians.

**Table 38: 2006 Annual Estimates for Camping**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Peak Month</b>	<b>Pop. %*</b>	<b>± %</b>	<b>Pop. N*</b>	<b>± N</b>	<b>Activity N</b>	<b>± N</b>
Camping with a kayak or canoe	July	4.8	4.4	301,419	287,205	154,899	109,963
Site/location not specifically designated	September	3.0	5.7	185,362	363,310	44,379	40,371
State park/other site specifically designated	July	3.7	4.2	230,723	267,832	105,547	87,062
Other	October	0.9	1.9	59,670	116,953	4,972	9,746
Camping in a boat	September	10.2	8.7	639,927	588,244	267,685	143,823
On the open water	September	5.7	7.5	356,867	495,209	77,061	61,322
Site or location not specifically designated	September	1.9	2.7	118,292	173,641	33,162	30,575
State park or other site specifically designated for	September	6.3	7.6	392,856	503,132	117,235	86,686
In a marina	September	2.1	4.0	128,778	252,406	40,226	32,255
Other	NA	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Backpacking at a primitive location	October	8.3	5.8	521,021	380,508	382,221	216,483
Self carry packs	October	8.3	5.8	521,021	380,508	369,037	215,737
With pack animals	May	1.1	2.2	70,901	138,966	9,994	13,801
Other	September	0.6	1.2	38,280	75,029	3,190	6,252
Bicycle camping	September	5.4	7.3	336,081	481,192	98,572	61,642
Site or location not specifically designated	July	1.3	1.9	84,446	118,076	25,713	20,418
At a campground	August	4.9	7.3	211,662	205,133	72,859	56,599
Other	August	0.0	0.0	157,511	210,698	0	0
Tent camping with a car or motorcycle	July	24.6	9.3	1,548,265	700,654	1,128,516	377,330
Site/location not specifically designated	January	4.6	5.8	181,052	260,084	258,597	162,130
A campground	October	17.4	8.0	672,400	419,143	820,104	318,099
Other	October	2.3	3.2	141,390	211,586	49,814	58,454
Recreational vehicle camping	September	20.3	8.8	1,273,122	610,418	1,136,405	301,451
Site/location not specifically designated	October	4.3	3.2	309,887	290,057	411,385	220,870
Campground	October	13.2	7.7	594,744	359,891	685,655	195,068
Other	October	1.6	1.9	479,604	418,676	39,364	33,964

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types and settings, tent camping with a car or motorcycle and recreational vehicle camping were the most prevalent camping activities (8.8% and 7.6%, respectively). For both activities, campgrounds were the most prevalent setting (6.7% and 5.2%, respectively). Considering all types and settings, camping is more prevalent in summer than other seasons for all camping activities except backpacking at a primitive location. Males were more likely than females to participate in camping in a boat on the open water (1.2%) and in backpacking at a primitive location (4.0%). Recreational vehicle camping

was more prevalent among residents in Wine Country (14.1%) than in another other region.

**Table 39: Significant Demographic Differences for Camping**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Camping with a kayak or canoe	1.4	0.8	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (3.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.2%)
Site/location not specifically designated	0.5	0.5	• No significant differences
State park/other site specifically designated	0.9	0.6	• No significant differences
Other	0.1	0.2	• No significant differences
Camping in a boat	1.9	1.0	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (5.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.9%), Q4 (0.1%)
On the open water	0.7	0.7	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.2%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (2.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.2%), Fall (0.1%)
Site or location not specifically designated	0.4	0.3	• No significant differences
State park or other site specifically designated for	1.1	0.8	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (0.1%)
In a marina	0.5	0.5	• No significant differences
Other	0.0	0.0	• No significant differences
Backpacking at a primitive location	2.8	1.1	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (4.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.7%)
Self carry packs	2.5	1.0	• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (3.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.5%)
With pack animals	0.2	0.2	• No significant differences
Other	0.1	0.1	• No significant differences
Bicycle camping	1.1	0.8	• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (3.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.3%), Spring (0.1%), Fall (0.4%)
Site or location not specifically designated	0.2	0.2	• No significant differences
At a campground	0.7	0.7	• No significant differences
Other	0.0	0.0	• No significant differences
Tent camping with a car or motorcycle	8.8	1.8	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (13.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (4.4%), 65+ (0.9%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (21.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (3.5%), Spring (5.3%), Fall (5.1%)
Site/location not specifically designated	2.1	0.9	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (4.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (0.1%) • INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$50K-<\$75K (5.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$75K+ (0.4%)
A campground	6.7	1.6	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.3%), 65+ (0.8%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (16.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (3.4%), Spring (3.6%), Fall (3.8%)
Other	0.3	0.3	• No significant differences
Recreational vehicle camping	7.6	1.5	• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Wine Country (14.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (3.5%) • RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (8.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (1.9%) • SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (13.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (2.8%)
Site/location not specifically designated	1.9	0.6	• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (4.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (0.8%)



Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Campground	5.2	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Wine Country (10.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (2.1%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (8.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.8%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.3	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, one-third of Washington residents expressed the interest in doing more tent camping with a car or motorcycle (33.4%) in the next 12 months. Lower levels of preference were shown for more recreational vehicle camping (20.6%) and more camping in general (21.1%).

Males showed higher levels than females of preference for more backpacking at a primitive location (13.0%). Children under 10 and adults age 20 to 49 were interested in more tent camping with a car or motorcycle at higher levels than other age groups (44.9% of 0 to 9, 42.1% of 20 to 34, and 38.7% of 35 to 49). Tweens and teens had the highest prevalence of interest in more camping in general (30.3%). Adults age 20 to 34 were the most interested in doing more backpacking at a primitive location (22.4%). Washingtonians with incomes from \$15,000 up to \$25,000 showed more interest (32.4%) than those in any other income range to do more tent camping with a car or motorcycle. White Non-Hispanic residents were more interested (22.0%) than other race or ethnic groups in doing more RV camping.

**Table 40: Preference for Camping**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Camping with a Kayak or Canoe	4.9	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (20.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (8.5%), 65+ (1.5%)</li> </ul>
Camping in a Boat	5.3	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> DK/REF (10.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (1.3%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (2.9%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (8.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (2.3%)</li> </ul>
Backpacking at a Primitive Location	13.0	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (15.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (10.5%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 20-34 (22.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (7.0%), 65+ (3.2%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (18.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (8.7%), Summer (8.8%)</li> </ul>
Bicycle Camping	4.4	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (7.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (1.5%)</li> </ul>
Tent Camping with a Car or Motorcycle	33.4	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (44.9%), 20-34 (42.1%), 35-49 (38.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (23.1%), 65+ (8.9%)</li> </ul>
Recreational Vehicle Camping	20.6	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (15.5%), Seattle-King (15.3%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (22.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (9.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Winter (25.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (14.1%)</li> </ul>
Camping in General	21.1	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (30.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (16.7%), 65+ (10.8%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (32.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (16.5%)</li> </ul>
Camping – Other	4.6	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Hunting and Shooting

Two categories of hunting or shooting—each one divided into types—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were archery and firearms. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was firearms (at least 10.8%), doing it over 2.4 million times (Table XX). The most prevalent type of activity with firearms was target, trap, or black powder shooting (at least 7.9%), followed by hunting big game (at least 6.1%), hunting birds or small game (at least 3.4%) and by hunting waterfowl (at least 2.5%). At least 2.9 % of Washingtonians engaged in archery, nearly all of it target shooting.

**Table 41: 2006 Annual Estimates for Hunting/Shooting**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Archery	August	2.9	4.6	184,637	295,867	470,024	297,795
Target shooting	August	2.9	4.6	184,637	295,867	444,448	285,291
Hunting	September	0.5	0.7	32,759	45,517	25,576	35,140
Other	NA	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Firearms	October	10.8	5.6	677,474	368,521	2,431,192	721,092
Target/trap/black powder shooting	May	7.9	7.4	496,072	485,488	1,309,180	415,889
Hunting waterfowl	November	2.5	2.6	156,729	163,772	172,810	105,286
Hunting birds or small game	October	3.4	2.9	216,830	186,186	318,861	138,714
Hunting big game	October	6.1	4.1	383,840	263,738	620,396	349,055
Other	April	0.2	0.4	13,854	27,155	9,945	12,641

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, in an average month in 2006, considering all types, activity with firearms was the most prevalent hunting or shooting activity (6.7%), most of it target, trap, or black power shooting (5.5%). Males were more likely than females to engage in nearly all types of hunting and shooting activity. Hunting waterfowl with firearms was more prevalent in fall (1.9%) than in any other season. Firearms activity of any type was more prevalent in the Columbia River Plateau (12.9%), the Rocky Mountain Gateway (11.1%), and Wine Country (12.3%) than in other regions.

**Table 42: Significant Demographic Differences for Camping**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Archery	1.4	0.7	• GENDER: >avg Male (2.6%); <avg Female (0.3%)
Target shooting	1.4	0.7	• GENDER: >avg Male (2.6%); <avg Female (0.3%)
Hunting	0.1	0.1	• No significant differences
Other	0.0	0.0	• No significant differences
Firearms	6.7	1.4	• GENDER: >avg Male (11.4%); <avg Female (2.1%) • REGION: >avg Columbia Riv Plat (12.9%), Rocky Mt Gateway (11.1%), Wine Country (12.3%); <avg Seattle-King (3.7%)
Target/trap/black powder shooting	5.5	1.3	• GENDER: >avg Male (9.5%); <avg Female (1.5%)

Hunting waterfowl	0.8	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.1%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (1.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.1%)</li> </ul>
Hunting birds or small game	1.6	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.4%)</li> </ul>
Hunting big game	1.6	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, Washington residents expressed the greatest interest in doing more firearms activity of any type (11.2%) and for more hunting and shooting in general (9.7%) in the next 12 months. Males were more likely than females to express an interest in doing more of all hunting or shooting activities on the questionnaire. Washingtonians in the Columbia River Plateau (18.4%) and in the Palouse (18.1%) showed the higher levels of interested in doing more firearms activity of any type than those in other regions. Residents in the Rocky Mountain Gateway had the largest prevalence of interest in doing more hunting and shooting in general (15.6%).

**Table 43: Preference for Hunting/Shooting**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Archery	4.0	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.6%), <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.5%)</li> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (17.7%), <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.7%)</li> </ul>
Firearms	11.2	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (4.6%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (18.4%), Palouse (18.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (6.2%)</li> </ul>
Hunting and Shooting in General	9.7	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (15.3%), <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.2%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (3.0%), 65+ (6.2%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Rocky Mt Gateway (15.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Seattle-King (6.1%)</li> </ul>
Hunting or Shooting – Other	0.4	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (0.6%), <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.1%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Exercise and Sports

Nineteen categories of exercise and sports activities—most divided into types or settings—were included on the survey questionnaire. The main categories were playground for recreation, aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility, weight conditioning with equipment at a facility, jogging or running, swimming, roller or in-line skating, skateboarding, badminton, court games, volleyball, basketball, tennis, football, rugby, lacrosse, soccer, baseball, softball, and golf. The category that the most Washington residents participated in during 2006 was swimming (at least 52.0%), doing it over 7.5 million times (Table XX). The next most prevalent exercise or sports activity was playground activity for recreation (at least 42.6%). Jogging or running and recreation on playgrounds were the most frequently performed activities in 2006 (both over 22 million times). The most prevalent setting for swimming was in an outdoor pool

(at least 40.8%), and the most prevalent setting for playground recreation was at a park facility (38.0%).

**Table 44: 2006 Annual Estimates for Exercise and Sports**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Peak Month</b>	<b>Pop. %*</b>	<b>± %</b>	<b>Pop. N*</b>	<b>± N</b>	<b>Activity N</b>	<b>± N</b>
Playground for recreation	June	42.6	10.6	2,677,139	900,686	22,314,788	3,029,188
Park facility	July	38.0	9.8	2,390,268	839,305	9,748,570	1,530,919
School facility	June	33.4	10.4	2,098,073	822,324	12,199,962	2,106,568
Other	January	2.2	3.1	139,864	199,515	366,256	345,398
Aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility	May	34.8	13.0	2,183,204	1,085,696	15,451,485	2,132,398
Weight conditioning with equipment at a facility	March	26.7	9.2	1,676,998	674,971	11,130,273	1,732,797
Jogging or running	July	37.0	9.4	2,324,377	754,403	22,666,715	3,510,030
Streets/sidewalks	July	26.8	8.9	1,684,505	664,837	11,621,769	2,136,433
On a trail	July	17.5	8.1	1,099,247	567,750	5,086,921	1,198,704
On an outdoor track	May	10.4	7.6	653,963	501,646	2,381,575	668,017
On an indoor track	July	9.8	7.0	619,136	469,834	2,407,426	1,009,060
Other	December	2.5	2.8	154,872	175,828	1,169,024	564,346
Swimming	August	52.0	10.1	3,277,856	947,997	7,557,583	1,131,793
Indoors	April	24.2	9.0	1,525,401	681,207	3,874,681	717,167
Outdoors	August	40.8	10.2	2,571,950	848,375	3,682,165	837,655
Other	April	0.0	0.1	2,950	5,782	738	1,446
Roller or in-line skating	May	12.8	9.1	800,787	619,297	1,811,010	680,069
Roads, sidewalks, other places	March	6.2	5.6	391,249	367,045	1,033,483	510,888
Trail or at an outdoor facility	September	7.8	9.0	486,879	599,603	399,569	285,003
Indoor facility	May	6.4	5.5	399,204	355,684	371,935	149,499
Other	December	1.0	1.9	62,636	122,766	6,022	10,351
Skateboarding	January	7.2	5.7	449,856	369,445	2,593,993	1,338,226
Roads/sidewalks, or places not specifically designated	January	6.7	5.6	420,490	367,850	1,855,523	794,556
Trail specifically designated	July	0.8	1.7	53,220	104,311	91,945	74,478
Skate park or court	February	2.6	3.3	165,369	209,986	646,525	656,904
Other	NA	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Badminton	July	9.4	6.4	590,308	430,464	581,313	374,020
Outdoor facility	July	7.5	5.5	470,214	361,709	424,201	316,875
Indoor facility	September	3.8	7.2	236,608	463,752	144,955	198,739
Other	July	1.9	3.7	120,094	235,383	12,157	20,063
Handball, racquetball, squash	June	6.4	5.6	400,790	363,774	1,298,417	807,927
Outdoor facility	June	3.8	4.1	241,144	261,329	565,261	625,018
Indoor facility	January	5.7	5.5	359,934	360,182	733,155	350,255
Other	NA	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Volleyball	July	14.6	7.7	918,282	536,804	1,967,905	843,556
Outdoor facility	July	10.3	6.2	648,867	413,292	774,104	460,826
Indoor facility	September	6.3	7.5	394,101	495,045	1,191,204	525,511
Other	July	0.1	0.3	8,386	16,436	2,597	3,681
Basketball	April	24.5	8.6	1,541,914	638,554	7,143,571	1,419,511
Outdoor facility	April	20.2	8.3	1,274,076	599,822	4,062,799	907,956

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Peak Month</b>	<b>Pop. %*</b>	<b>± %</b>	<b>Pop. N*</b>	<b>± N</b>	<b>Activity N</b>	<b>± N</b>
Indoor facility	April	14.1	7.5	884,795	517,418	2,976,749	831,052
Other	January	1.1	2.2	71,492	140,124	104,022	176,637
Tennis	September	13.8	9.4	864,934	651,387	1,266,627	448,923
Outdoor facility	September	13.8	9.4	864,934	651,387	1,051,200	408,221
Indoor facility	July	1.3	2.5	82,220	161,150	215,428	142,053
Other	NA	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Football	September	12.9	7.0	811,194	463,859	2,502,538	778,944
Rugby	November	1.0	1.6	65,710	98,388	47,816	49,420
Lacrosse	August	2.2	4.2	136,829	268,186	178,167	193,712
Soccer	April	18.2	9.2	1,145,621	571,236	4,725,766	1,049,024
Indoors	April	7.0	5.8	439,336	382,325	759,370	431,065
Outdoors	May	18.2	9.2	1,141,884	626,032	3,966,396	915,262
Other	NA	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Baseball	July	16.4	8.0	1,028,347	564,908	3,250,102	959,998
Softball	July	11.7	6.9	733,755	468,171	1,546,493	527,967
Golf	August	19.7	8.7	1,240,144	619,188	3,171,728	930,926
Driving range	June	10.5	6.8	662,031	454,771	1,082,991	396,788
Pitch-n-putt course	July	3.6	3.9	228,181	248,082	119,073	73,728
9- or 18-hole course	August	13.3	7.2	838,859	487,269	1,797,829	608,745
Other	August	2.9	3.7	182,970	237,588	171,834	146,488

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

As shown in Table XX, considering all types and settings, playground recreation (34.3%) and jogging or running (29.7%) were the most prevalent exercise or sports activities in the average month in 2006. Aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility (24.9%) and swimming (23.1%) were the next more prevalent.

Females were more likely than males to participate in playground recreation (37.4%) and aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility (30.2%). Males were more likely than females to participate in skateboarding (6.3%), basketball (21.6%), tennis (7.3%), football (11.0%), baseball (13.7%), and golf (14.5%).

Children under 10 and tweens and teens were more likely than older Washingtonians to participate in playground recreation, jogging or running, swimming, basketball, soccer, and baseball. Tweens and teens were more likely than any other age group to participate in baseball, roller or in-line skating, court games, volleyball, football, and softball. Adults age 20 to 35 were the most likely Washington residents to participating in weight conditioning with equipment at a facility.

Non-White Non-Hispanic residents went jogging or running at a higher rate (44.1%) than other residents. Basketball at an outdoor facility had a higher prevalence among Hispanic residents (26.7%) than among others. White Non-Hispanic residents participated in golf at a higher rate (10.7%) than other Washingtonians.

Washingtonians with incomes of \$75,000 or more showed higher rates than other income ranges of participation in playground recreation, aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility, weight conditioning with equipment at a facility, jogging or running, swimming, court games, soccer, and golf. People with incomes of \$50,000 up to

\$75,000 participated in badminton at an outdoor facility at a higher rate than those in other income ranges.

Residents in Seattle-King County participated in aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility and in swimming at indoor pool facilities at higher rates than those in other regions. Those in Wine County showed the highest prevalence of volleyball at an outdoor facility.

Playground recreation at school facilities and basketball in outdoor facilities had the highest prevalence in spring. Softball saw the highest level of participation in spring and summer. In summer, baseball and activities in outdoor facilities including swimming, badminton, volleyball, and tennis were at their highest prevalence in 2006.

**Table 45: Significant Demographic Differences for Exercise/Sports**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Playground for recreation	34.3	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (37.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (31.2%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (88.0%), 10-19 (51.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (25.8%), 50-64 (13.3%), 65+ (2.7%)</li> <li>• RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (32.6%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (42.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (27.0%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (28.0%)</li> </ul>
Park facility	29.0	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (74.1%), 10-19 (38.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (23.7%), 50-64 (10.8%), 65+ (1.7%)</li> <li>• RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> DK/REF (54.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (27.3%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (35.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (23.9%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (20.8%)</li> </ul>
School facility	22.0	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (24.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (19.4%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (60.2%), 10-19 (40.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (15.6%), 35-49 (16.3%), 50-64 (6.2%), 65+ (1.1%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (30.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (8.8%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (28.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Other	0.6	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility	24.9	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (30.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (19.5%)</li> <li>• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (33.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (14.7%), Columbia Riv Plat (15.6%), Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (15.9%), Palouse (17.0%), Rocky Mt Gateway (19.0%), Wine Country (13.4%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (32.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (9.0%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (13.3%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (16.4%), DK/REF (16.6%)</li> </ul>
Weight conditioning with equipment at a facility	18.2	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (26.0%), 20-34 (27.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.5%), 65+ (11.0%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (24.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (6.7%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (9.6%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (11.3%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (13.5%)</li> </ul>
Jogging or running	29.7	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (37.1%), 10-19 (62.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (24.4%), 50-64 (17.3%), 65+ (11.5%)</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (44.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (27.7%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (39.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (16.8%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (21.9%)</li> </ul>
Streets/sidewalks	18.7	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (37.8%), 20-34 (26.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (11.7%), 65+ (5.8%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (29.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (26.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (9.4%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (11.4%)</li> </ul>
On a trail	11.7	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (6.8%), 65+ (5.7%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (21.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (10.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (18.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (5.6%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (5.6%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (5.8%)</li> </ul>
On an outdoor track	6.5	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (23.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (2.5%), 65+ (1.4%)</li> </ul>
On an indoor track	4.5	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (11.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (2.1%), 50-64 (1.8%), 65+ (1.4%)</li> </ul>
Other	1.5	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Swimming	23.1	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (40.8%), 10-19 (39.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (12.8%), 65+ (11.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (29.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (11.2%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (38.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (14.7%), Fall (15.6%)</li> </ul>
Indoors	14.9	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (25.2%), 10-19 (24.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (9.4%), 65+ (6.7%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (19.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Columbia Riv Plat (6.8%), Volcano Country (10.4%)</li> </ul>
Outdoors	11.0	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (20.9%), 10-19 (19.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (4.6%), 65+ (5.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (30.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.7%), Fall (2.6%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Roller or in-line skating	6.9	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (14.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (2.5%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> </ul>
Roads, sidewalks, other places	2.9	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Trail or at an outdoor facility	1.9	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.3%), Fall (0.8%)</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	3.5	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (0.6%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.1	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Skateboarding	4.3	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.3%)</li> </ul>
Roads/sidewalks, or places not specifically designated	3.8	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (5.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.2%)</li> </ul>
Trail specifically designated	0.3	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Skate park or court	1.3	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (2.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.3%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Badminton	2.8	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> \$25K-&lt;\$35K (0.8%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (0.9%), DK/REF (0.7%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (6.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.8%),</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
			Fall (0.8%)
Outdoor facility	1.9	0.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (0.4%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (4.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$25K-&lt;\$35K (0.3%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (0.9%), DK/REF (0.7%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (4.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.4%), Fall (0.4%)</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	0.6	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.2	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Handball, racquetball, squash	4.1	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (15.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (2.3%), 50-64 (1.8%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (7.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (0.6%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (1.4%), DK/REF (1.7%)</li> </ul>
Outdoor facility	1.1	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	2.9	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (8.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (1.2%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (5.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (0.6%), DK/REF (1.0%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Volleyball	7.0	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (20.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (1.3%), 65+ (1.4%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (10.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (2.9%)</li> </ul>
Outdoor facility	3.7	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (0.8%), 65+ (0.9%)</li> <li>• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Wine Country (9.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (1.3%), Palouse (1.4%), Volcano Country (1.6%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (7.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.6%), Fall (0.8%)</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	3.7	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (16.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.7%), 50-64 (0.5%), 65+ (0.5%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Basketball	16.8	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (21.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (12.0%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (25.2%), 10-19 (46.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (5.7%), 65+ (1.5%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (11.3%)</li> </ul>
Outdoor facility	13.0	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (16.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (9.3%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (36.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (2.9%), 65+ (1.5%)</li> <li>• RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Hispanic (26.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (12.0%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (17.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (6.6%)</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	7.5	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (9.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.4%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (23.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.3%), 65+ (0.2%)</li> <li>• RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Other	0.1	0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant differences</li> </ul>
Tennis	5.4	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (7.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.6%)</li> <li>• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Palouse (2.5%), Volcano Country (2.6%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (11.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (1.5%)</li> </ul>
Outdoor facility	5.1	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.3%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (2.0%)</li> <li>• REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Palouse (1.6%), Volcano Country (2.1%)</li> </ul>



Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (11.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (3.1%), Fall (0.9%)</li> </ul>
Indoor facility	0.7	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Football	7.1	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (11.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.3%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (24.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (3.0%), 50-64 (0.6%), 65+ (0.4%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Volcano Country (3.9%)</li> </ul>
Rugby	0.3	0.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Lacrosse	0.7	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Soccer	13.2	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (34.8%), 10-19 (37.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (5.8%), 35-49 (8.5%), 50-64 (2.1%), 65+ (0.2%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (21.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$25K-&lt;\$35K (7.1%), \$35K-&lt;\$50K (8.4%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (7.3%)</li> </ul>
Indoors	2.5	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (8.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (1.2%), 50-64 (0.2%), 65+ (0.0%)</li> </ul>
Outdoors	11.7	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (29.9%), 10-19 (34.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (4.4%), 35-49 (7.9%), 50-64 (2.1%), 65+ (0.2%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (19.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (6.3%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (6.3%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.0	0.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Baseball	9.7	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (13.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.7%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (22.3%), 10-19 (19.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (0.9%), 65+ (0.8%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (14.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (6.4%), Fall (4.8%)</li> </ul>
Softball	5.7	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (14.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (1.7%), 65+ (1.0%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (9.2%), Summer (8.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (1.4%), Fall (3.5%)</li> </ul>
Golf	9.8	1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (14.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.1%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (10.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (4.3%), Hisp (3.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (14.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (15.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (6.4%), Fall (7.2%)</li> </ul>
Driving range	5.4	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (8.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (1.8%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (9.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$50K-&lt;\$75K (3.2%), DK/REF (3.2%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (9.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (2.7%)</li> </ul>
Pitch-n-putt course	1.2	0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (1.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (0.6%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (3.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (0.5%), Fall (0.6%)</li> </ul>
9- or 18-hole course	7.5	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (11.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (4.0%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (10.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (0.3%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (3.5%)</li> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Summer (12.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Winter (4.9%)</li> </ul>
Other	0.6	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, Washington residents expressed the greatest interest in doing more swimming in a pool (19.6%) in the next 12 months. At the next highest prevalence levels came interest in more jogging or running (13.8%), golf (12.3%), aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility (12.2%), weight conditioning at a facility (10.3%), playground recreation (9.8%), soccer (8.7%), and basketball (8.0%).

Males were more likely than females to express an interest in doing more basketball (10.3%) and golf (15.5%). Females showed higher levels of interest than males in doing more playground recreation (11.9%), aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility (16.2%), and swimming in a pool (25.7%).

Parents of children under 10 indicated the highest level of interest in their child doing more playground recreation (25.2%), swimming in a pool (27.9%), soccer (23.6%), and baseball (13.3%, along with 12.3% of tweens and teens), and other exercise or sports (10.6%). Tweens and teens expressed higher prevalence of interest than other age groups in doing more skateboarding (10.1%), basketball (19.8%), tennis (10.5%), and football (8.2%, along with 8.1% of adults age 20 to 35). Adults age 35 to 49 expressed the highest level of interest in doing more weight conditioning with equipment in a facility (15.0%) and in more jogging or running (18.4%).

Non-White Non-Hispanic Washingtonians expressed a higher level of interest than others in doing more jogging or running (25.8%). Washington residents with incomes of \$75,000 or more had the highest percentages of interest in jogging or running (20.3%), roller or in-line skating (7.3%), skateboarding (7.3%), tennis (8.1%), soccer (13.3%), and golf (17.7%). Residents in Seattle-King County had the highest level of interest in doing more jogging or running (19.3%), whereas those in Wine County expressed a higher interest than those in other regions in playing more basketball (18.2%).

**Table 46: Preference for Exercise/Sports**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Playground Activities, such as Using Swings or Slides	9.8	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (11.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (7.7%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (25.2%), 20-34 (15.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (2.6%), 65+ (1.7%)</li> </ul>
Aerobics or Other Fitness Activities at a Facility	12.2	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (16.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (8.3%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (6.8%), Palouse (7.9%), Rocky Mt Gateway (6.9%), Wine Country (7.0%)</li> </ul>
Weight Conditioning with Equipment at a Facility	10.3	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (15.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.3%), 65+ (4.7%)</li> </ul>
Jogging or Running	13.8	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 35-49 (18.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (7.4%), 50-64 (10.2%), 65+ (5.1%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Seattle-King (19.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (7.6%), Olympic &amp; Kitsap Pen (8.2%), Volcano Country (9.1%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: <b>&gt;avg</b> Non-White Non-Hisp (25.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> White Non-Hisp (12.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (20.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b></li> </ul>
Swimming in a Pool	19.6	2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (25.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (13.6%)</li> </ul>

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (27.9%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (14.3%), 65+ (14.0%)</li> </ul>
Roller or In-Line Skating	4.5	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (7.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (2.0%), \$15K-&lt;\$25K (1.9%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (1.1%)</li> </ul>
Skateboarding	1.7	0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (10.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.2%), 35-49 (0.3%), 50-64 (0.4%), 65+ (0.3%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (7.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (0.4%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (0.4%)</li> </ul>
Badminton	2.8	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Court Games like Handball, Racquetball, and Squash	3.2	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (0.3%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> </ul>
Volleyball	5.5	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (11.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.0%), 65+ (0.8%)</li> </ul>
Basketball	8.0	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (10.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (5.6%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (19.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.7%), 65+ (1.0%)</li> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> Wine Country (18.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (4.2%)</li> </ul>
Tennis	5.3	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (10.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (1.1%), 65+ (2.4%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (8.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (2.1%), \$25K-&lt;\$35K (1.7%)</li> </ul>
Football	4.1	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (6.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (2.0%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 10-19 (8.2%), 20-34 (8.1%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (1.1%), 65+ (0.3%)</li> </ul>
Rugby	0.4	0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences</li> </ul>
Lacrosse	0.7	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Spring (1.8%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Summer (0.1%), Fall (0.2%)</li> </ul>
Soccer	8.7	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (23.6%), 10-19 (16.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (4.6%), 50-64 (1.8%), 65+ (0.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (13.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> \$15K-&lt;\$25K (1.9%)</li> </ul>
Baseball	6.8	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (10.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (3.5%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (13.3%), 10-19 (12.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 50-64 (3.4%), 65+ (0.7%)</li> </ul>
Softball	5.1	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REGION: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Coast (2.1%), Seattle-King (2.4%)</li> </ul>
Golf	12.3	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Male (15.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Female (9.1%)</li> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (3.9%)</li> <li>INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> \$75K+ (17.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (2.2%)</li> </ul>
Exercise/Sports in General	5.0	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (1.3%)</li> </ul>
Exercise/Sports – Other	5.6	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (10.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 20-34 (2.9%), 65+ (3.6%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## Indoor Community Facility Activities

Four categories of recreational activity at indoor community facilities were included on the survey questionnaire. The categories included activity centers, arts and crafts classes or activities, classes or instruction, and social events. During 2006, the greatest percentage of Washington residents (at least 39.1%) participated in a social event (Table XX). The indoor community facility activity that Washingtonians participated in the most frequently (nearly 6.2 million times) was visiting an activity center.

**Table 47: 2006 Annual Estimates for Indoor Community Facility Activities**

Activity	Peak Month	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N	Activity N	± N
Activity center	April	17.5	8.4	1,099,834	600,435	6,194,612	1,530,477
Arts and crafts class or activity	October	9.1	5.7	573,861	375,939	1,388,308	535,566
Class or instruction	June	19.8	8.9	1,246,097	632,648	5,409,056	1,328,038
Social event	December	39.1	9.0	2,460,898	725,266	5,109,892	647,190

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

In an average month in 2006, 30.9% of Washington residents went to a social event at an indoor community facility. Females were more likely than males to have participated in all categories of indoor community facility activity. Children under 10 were the most likely to have visited an activity center (24.8%), and Washingtonians under 20 showed the highest prevalence of participation in a class or instruction at an indoor community facility (29.4% of children under 10 and 20.8% of tweens and teens). Washingtonians age 50 and older were the mostly likely to have gone to a social event at an indoor community facility (36.2% of those 50 to 64 years and 38.0% of those 65 or older). Washington residents with income of \$75,000 or more were the most likely to have gone to an indoor community facility for an arts and crafts class or activity, a class or instruction, or a social event.

**Table 48: Significant Demographic Differences for Indoor Community Facility Activities**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Activity center	11.5	1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: &gt;avg Female (14.3%); &lt;avg Male (8.7%)</li> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 0-9 (24.8%); &lt;avg 50-64 (4.8%)</li> <li>RACE/ETHNICITY: &gt;avg NS; &lt;avg NS</li> </ul>
Arts and crafts class or activity	5.3	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: &gt;avg Female (6.8%); &lt;avg Male (3.8%)</li> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 0-9 (12.2%); &lt;avg 20-34 (2.5%)</li> <li>INCOME: &gt;avg \$75K+ (7.4%); &lt;avg \$15K-&lt;\$25K (1.1%), DK/REF (2.4%)</li> </ul>
Class or instruction	13.3	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: &gt;avg Female (18.3%); &lt;avg Male (8.2%)</li> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 0-9 (29.4%), 10-19 (20.8%); &lt;avg 35-49 (8.0%), 50-64 (7.8%), 65+ (8.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: &gt;avg \$75K+ (17.7%); &lt;avg \$50K-&lt;\$75K (9.4%)</li> </ul>
Social event	30.9	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GENDER: &gt;avg Female (35.4%); &lt;avg Male (26.4%)</li> <li>AGE: &gt;avg 50-64 (36.2%), 65+ (38.0%); &lt;avg 0-9 (21.6%)</li> <li>INCOME: &gt;avg \$75K+ (35.7%); &lt;avg &lt;\$15K (12.7%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

On average in 2006, 24.3% Washington residents wanted to attend a social event at an indoor community facility more in the next 12 months (Table XX). Females expressed this desire more frequently than males for arts and crafts class or activity (10.9%), class or instruction (22.5%), and for social events (27.2%). Parents of children under 10 expressed the highest level of interest for the child attending arts and crafts classes or activities more (17.4%) and more attendance at classes or instruction (26.6%). Washington residents age 50 to 64 indicated the highest level of interest for attending social events more (31.3%), and those age 65 or older expressed the greatest level of interest in attending activity centers more (12.0%). Washingtonians with incomes less than \$15,000 had the highest level of interest in more attending arts and crafts classes or activities (25.0%) more in the next 12 months.

**Table 49: Preference for Indoor Community Facility Activities**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Significant Differences (p < .05)**
Activity Center	5.0	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 65+ (12.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 35-49 (2.3%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> \$35K-&lt;\$50K (3.1%)</li> </ul>
Arts and Crafts Class or Activity	10.9	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (15.7%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (6.1%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (17.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (6.2%)</li> <li>• INCOME: <b>&gt;avg</b> &lt;\$15K (25.0%); <b>&lt;avg</b> DK/REF (5.0%)</li> </ul>
Class or Instruction	17.0	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (22.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (11.4%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 0-9 (26.6%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 65+ (11.7%)</li> </ul>
Social Event	24.3	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENDER: <b>&gt;avg</b> Female (27.2%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Male (21.4%)</li> <li>• AGE: <b>&gt;avg</b> 50-64 (31.3%); <b>&lt;avg</b> 0-9 (12.2%)</li> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (29.4%); <b>&lt;avg</b> NS</li> </ul>
Indoor Community Facility Activities in General	5.8	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> NS; <b>&lt;avg</b> Fall (1.1%)</li> </ul>
Indoor Community Facilities – Other	3.4	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEASON: <b>&gt;avg</b> Fall (9.5%); <b>&lt;avg</b> Spring (2.7%)</li> </ul>

\* Monthly average in 2006

\*\* Pearson chi-square test; group differences indicated for standardized residuals > 2 ("NS" = not significant or insufficient expected cell frequencies for test)

## 2006 Activity Rankings

Because outdoor recreation activities were measured on several dimensions, there is more than one way to rank the activities performed by Washington residents in 2006. Table XX shows the top 20 activities ranked by peak month prevalence. This is the best estimate from the current survey of the prevalence of participation in the activity among Washington residents. In 2006, picnicking was the most prevalent peak month activity.

**Table 50: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Peak Month Prevalence**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout	78.4	7.0	4,927,720	1,071,600
Walking without a pet	67.2	9.8	4,224,902	1,083,286
Swimming or wading at a beach	58.4	9.1	3,675,934	973,508
Sightseeing	57.7	10.0	3,635,404	953,693
Flower or vegetable gardening	52.9	10.6	3,327,473	911,012
Swimming in a pool	52.0	10.1	3,277,856	947,997
Walking with a pet	47.4	10.4	2,980,256	954,741
Playground recreation	42.6	10.6	2,677,139	900,686
Bicycle riding	41.6	9.6	2,618,693	807,427
Social event	39.1	9.0	2,460,898	725,266
Observing or photographing wildlife or nature	39.0	8.9	2,453,243	714,497
Jogging or running	37.0	9.4	2,324,377	754,403
Aerobics or fitness activities at a facility	34.8	13.0	2,183,204	1,085,696
Beachcombing	34.0	9.0	2,136,092	680,029
Sledding, inner tubing, other snow play	31.8	9.1	2,003,681	727,453
Hiking	30.9	9.1	1,942,715	693,370
Motor boating	26.7	9.1	1,676,747	686,082
Weight conditioning at a facility	26.7	9.2	1,676,998	674,971
Camping with a car or motorcycle	24.6	9.3	1,548,265	700,654
Basketball	24.5	8.6	1,541,914	638,554

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

Another way to rank activities is by prevalence in the average month in 2006. This measure evens out the variation of prevalence in the monthly samples and gives a sense of the relative level of the activity among Washington residents for the year as a whole. Table XX shows the top 20 activities ranked by prevalence in the average month. In 2006, walking without a pet was the most prevalent activity in the average month.

**Table 51: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Average Month Prevalence**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N
Walking without a pet	55.2	2.9	3,473,870	211,925
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout	48.5	2.9	3,050,969	219,437
Sightseeing	42.7	2.9	2,686,008	199,168
Walking with a pet	36.4	2.8	2,290,621	197,488
Playground recreation	34.3	2.9	2,157,113	207,155
Bicycle riding	32.6	2.9	2,049,743	203,620
Flower or vegetable gardening	32.1	2.7	2,020,627	175,769
Observing or photographing wildlife or nature	31.2	2.7	1,961,441	171,944

Social event	30.9	2.7	1,942,400	180,175
Jogging or running	29.7	2.7	1,869,554	186,576
Aerobics or fitness activities at a facility	24.9	2.6	1,562,726	177,519
Swimming in a pool	23.1	2.6	1,452,095	172,217
Hiking	20.5	2.4	1,288,746	155,902
Beachcombing	19.9	2.4	1,250,857	154,484
Swimming or wading at a beach	18.6	2.3	1,169,260	152,685
Weight conditioning at a facility	18.2	2.3	1,146,819	147,094
Basketball	16.8	2.2	1,058,079	147,109
Gathering or collecting things in nature setting	16.2	2.2	1,018,397	139,733
Class or instruction	13.3	2.1	833,466	132,370
Soccer	13.2	2.1	826,925	138,917

\* Monthly average in 2006

A third way to look at the activities that Washington residents participated in during 2006 is to count the number of times that an individual member of the population did the activity. Table XX shows the top 20 activities ranked by number of times the activity was done in 2006. Walking without a pet was the most frequently performed recreation activity in 2006.

**Table 52: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Activity Frequency**

Activity	Activity N	± N
Walking without a pet	3,473,870	211,925
Observing or photographing wildlife or nature	3,050,969	219,437
Walking with a pet	2,686,008	199,168
Jogging or running	2,290,621	197,488
Playground recreation	2,157,113	207,155
Bicycle riding	2,049,743	203,620
Flower or vegetable gardening	2,020,627	175,769
Aerobics or other fitness activity at a facility	1,961,441	171,944
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout	1,942,400	180,175
Sightseeing	1,869,554	186,576
Weight conditioning with equipment at a facility	1,562,726	177,519
Hiking	1,452,095	172,217
Swimming	1,288,746	155,902
Gathering or collecting things in nature setting	1,250,857	154,484
Basketball	1,169,260	152,685
4-wheel drive vehicle	1,146,819	147,094
Activity center	1,058,079	147,109
Class or instruction	1,018,397	139,733
Swimming or wading at a beach	833,466	132,370
Social event	826,925	138,917

Finally, the desire of Washington residents to participate in activities over the next 12 months was measured to provide a sense of current preference for those activities. Table XX shows the top 20 activities ranked by the prevalence of expressed desire to do more of the activity over the 12 months following the survey interview. The greatest percentage of Washingtonians mentioned sightseeing in general as the activity they would like to do more of in the coming 12 months.

**Table 53: Top 20 Recreation Activities in 2006, Ranked by Preference**

Activity	Pop. %*	± %	Pop. N*	± N
Sightseeing – in general	46.9	2.9	2,949,926	213,492
Picnicking – in general	39.4	2.9	2,477,534	200,310
Hiking	33.5	2.8	2,107,998	185,325
Tent camping with a car or motorcycle	33.4	2.9	2,097,926	205,270
Swimming or wading at beach	28.4	2.6	1,787,702	176,047
Bicycle riding – in general	27.1	2.7	1,704,440	186,186
Sightseeing – specific type	26.9	2.6	1,690,110	170,502
Observing or photographing wildlife or nature	25.8	2.5	1,620,123	162,857
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout – location not specifically designated	25.7	2.6	1,619,010	173,482
Walking and hiking – in general	25.6	2.6	1,612,803	173,879
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout – site specifically designated	25.6	2.7	1,608,425	182,823
Flower or vegetable gardening	25.2	2.6	1,587,547	171,201
Walking without a pet	24.3	2.4	1,530,646	155,096
Social event	24.3	2.5	1,527,571	160,432
Bicycle riding	24.2	2.6	1,520,895	174,869
Skiing	23.9	2.5	1,505,184	169,189
Equestrian activities – in general	23.7	2.6	1,491,527	172,002
Motor boating	23.6	2.5	1,482,841	162,571
Beachcombing	21.6	2.4	1,359,408	159,328
Camping – in general	21.1	2.4	1,326,929	162,036

\* Monthly average in 2006

### ***Comparison of 2002 and 2006 Survey Results***

One of the goals of the 2006 survey was to assess changes in the prevalence of outdoor recreation activity since the previous survey, conducted in 1999–2000 and reported in 2002. This proved challenging for a couple of important reasons. First, the sample designs were significantly different. The 1999–2000 survey used a longitudinal sample, with data collected from a single set of individuals at three-month intervals over the course of the 12-month field period. The present study used a repeated cross-sectional design, in which 12 independent samples were produced, one for each month during the yearlong field period. The 2006 design was chosen to eliminate the problem of participant attrition and to shorten the period of time the respondent was asked to report about, thereby easing the recall process and improving the quality of the collected data. However, the repeated cross-sectional design made it difficult to produce estimates of annual participation directly comparable to those reported in 2002.

Second, the mode of data collection changed from a self-administered form in 1999–2000 to a telephone survey interview in 2006. This too was done in an effort to improve data quality, by improving response rates and providing a more standardized data collection process by giving control of the questionnaire administration to trained interviewers. It is possible, however, that the switch of modes introduced systematic differences between 1999–2000 and 2006 in the way that recreation activities were recalled and reported. This could lead to apparent differences in the levels of reported activity that are not due to actual changes of activity in the Washington population.

With these issues in mind, we examined the weighted data from both surveys. In general, the estimates from the 2002 report were lower than those coming from the 2006 survey, both in terms of percentage of the Washington population engaging in a given activity but also in terms of the absolute numbers of individuals. The differences



were across the board and greater than could be explained by changes in the characteristics of the population of Washington during the intervening years. We therefore determined that systematic differences had been introduced by the 2006 methodology that made direct comparison of the survey results from the two surveys unreliable. We determined therefore that activity prevalence rankings would provide a more valid basis for comparing the results of the two surveys than would population percentage or count estimates.

Table XX provides the rankings of the main activity categories from the 2006 survey with those reported in 2002 from the 1999–2000 survey. The activities that moved up the rankings the most number of places from 2002 to 2006 include aerobics or fitness activities at a facility, inner tubing or floating, badminton (all moving up 20 places), football (19 places), baseball (18 places), and snow play (16 places). Those activities that moved down the rankings the most number of places include equestrian activity (21 places), activity with firearms (19 places), archery (17 places), and skateboarding (15 places). The apparent drop in the rankings for snowmobiling was most likely due mainly to its having been grouped with ATV riding on the previous survey and measured separately in 2006.

**Table 54: Ranking of Participation in Main Activity Categories by Survey Year**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>2006*</b>	<b>2002</b>
Picnic, BBQ, or cookout	1	9
Walking without a pet	2	1
Swimming or wading at a beach	3	14
Sightseeing	4	3
Flower or vegetable gardening	5	4
Swimming in a pool	6	12
Walking with a pet	7	5
Playground activities such as swings or slides	8	13
Bicycle riding	9	6
Social event	10	11
Observe or photograph wildlife or nature	11	2
Jogging or running	12	15
Aerobics/fitness activities at a facility	13	33
Beachcombing	14	21
Sledding, inner tubing, other snow play	15	31
Hiking	16	8
Motor boating	17	18
Weight conditioning at a facility	18	24
Camping with a car or motorcycle	19	26
Basketball	20	28
Gather or collect things in a nature setting	21	7
Recreational vehicle camping	22	16
Class or instruction	23	29
Golf	24	10
Inner tubing or floating	25	45
4-wheel drive vehicle	26	23
Soccer	27	36
Canoeing, kayaking, row boating, other hand-powered boating	28	38
Activity center	29	27
Fishing from a private boat	30	19

<b>Activity</b>	<b>2006*</b>	<b>2002</b>
Fishing from a bank, dock, or jetty	31	17
Baseball	32	50
Visit a nature interpretive center	33	20
Volleyball	34	46
Skiing	35	25
Tennis	36	32
Football	37	56
Roller or in-line skating	38	30
ATV or dune buggy	39	37
Softball	40	53
Firearms	41	22
ATV riding on snow or ice**	42	**44
Camping in a boat	43	55
Climbing or mountaineering	44	54
Badminton	45	65
Motorcycle	46	35
Arts and crafts class or activity	47	40
Fishing for shellfish	48	39
Snowboarding	49	43
Backpacking at a primitive location	50	51
Sail boating	51	59
Ice skating	52	47
Personal watercraft, such as a Jet Ski	53	52
Water skiing	54	42
Equestrian activities	55	34
Skateboarding	56	41
Flying gliders, ultralights, aircraft	57	49
Court games like handball, racquetball, and squash	58	58
Bicycle camping	59	64
Scuba or skin diving	60	60
Snowmobiling**	61	**44
Camping with a kayak or canoe	62	62
Snowshoeing	63	61
White water rafting	64	66
Archery	65	48
Lacrosse	66	71
Fishing with a guide or charter	67	63
Bicycle touring	68	57
Bungee jumping	69	73
Surfboarding	70	69
Rugby	71	72
Sky diving, parachuting	72	74
Wind surfing	73	67
Hot air ballooning	74	68
Paragliding, hang gliding	75	70

\* Based on peak month data, therefore the lower bound estimate of participants in 2006.

\*\* Snowmobiling and ATV riding were combined in one category in 2002

**Appendix A: Questionnaire**

**Appendix B: Advance Letter**

**Appendix C: Open-ended Responses**

**Appendix D: Crosstabulations**