

Publishing information

Title: How are we doing? – Provincial Summary

Author: Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation
Parks Division
Policy and Strategic Support
Business Integration and Analysis Section

Printing date: February 2011

Web location: <http://publications.albertaparks.ca/>
(locate 'Visitor Research' section)

Acknowledgement

The Parks Division greatly appreciates and acknowledges the conscientious efforts of all those who support the camper satisfaction survey program.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| About this Survey | 1 |
| Objectives..... | 1 |
| Brief Methodology | 1 |
| In-Season Changes..... | 2 |
| Key Highlights | 3 |
| Results | 4 |
| Satisfaction Measures..... | 5 |
| Summary of Camper Satisfaction | 6 |
| Performance Measure..... | 8 |
| Camper Profiles | 10 |
| Information Source and Repeat Visitation | 10 |
| Party Size | 11 |
| Trip and Destination Type | 11 |
| Origin | 12 |
| Importance-Performance Analysis | 13 |
| Comment Analysis | 15 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Appendix 1: 2010 Survey Distribution/Collection Quotas..... | 21 |
| Appendix 2: 2010 Questionnaire..... | 25 |
| Appendix 3: Satisfaction Score Results - Detailed Summary..... | 29 |
| Appendix 4: Traffic Light Summary by Survey Locations..... | 33 |

How are we doing?

PROVINCIAL SUMMARY

ABOUT THIS SURVEY

Initiated in 2002, the Camper Satisfaction (CS) Survey program includes a representative cross-section of 105¹ provincial parks or recreation area campgrounds according to size (visitation), management method, and geography. Only campgrounds where visitation is greater than 1,050 occupied campsite nights (OCN's)² were initially included in the program. Campers are surveyed at approximately 26 campgrounds per year on a 4-year rotational cycle³. Each campground included in the program will be surveyed at least once every 4-year cycle. 2010 marks the second year of a 4-year cycle.

Objectives

The objectives of the 2010 CS Survey are to:

- determine campers overall satisfaction and compare it against the established performance target;
- allow for long-term monitoring;
- determine the level of satisfaction with services, facilities, opportunities, and overall satisfaction on a site-specific and province-wide basis;
- collect ongoing demographic and visit information about campers to identify trends; and
- provide a site-specific planning tool where the results can be used for planning and operations management or improving the design of park facilities.

Brief Methodology

Respondents for the 2010 CS Survey were randomly selected from the target population of all campers to auto-accessible campgrounds in Alberta's provincial parks and recreation areas using a sampling frame defined as:

- all campers (over the age of 18) who visit any one of the 28 pre-selected survey locations from June 1st to September 6th, 2010.

Sample sizes were calculated to provide statistically valid results on a site-by-site basis with a 7% margin of error at a 95% confidence interval. The reliability of site-specific results is a direct function of the total number of valid surveys returned at each site. (See Appendix 1 for sample targets and final response).

¹ The 2002-2004 and 2005-2008 CS Survey programs included a cross-section of 106 and 93 Provincial Parks or Recreation Area campgrounds respectively.

² OCN: One campsite occupied for one night.

³ Prior to 2005, campgrounds were surveyed based on a 3-year rotational cycle.

Every year, supplemental questions (i.e., those questions that are not part of the core question regarding satisfaction with campground services and facilities) are included in the survey and change from year to year.

A detailed account of the sampling rationale, design and methodology is described in the 2010 Visitor Satisfaction Survey Planning Report.⁴

In-Season Changes

Although 28 campgrounds were initially identified for sampling in the 2010 season, not all campgrounds and/or surveys are included in the provincial summary analysis or any further reporting of the results for the following reason:

- Two campgrounds were removed before surveying began due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g., insufficient resources).
- One campground was removed due to flooding.
- One campground did not achieve an adequate sample size/return. Statistically, a minimum sample size of 30 is required to provide reliable analysis on an individual site basis. As such, it was decided that sites with a sample size of less than 30 should not be included in the provincial summary or any further analysis due to the potential bias from poor or inadequate sampling/distribution methods and results.

Results from the following 4 campgrounds (Table 1) were removed entirely from the provincial summary and any further analysis for the reason identified. A total of 2,562 surveys were returned province-wide, of which 23 from these campgrounds were excluded from further analysis.

Table 1: Survey Locations Excluded from Provincial Analysis

| Campground | Sample Size | # Surveys excluded | Reason excluded from analysis |
|--|--------------|--------------------|--|
| Cypress Hills Provincial Park – Reesor Lake | 0 | N/A | Removed due to flooding |
| Brazeau Reservoir – Reservoir Loops 1 & 2 | 23 | 23 | Inadequate sample size |
| William A. Switzer Provincial Park – Gregg Lake | 0 | N/A | Non-participation (insufficient resources) |
| Prairie Creek Provincial Recreation Area – Prairie Creek | 0 | N/A | Non-participation |
| Total Survey - ALL campgrounds | 2,562 | 23 | |
| Total Usable Surveys | 2,539 | N/A | Included in Provincial Analysis |

⁴ Copies of this report are available upon request by contacting the Business Integration and Analysis Section at: (1-866-427-3582).

KEY HIGHLIGHTS

- 93.1% of campers rated their overall satisfaction as either satisfied or very satisfied.
- Campers were most satisfied with 'friendliness and courtesy of staff' and least satisfied with 'value for camping fee'.
- According to campers, the number one priority to improve upon is the Cleanliness of Washrooms.
- Campers identified 'Needing More' as the primary problem for all Park information services and sources, followed by 'Difficult to find'.

Trip Profile

- The average party size was 3.1 campers.
- Most visits to a campground are planned (85%) and the main destination (91%).
- 89% of campers would return to the campground they visited.

Origin

- Majority (93.0%) of campers were from Alberta.
- Other Canadian visitors accounted for 7% of campers.
- Less than 1% of campers were from the United States and other countries respectively.

Comments

- Park Information Services would be improved through improved signage and more/detailed campground maps both onsite and offsite.
- Keeping washrooms clean, odour free and adequately lit would improve the camping experience. Well maintained washrooms correlates to fewer comments about needing new or more washroom facilities.
- Campers feel strongly that fees are too high.
- Campers are concerned about campsites having camping equipment on them with no campers ever being present.

RESULTS

This report provides provincial summary results from the 2010 CS Survey based on 2,539 surveys collected from a total of 6,890 surveys distributed to campers at 24 campgrounds throughout Alberta (Table 2). For the purposes of the CS Survey, satisfaction was measured using 10 individual attributes related to services and facilities (see Summary of Camper Satisfaction, page 6) and a single overall satisfaction attribute. The attributes were chosen based on a comparison of key issues identified from previous surveys and a review of attributes used by other selected park agencies to measure visitor satisfaction.

The 2010 provincial summary results have a 1.9% margin of error at the 95% confidence level.

Table 2: 2010 Survey Locations included in Provincial Summary

| Provincial Parks (PP) - Campground | # Surveys Returned |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Big Knife - Big Knife | 55 |
| Bow Valley - Three Sisters | 60 |
| Crimson Lake - Crimson Lake | 89 |
| Cypress Hills - Beaver Creek | 131 |
| Dillberry Lake - Dillberry Lake | 56 |
| Dinosaur - Dinosaur | 70 |
| Kinbrook Island - Kinbrook Island | 85 |
| Little Bow - Little Bow | 201 |
| Moonshine Lake - Moonshine Lake | 229 |
| Peter Lougheed - Canyon | 55 |
| Peter Lougheed - Interlakes | 188 |
| Red Lodge - Red Lodge | 280 |
| Rochon Sands - Rochon Sands | 51 |
| Saskatoon Island - Saskatoon Island | 116 |
| Tillebrook - Tillebrook | 64 |
| Wabamun Lake - Wabamun Lake | 40 |
| Total | 1,770 |

| Provincial Recreation Areas (PRA) - Campground | # Surveys Returned |
|--|--------------------|
| Bleriot Ferry - Bleriot Ferry | 94 |
| Etherington Creek - Etherington Creek | 120 |
| Franchere Bay - Franchere Bay | 87 |
| Goldeye Lake - Goldeye Lake | 102 |
| Gooseberry - Gooseberry | 111 |
| Lakeland - Pinehurst | 85 |
| Lundbreck Falls - Lundbreck Falls | 96 |
| North Buck Lake - North Buck Lake | 74 |
| Total | 769 |

SATISFACTION MEASURES

Campers were asked to rate 10 of the campground's services and facilities using a five-point Likert scale (see questionnaire in Appendix 2) where:

- 5=Very Good, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Poor, and 1=Very Poor.
- Scores calculated from these ratings are assumed to reflect satisfaction.

Campers also rated their overall satisfaction with the quality of services and facilities at the campground using a five-point Likert scale where:

- 5=Very Satisfied, 4=Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 2=Dissatisfied, and 1=Very Dissatisfied.
- Scores calculated from these ratings directly reflect satisfaction.

Satisfaction was then summarized using three interpretive measures: average score, 'top box', and 'low box'.

Average Score represents the mean score or average level of satisfaction with a given attribute. A threshold score of 4.0 or higher is described as satisfied, while a score less than 4.0 suggests the attribute may need attention.

Top box (5=very good/very satisfied) represents the proportion of respondents who are considered 'very satisfied' (i.e., select a rating of 5) with a given attribute. It is assumed that a threshold of 40% or more of campers will choose the 'top box' if we are doing a good job of satisfying our clients.

Low box (1=very poor/very dissatisfied or 2=poor/dissatisfied) represents the proportion of respondents who are considered 'dissatisfied' (i.e., select ratings of 1 or 2) with a given attribute. Attributes for which a threshold of 10% or more of campers chooses the 'low box' may need attention.

Each attribute is then assigned a 'traffic light' score based on the set thresholds of each satisfaction measure outlined above as follows:

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | A green light indicates High Satisfaction (all 3 measures meet set thresholds) |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | An amber light indicates Moderate Satisfaction (1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds) |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | A red light indicates potentially Low Satisfaction (2 or 3 measures fail to meet thresholds) |

'Traffic light' scores (green, amber, red) are intended to provide an easily interpretable summary of satisfaction results and quickly highlight areas of potentially high, moderate and low satisfaction.

SUMMARY OF CAMPER SATISFACTION

A few patterns emerged from the satisfaction scores across the province (Table 3)⁵.

In the 2010 season, campers continue to express high satisfaction overall with Alberta's parks. The favorably evaluation rating of services/facilities is down slightly (5 out of 10) from 2009 (7 out of 10).

Campers remain highly satisfied with control of noise, friendliness and courtesy of staff, safety and security and cleanliness of grounds. Lowest ratings continue to be given to value of camping fee and park information services.

Table 3: Camper Satisfaction Traffic Lights by Attribute and Overall Score⁶

| Park Services and Facilities | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Control of Noise | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Cleanliness of Washrooms | ● | ● ³ | ● ² | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● ¹ |
| Friendliness and Courtesy of Staff | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Availability of Firewood | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● ¹ | ● ¹ | ● | ● ¹ | ● ² | ● ¹ |
| Condition of Facilities | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Safety and Security | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● | ● |
| Cleanliness of Grounds | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Value of Camping Fee | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● ¹ | ● ¹ | ● |
| Responsiveness of Staff to Visitor Concerns | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● ¹ |
| Park Information Services | ● | ● ¹ | ● ¹ | ● | ● | ● | ● ¹ | ● | ● ¹ |
| Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities? | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● ¹ | ● ¹ | ● | ● | ● |

Legend

| | |
|---|---|
| ● | High Satisfaction (all 3 measures meet set thresholds) |
| ● | Moderate Satisfaction (1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds) |
| ● | Potentially Low Satisfaction (2 or 3 measures fail to meet thresholds) |
| 1 | At least one of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |
| 2 | Two of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |
| 3 | Three of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |

⁵ For a detailed summary of ratings and satisfaction measures / thresholds for the province, please see Appendix 3.


⁶ Traffic light summaries for each survey location are included in Appendix 4.

Camper satisfaction with park information services was again low in 2010 and, in fact, has been an ongoing concern since 2002. In an effort to address this concern, the 2010 CS survey included a specific question on public information. Campers were asked to indicate what the problems were with park information services and sources (Table 4).

The top three problem areas identified with information services and sources were On-site information (44%), On-site Campground maps (42%) and Park trail signs (38%). Other highlights include:

- The primary problem for all park information services and sources was the need for more of each, followed by difficult to find.
- Campers, to a lesser extent, also expressed difficulty finding On-site information (8%), On-site Campground maps (7%) and Park trail signs (6%).
- Although an equal number of respondents (25%) stated the need for more Park trail signs and Highway signs, being difficult to find elevated Park trail signs to third most problematic.
- Of note is the demand for downloadable information which ranked as the 5th overall problem area, but 4th as difficult to find.
- There are few issues with park information services and sources being inaccurate, difficult to understand or visually hard to read.

Table 4: Problems with Park Information Services and Sources



PERFORMANCE MEASURE

One of the main objectives of this survey is to monitor visitor satisfaction, which will be used to gauge performance and set targets for the future. By asking campers about their level of satisfaction on an annual basis using the same questions and procedures, measurable targets of performance can be established and compared year to year. These in turn can be used to improve on the quality of services and facilities being offered.

In addition, visitor satisfaction provides valuable information that can contribute to program improvements. The performance target for visitor satisfaction was first established in 2004. The target was set at 91% based on the average of 2003 and 2004 results. Subsequent to that targets are set as a rounded average of the last three years' results and may include a one percent stretch factor if deemed appropriate based on an evaluation of the results.

In the 2010 season, 93.1% of the 2,485 respondents who rated their overall satisfaction with quality of services and facilities were either 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied'. Of those, 45.7% of respondents were considered 'very satisfied', while 47.4% were considered 'satisfied' (Table 5).

Table 5: Overall Satisfaction with Quality of Services and Facilities

| Year | Very Satisfied (%) | Satisfied (%) | Performance Measure (%) | Business Plan | Target (%) |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 2010 (n=2,485) | 45.7 | 47.4 | 93.1 | 2010-13 | 92 |
| 2009 (n=2,770) | 51.5 | 43.2 | 94.7 | 2009-12 | 91 |
| 2008 (n=2,001) | 50.7 | 42.5 | 93.3 | 2008-11 | 91 |
| 2007 (n=2,409) | 41.4 | 48.1 | 89.5 | 2007-10 | 92 |
| 2006 (n=2,333) | 41.1 | 48.0 | 89.1 | 2006-09 | 91 |
| 2005 (n=2,050) | 46.0 | 45.1 | 91.1 | 2005-08 | 91 |
| 2004 (n=3,136) | 51.5 | 39.4 | 90.9 | N/A | |
| 2003 (n=3,006) | 46.4 | 44.0 | 90.4 | N/A | |
| 2002 (n=5,336) | 42.9 | 44.2 | 87.1 | N/A | |

Note: Due to a modification of the Likert scale wording measuring camper satisfaction, the results from 2002 should not be compared to other years. 2002 results are provided for reference purposes only. Due to rounding, columns may not equate to totals.


CAMPER PROFILES

Information Source and Repeat Visitation:

Table 6 lists responses to some supplemental questions asked of campers.

- Over a third (37%) of campers said they used the Internet to research the park before visiting.
- A third (33%) of campers are first time visitors to the park.
- The majority (89%) of campers would return to the campground they stayed at while only 2% specifically said they would not.


Table 6: Supplemental Questions



Party Size:

The average party size (defined as the number of campers included on an overnight permit) for all campgrounds surveyed in 2010 was 3.1 campers. Most camping parties were made up of either 2 (43.6%) or 4 campers (21.6%) on an overnight permit.


Please specify the number of people who are included on your overnight camping permit.



Type of Trip and Destination

The majority of campers (85.3%) visit to the campground was planned while 14.7% described their visit as spontaneous. Most campers (90.9%) consider the campground the main destination of their trip. Whereas only 9.1 % indicated it is a stopover on their trip.

Was your visit to this campground?



Origin:

Similar to previous results, 98.2% of all campers in 2010 are from Canada. Canadian campers were most likely to be from Alberta (93.0%). Less than 1% of campers were from the United States (US) and other countries respectively. Table 7 presents the specifics.

The largest single centres of camping origin in the province were Calgary (26.7%) and Edmonton (7.1%), mirroring the two largest population centres of the province. The next largest centres of origin include Grande Prairie (6.3%), Red Deer (3.7%) and Medicine Hat (2.9%). Together, these five cities accounted for 46.7% of all Alberta campers to surveyed campgrounds in 2010.

Table 7: Origin Profiles of campers

| Origin | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Alberta | 92.9% | 94.2% | 91.5% | 93.8% | 92.0% | 95.2% | 93.0% |
| British Columbia | 2.5% | 2.8% | 3.7% | 2.2% | 2.1% | 2.4% | 4.7% |
| Saskatchewan | 1.6% | 1.3% | 2.3% | 1.5% | 2.0% | 1.2% | 1.7% |
| Ontario | 1.5% | 0.8% | 1.6% | 1.2% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 0.3% |
| Other Canada | 1.5% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 1.3% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 0.3% |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Canada | 97.5% | 95.5% | 97.3% | 97.8% | 98.4% | 98.6% | 98.2% |
| United States | 1.5% | 2.6% | 1.1% | 2.0% | 0.9% | 0.7% | 0.9% |
| International | 1.0% | 1.9% | 1.6% | 0.2% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.9% |

IMPORTANCE-PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND PRIORITIES

Campers were asked to rate the importance of the same 10 campground services and facilities used to rate their satisfaction (see questionnaire in Appendix 2). A five-point Likert Importance scale was used where:

5=Extremely Important, 4=Important, 3=Neutral, 2=Not Important, and 1=Not at all Important.

By comparing satisfaction with importance, it can be determined where improvements should be emphasized. This can be accomplished using a method known as Importance-Performance (IP) Analysis.




The IP analysis is based on the concept that satisfaction or performance can be increased by emphasizing improvements in those services and facilities where the level of satisfaction is relatively low and the perceived importance relatively high. That is to say a high satisfaction rating on an attribute of low importance is of less concern than a low satisfaction rating on an item of high importance.

By prioritizing the 10 campground services and facilities, it is possible to determine where the emphasis on improving performance should be. This can be accomplished by calculating an IP Rating. An IP rating is derived by weighting the difference between the importance mean and satisfaction mean for each service and facility, by its importance.

$$\text{IP Rating} = [\text{Mean Importance} - \text{Mean Satisfaction}] * \text{Mean Importance}$$

While the service or facility with the highest IP rating represents the area that is in greatest need of improvement, and the lowest rating is the area that is in no need of improvement, the determination of which other attributes to include among improvement priorities is 'relative'. The thresholds shown in Table 8 are therefore intended as a guide only.

Table 8: Importance-Performance (IP) Rating Thresholds







| IP Rating | Action Required | Priority Level |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Greater than 1.50 | Definitely Increase Emphasis |  |
| 1.00 to 1.49 | Increase Current Emphasis |  |
| 0.00 to 0.99 | Only after higher opportunities are dealt with |  |
| Less than 0.00 | Maintain current level of service | --- |

Importance-Performance Analysis:

According to campers, the number one priority to improve upon is the Cleanliness of Washrooms, followed by improving the Value of the Camping Fee. Subsequent priorities include improving the Condition of Facilities and Safety and Security (Table 9).

Services and facilities with negative values suggest that expectations are being met.

Table 9: Importance-Performance (IP) Ratings and Priorities for 2010

| Park Services and Facilities | IP Rating | Priority Level | Traffic Light Score |
|---|-----------|--|---------------------|
| Cleanliness of Washrooms | 2.61 |  | ● ¹ |
| Value of Camping Fee | 1.47 |  | ● |
| Condition of Facilities | 0.78 |  | ● |
| Safety and Security | 0.63 |  | ● |
| Availability of Firewood | 0.61 |  | ● ¹ |
| Park Information Services | 0.04 |  | ● ¹ |
| Cleanliness of Grounds | -0.07 | --- | ● |
| Responsiveness of Staff to Visitor Concerns | -0.14 | --- | ● ¹ |
| Control of Noise | -0.27 | --- | ● |
| Friendliness and Courtesy of Staff | -0.71 | --- | ● |

Traffic Light Score Legend

| | |
|---|---|
| ● | High Satisfaction (all 3 measures meet set thresholds) |
| ● | Moderate Satisfaction (1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds) |
| ● | Potentially Low Satisfaction (2 or 3 measures fail to meet thresholds) |
| 1 | At least one of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |
| 2 | Two of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |
| 3 | Three of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |

COMMENT ANALYSIS

Unsolicited comments supplied by campers in the completed surveys provide valuable insight into potential issues in Alberta's provincial parks and recreation areas.⁷

The following analysis employs Text Mining – automated comprehension of unstructured textual data sources. Text mining efficiently analyses camper comments and discovers insights that result in clearer opportunities to improve park services and facilities.

Washrooms and Showers (12%)

- Comments regarding washrooms (including outhouses) and showers focused on 5 general areas (in no particular order): More washroom facilities needed, cleanliness, odours, hand sanitizer / soap and lighting.
- Parks should strive to keep washrooms and showers clean, odour free and adequately lit to ensure satisfactory camping experience.
- In particular, hand sanitizer should always be available in washrooms or outhouses without running water and soap in washrooms with running water. A toilet facility without these will have a high negative impact on visitors.
- For high visitation parks, there were many comments to increase the number of toilet facilities.
- Washroom condition is very important to campers. Broken hinges or doors, the need for painting, water temperature, missing shelves or bath mats, and many other maintenance and supply related issues impact the overall visit experience.
- Ensuring a well maintained washroom correlates to fewer comments about needing more washroom facilities.
- Campers want more showers, showers to be clean, operating properly (timing and temperature), and free (or at least more time allotted).

⁷ Note: 1,913 Surveys Represented.

Information Services (8%)

- Two of the biggest concerns were in regard to policies needing to be posted and more trail information and path signs.
- Campers indicated needing more information on the internet but did not provide many specific examples other than maps. There were also a few comments about needing more information at visitor centers (e.g., printed bird information).
- Ensure park signs are clean.
- An emergency/complaint phone number needs to be posted for emergencies and enforcement issues.

The lack of sign standardization across the province is leaving campers confused and frustrated. Signage consistency continues to be a key factor in improving camper satisfaction with Park information services. Various inconsistencies are outlined below:

- Lack of campground maps available onsite and offsite. A significant amount of map related comments had to do with map availability online (i.e., printable version).
- Maps should be detailed and always indicate trails.
- Need for central information area within a park (e.g., bulletin board location).
- More campground signs showing facility locations (e.g., wood lot, booth location).
- In 2009, comments were made in regards to having a Vacancy / No Vacancy sign posted at the park entrance. In contrast, in 2010, many comments were made about having No Vacancy signs for individual loops if those loops were full.
- The discrepancy between what staff are saying and what signs indicate in regards to rules etc. Similarly, there is inconsistency between individual staff messages.

Fees / Value (7%)

- Campers felt strongly that fees in general are too high, firewood and showers should be free and the reservation fee is too high. Specifically, some campers were not happy about the 2009 and 2010 fee increases, particularly for camping that is viewed as 'rustic'.
- Senior discounts are important and appreciated.
- Although negative comments on costs being too high are surpassed by the number of comments about the beautiful campground or the wonderful visit, those that do comment on fees and values do so strongly.

Firewood (6%)

- Firewood remains a heavily commented theme. The majority of comments were complaints about the quality of firewood. Other comments include that wood be included in the fee or that it be free.
- Firewood accessibility was a mild concern in firewood related comments.

Reservations (5%)

- As with comments from previous years, expectations are created online. If expectations of reservations are not met, campers lean toward “first come first serve” systems or discuss issues of fairness.
- Campers see the value in the system, but comment that a good balance is needed between first come first serve and reservations.
- One of the strongest reservation theme complaints was in regards to reserved sites being occupied by tents or other camping equipment, but that no people were present.
- There was some mild difficulty using the online reservation system, but no specific reasons were mentioned.

Campers generally approve of the system and provide some suggestions:

- Reservations needed for (more) electrical sites
- A surprising number of comments about more reservable prime location sites (e.g., near lake, away from highway).
- Generally need more sites and parks on the system
- Better monitoring of online system behavior (e.g., do not allow individuals to have more than one or two outstanding reservations at any given time.).
- Reservation fees are too high.

Lake / Dock / Boat Launch (4%)

- Many comments in regards to lakes were positive comments. Other comments fell under issues of wanting a campsite closer to the lake (particularly reservable campsites), algae/weed cleaning, and signs for sandbars and shallow areas.
- Ensuring proper, safe, and multiple access points (steps, paths, etc.) to lakes is important to campers.
- Docks and Boat Launches should always be kept in good condition.

Staffing/C.O.'s/Hosts (3%)

- The majority of comments about staff and hosts are positive and describe them as going ‘above and beyond’ and being ‘friendly’ and ‘accommodating’. However, some campers provided gentle reminders to ensure enforcement of policies such as for leashed dogs and noise.
- A few comments suggest that staff can improve in customer service (e.g., politeness, better choice of words and being consistent with information).
- Some campers also commented that more staff is needed and that staff are not present/not seen.

Road (2%)

- Most comments about Roads are in regards to decreasing the amount of dust resulting from vehicles, to be less rough (less bumps and potholes) or to be paved.

Noise Complaints (2%)

- Noise comments are mostly regarding generators and camper noise (e.g., partying). Better control of noise is required and is linked to perceived safety.

Roll-up Category Insights:

A number of comments have been rolled up into major categories of Campsite issues, Campground issues and Other issues.

Campsites Issues (20%)

These comments include various campsite preferences including, without surprise, more privacy, leveling, firepits, adequate gravel, proximity to amenities, and running water. Other comments include:

- Many campers want power hookups and those with large vehicles will comment on narrow sites.
- Many campers complimented on well maintained sites.
- Policies and fees for tenters or extra tents should be more fair and cheaper.

Of note is that some campers commented on sites with equipment (e.g., tents, RV, vehicle) but expressed a concern with seeing no people for their entire stay.

Campground Issues (19%)

These comments include ones of operations and policies, concessions and facilities, beaches and playgrounds, trails, grounds maintenance (landscaping, garbage, and debris), fishing and interpretive programs.

Of note include:

- A large portion of these comments include positive comments about the beautiful campground or having a great visit.
- Playgrounds, while not significantly commented on, are a very important for families. Those that commented on playgrounds often mentioned beaches in the same sentence.

Operational consistency is important. Although there were no strong themes in this regard, one-time issues compound to overall dissatisfaction. An example of a one-time issue from one visitor was a site they wanted to reserve was unavailable online but that same park would reserve over the phone.

Other Issues (12%)

Included in this category are comments such as dogs being off-leash, insect complaints, and other miscellaneous or single item comments.

Similar to last year, perceived safety can be impacted by the level of noise, bathroom or site cleanliness, and the amount of patrols. Failing in any of these may contribute to campers feeling unsafe. That said, many campers feel that parks do a good job of providing a safe environment.

A fair number of comments were made in regards to cell phone coverage or needing access to a phone.

Campers that commented on interpretive programs or amphitheatres are interested in self-serve programs, interactive programs (particularly for children) or guided hikes.

There were a few comments about repeat visitation and how the park is a part of their lives. One particular comment highlighted that they've been visiting the park for 35 years and this year was the first with 4 generations together at the park.

APPENDIX 1

2010 Survey Distribution / Collection Quotas

Distribution and Collection Guidelines and Final Response Number of Surveys by Survey Location

(Returns from survey locations not included in final analysis are excluded.)

| 2010 Provincial Park / Provincial Recreation Area - Campground | Adjusted Population (OCN/3) ¹ | Sample Target to be Collected ² | Sample Target to be Distributed ³ | Sample Target | | | | | | | | Actual Return | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|------|--------|-----------|------------|------|--------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | Collect | | | | Distribute | | | | Surveys Processed | % of Collection Target Achieved |
| | | | | June | July | August | September | June | July | August | September | | |
| Red Lodge PP - Red Lodge | 2,149 | 180 | 325 | 46 | 57 | 68 | 10 | 82 | 102 | 123 | 18 | 280 | 156% |
| Big Knife PP - Big Knife | 643 | 150 | 275 | 33 | 57 | 42 | 17 | 61 | 104 | 78 | 32 | 55 | 37% |
| Rochon Sands PP - Rochon Sands | 1,019 | 165 | 300 | 28 | 69 | 54 | 13 | 51 | 126 | 99 | 24 | 51 | 31% |
| Bleriot Ferry PRA - Bleriot Ferry | 529 | 145 | 260 | 26 | 48 | 59 | 11 | 48 | 87 | 106 | 19 | 94 | 65% |
| Dillberry Lake PP - Dillberry Lake | 528 | 145 | 260 | 31 | 58 | 42 | 14 | 55 | 105 | 76 | 24 | 56 | 39% |
| Gooseberry PRA - Gooseberry | 1,311 | 170 | 310 | 31 | 61 | 54 | 24 | 56 | 111 | 99 | 44 | 111 | 65% |
| Peter Lougheed PP - Interlakes | 1,438 | 175 | 315 | 18 | 84 | 63 | 11 | 32 | 150 | 113 | 20 | 188 | 107% |
| Peter Lougheed PP - Canyon | 717 | 155 | 280 | 28 | 59 | 48 | 21 | 50 | 107 | 87 | 37 | 55 | 35% |
| Bow Valley PP - Three Sisters | 813 | 160 | 285 | 25 | 71 | 44 | 20 | 44 | 126 | 79 | 36 | 60 | 38% |
| Etherington Creek PRA - Etherington Creek | 453 | 135 | 250 | 13 | 37 | 50 | 35 | 24 | 68 | 93 | 65 | 120 | 89% |
| Lakeland PRA - Pinehurst | 1,111 | 165 | 305 | 9 | 34 | 97 | 25 | 17 | 63 | 179 | 46 | 85 | 52% |
| Franchere Bay PRA - Franchere Bay | 568 | 145 | 265 | 20 | 23 | 58 | 44 | 36 | 43 | 106 | 80 | 87 | 60% |
| North Buck Lake PRA - North Buck Lake | 1,127 | 165 | 305 | 45 | 56 | 48 | 16 | 83 | 104 | 89 | 29 | 74 | 45% |
| Saskatoon Island PP - Saskatoon Island | 2,379 | 180 | 330 | 48 | 60 | 47 | 25 | 89 | 109 | 87 | 45 | 116 | 64% |
| Moonshine Lake PP - Moonshine Lake | 1,732 | 175 | 320 | 27 | 75 | 63 | 9 | 50 | 137 | 116 | 16 | 229 | 131% |
| Kinbrook Island PP - Kinbrook Island | 3,552 | 185 | 340 | 29 | 74 | 63 | 18 | 54 | 136 | 117 | 33 | 85 | 46% |
| Dinosaur PP - Dinosaur | 2,720 | 185 | 335 | 31 | 73 | 64 | 18 | 56 | 132 | 115 | 32 | 70 | 38% |
| Little Bow PP - Little Bow | 2,933 | 185 | 335 | 23 | 41 | 59 | 63 | 41 | 74 | 106 | 114 | 201 | 109% |
| Tillebrook PP - Tillebrook | 2,179 | 180 | 325 | 25 | 76 | 56 | 23 | 45 | 138 | 101 | 42 | 64 | 36% |
| Lundbreck Falls PRA - Lundbreck Falls | 1,139 | 165 | 305 | 23 | 70 | 51 | 21 | 42 | 129 | 95 | 39 | 96 | 58% |
| Cypress Hills PP - Beaver Creek | 716 | 155 | 280 | 19 | 64 | 56 | 16 | 34 | 115 | 102 | 30 | 131 | 85% |
| Crimson Lake PP - Crimson Lake | 2,606 | 180 | 330 | 22 | 82 | 63 | 13 | 40 | 150 | 116 | 24 | 89 | 49% |
| Goldeye Lake PRA - Goldeye Lake | 522 | 145 | 260 | 21 | 67 | 44 | 13 | 38 | 120 | 79 | 23 | 102 | 70% |
| Wabamun Lake PP - Wabamun Lake | 2,330 | 180 | 330 | 39 | 77 | 49 | 14 | 72 | 141 | 91 | 26 | 40 | 22% |
| Provincial Total | 35,213 | 3,970 | 7,225 | | | | | | | | | 2,539 | 64% |

PP - Provincial Park; PRA - Provincial Recreation Area;

¹ Population sizes are based on recent camping visitation statistics: 2 or 3 year averages of most recent reported occupied campsite nights (OCN) from May - September for each site (estimates were not used in calculations). Populations are then adjusted to account for average length of stay of 3 nights/party (OCN / 3).

² Collection targets are calculated to achieve a $\pm 7\%$ margin of error at a 95% confidence interval.

³ Distribution targets are calculated assuming a 45% non-response rate.

APPENDIX 2

2010 Questionnaire

Welcome to Alberta's Provincial Parks and Recreation Areas.

We ask that **ONE** adult (18 years or older) in your **immediate** group who most recently had a birthday to complete this survey. We welcome your comments, however please write them on the back of the survey.

1. Please rate the **Importance** of the following services and facilities as well as your **Satisfaction** with each:
(mark N/A for any items that did not apply to this visit)

| | IMPORTANCE | | | | | | SATISFACTION | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT | NEUTRAL | NOT IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | NOT APPLICABLE | VERY GOOD | GOOD | AVERAGE | POOR | VERY POOR | NOT APPLICABLE |
| Cleanliness of washrooms | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Friendliness and courtesy of staff | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Park information services | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Cleanliness of grounds | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Condition of facilities | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| FOLD HERE THIRD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Control of noise | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Safety and security | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Value for camping fee | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Availability of firewood | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

2. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities? (mark only one)

| VERY SATISFIED | SATISFIED | NEUTRAL | DISSATISFIED | VERY DISSATISFIED |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3. Number of people in your immediate party:

(those included on a single permit, including yourself)

FOLD HERE SECOND

4. Was this visit to this park:

a) Pick one:

- a Main Destination
- a Stopover en route

b) Pick one:

- Planned
- Spontaneous

5. Please respond to each of the following:

| | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Is this your FIRST visit to THIS park? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Will you return to THIS park? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Was the internet one of the sources you used to plan your trip to THIS park? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

6. What do you think are problems with the following park information services and sources?

Please mark all that apply:

| | NEED MORE | INACCURATE | DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND | DIFFICULT TO FIND | HARD TO READ | VISUALLY NOT APPLICABLE |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Highway signs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Park road signs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Park trail signs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other park signs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| On-site campground maps | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| On-site information (e.g. brochures, trail guides) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| FOLD HERE SECOND | | | | | | |
| Downloadable information (e.g. maps, brochures) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Information in "The Official Alberta Campground Guide" | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| AlbertaParks.ca website information | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Park Reservations website information (i.e. Reserve.AlbertaParks.ca) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other park information services and sources | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please specify:

7. Please comment on any ideas you may have to help us improve park information services and sources:

FOLD HERE FIRST

please proceed to back of survey →

THIS IS THE ONLY SEAL NEEDED. PLEASE DO NOT ADD STAPLES, GLUE OR TAPE.

Thank you for completing this survey. If you complete the Prize Draw entry form below you will be eligible to win **one of four \$100 gift certificates** from an outdoor equipment retailer of your choice.

See the reverse side for the Official Contest Rules. To ensure confidentiality, the completed Prize Draw entry forms will be detached from the survey before any answers are tabulated. The personal information that you provide on the Prize Draw entry form will be used for the purpose of selecting and contacting the contest winners. It is collected under the authority of section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and is protected by the privacy provisions of that Act. If you have any questions about the collection of this information please contact Alberta Tourism, Parks & Recreation, 2nd Floor, Oxbridge Place, 9820-106 Street, Edmonton, AB T5K2J6, phone 780-427-3582 or toll-free 1-866-427-3582.

DRAW ENTRY FORM

Name: _____

Telephone Number: _____

(please print clearly)

Government of Alberta ■

Official Contest Rules:

TO ENTER the HOW ARE WE DOING survey contest (the "Contest") simply complete the survey and attached draw entry form and submit both by mail or by one of the methods set out on the front of the survey. Incomplete and illegible surveys may be disqualified. No purchase necessary. Contest starts at 9:00 a.m. MST on Tuesday, June 1, 2010, and closes on Friday, October 15, 2010, at 11:59.59 MST. To be eligible, entries must be completed and received on or by the closing date of the draw. All entries shall become the property of Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation. Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation is not responsible for lost, misdirected or delayed entries. Must be eighteen (18) years of age or older to participate. Limit of one (1) entry per camping party. Must correctly answer, unaided, a mathematical skill testing question to be declared a winner. Approximate retail value of each of the four (4) Prizes is One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) Cdn. The odds of winning the Prize are based on the amount of entries received. For full contest rules please visit AlbertaParks.ca/survey.

8.

Where do you live?

Canada

United States

Other Country

Canadian Postal Code:

Four empty boxes for postal code

FOR PARK USE ONLY

Grid of letters A-Z and numbers 0-9 for drawing

What could we have done to make your visit better?

Seven horizontal lines for handwritten feedback

Government of Alberta

How Are We Doing?

Dear Visitor,

We are dedicated to providing a high quality experience to our visitors. To continue to improve our services, we are asking for your help by taking a few minutes at the END OF YOUR VISIT to complete this short survey.

Options for returning your sealed completed survey:

- Return to any of our staff
• Drop it off at the check-in station, self-registration vault or visitor comment box
• By Mail

For more information on Alberta Parks visit www.AlbertaParks.ca

2010

Serial Number

Please do not tape, glue or staple the survey

APPENDIX 3

Satisfaction Score Results – Detailed Summary

**How Would You Rate Each of the Following?
Satisfaction with 10 Park Services and Facilities
2010 Provincial Summary**

| How would you rate each of the following services and facilities? | Rating | | | | | | | | | | | | Number of Respondents | Mean Score | Lowbox | Topbox | Evaluation Total |
|---|--------|------|-----------|-----|------|-----|---------|------|-------|------|-----------|------|-----------------------|------------|--------|--------|------------------|
| | N/A | | Very Poor | | Poor | | Average | | Good | | Very Good | | | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | mean | % | % | # |
| Cleanliness of washrooms | 97 | 4.0 | 50 | 2.1 | 104 | 4.3 | 389 | 16.1 | 890 | 36.8 | 890 | 36.8 | 2,420 | 4.1 | 6.6 | 38.3 | 2,323 |
| Friendliness and courtesy of staff | 37 | 1.5 | 6 | 0.2 | 12 | 0.5 | 131 | 5.4 | 675 | 27.6 | 1,586 | 64.8 | 2,447 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 65.8 | 2,410 |
| Park information services | 120 | 5.0 | 13 | 0.5 | 76 | 3.2 | 456 | 18.9 | 1,019 | 42.3 | 724 | 30.1 | 2,408 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 31.6 | 2,288 |
| Cleanliness of grounds | 124 | 5.2 | 18 | 0.8 | 71 | 3.0 | 253 | 10.6 | 870 | 36.4 | 1,055 | 44.1 | 2,391 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 46.5 | 2,267 |
| Condition of facilities | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 0.3 | 38 | 1.6 | 168 | 6.9 | 819 | 33.7 | 1,399 | 57.5 | 2,432 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 57.5 | 2,432 |
| Responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns | 31 | 1.3 | 20 | 0.8 | 52 | 2.1 | 295 | 12.1 | 1,033 | 42.5 | 1,001 | 41.2 | 2,432 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 41.7 | 2,401 |
| Control of noise | 536 | 23.0 | 5 | 0.2 | 28 | 1.2 | 173 | 7.4 | 713 | 30.6 | 876 | 37.6 | 2,331 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 48.8 | 1,795 |
| Safety and security | 73 | 3.1 | 12 | 0.5 | 34 | 1.4 | 225 | 9.5 | 970 | 40.8 | 1,064 | 44.7 | 2,378 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 46.2 | 2,305 |
| Value for camping fee | 11 | 0.5 | 57 | 2.4 | 129 | 5.3 | 577 | 23.9 | 905 | 37.4 | 739 | 30.6 | 2,418 | 3.9 | 7.7 | 30.7 | 2,407 |
| Availability of firewood | 282 | 11.8 | 110 | 4.6 | 154 | 6.4 | 280 | 11.7 | 609 | 25.4 | 959 | 40.1 | 2,394 | 4.0 | 12.5 | 45.4 | 2,112 |

Low Box, Top Box and Mean Scores are calculated using only rated responses. All 'not applicable' responses were removed for traffic-light evaluation purposes.

**Overall Satisfaction with Services and Facilities
2010 Provincial Summary**

| Overall Satisfaction | Rating | | | | | | | | | | Number of Respondents | Average Score | LowBox | TopBox | Evaluation Total |
|--|-------------------|------|--------------|-----|---------|-----|-----------|------|----------------|------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Neutral | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | mean | % poor + very poor | % very good | # |
| Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities? | 8 | 0.32 | 49 | 2.0 | 115 | 4.6 | 1,178 | 47.4 | 1,135 | 45.7 | 2,485 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 45.7 | 2,485 |

**Satisfaction Measures: Thresholds and Traffic Light Scores for 10 Park Services and Facilities
2010 Provincial Summary**

| Park Services and Facilities | Mean Score (mean) | Threshold >4.0 | LowBox Poor + Very Poor (%) | Threshold <10% | TopBox Very Good (%) | Threshold >40% | Traffic Light Evaluation | Pass Level |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Cleanliness of washrooms | 4.0616 | Pass | 6.6294 | Pass | 38.3125 | Fail | ● | 1 |
| Friendliness and courtesy of staff | 4.5863 | Pass | 0.7469 | Pass | 65.8091 | Pass | ● | |
| Park information services | 4.0337 | Pass | 3.8899 | Pass | 31.6434 | Fail | ● | 1 |
| Cleanliness of grounds | 4.2673 | Pass | 3.9259 | Pass | 46.5373 | Pass | ● | |
| Condition of facilities | 4.4650 | Pass | 1.8914 | Pass | 57.5247 | Pass | ● | |
| Responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns | 4.2257 | Pass | 2.9988 | Pass | 41.6910 | Pass | ● | 1 |
| Control of noise | 4.3521 | Pass | 1.8384 | Pass | 48.8022 | Pass | ● | |
| Safety and security | 4.3189 | Pass | 1.9957 | Pass | 46.1605 | Pass | ● | |
| Value for camping fee | 3.8891 | Fail | 7.7275 | Pass | 30.7021 | Fail | ● | |
| Availability of firewood | 4.0194 | Pass | 12.5000 | Fail | 45.4072 | Pass | ● | 1 |

**Overall Satisfaction Measure: Thresholds and Traffic Light Scores
2010 Provincial Summary**

| Overall Satisfaction | Mean Score (mean) | Threshold >4.0 | LowBox Poor + Very Poor (%) | Threshold <10% | TopBox Very Good (%) | Threshold >40% | Traffic Light Evaluation | Pass Level |
|--|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities? | 4.36 | Pass | 2.30 | Pass | 45.67 | Pass | ● | |

| Traffic Light Evaluation | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| ● High Satisfaction: | All 3 measures meet set thresholds |
| ● Moderate Satisfaction: | 1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds |
| ● Potentially Low Satisfaction: | 2 or 3 measures fail to meet thresholds |

| Pass Level |
|--|
| 1: 1 of 3 measures barely passed set thresholds |

APPENDIX 4

Traffic Light Summary by Survey Locations:
How Would You Rate Each of the Following?

2010 Camper Satisfaction Survey – Traffic Light Summary of All Sites

| Provincial Park / Provincial Recreation Area - Campground | Cleanliness of washrooms | Friendliness and courtesy of staff | Park information services | Responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns | Condition of facilities | Cleanliness of grounds | Control of noise | Safety and security | Value for camping fee | Availability of firewood | Overall Satisfaction with Services and facilities |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Big Knife PP - Big Knife | ● | ● | ● 2 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 |
| Bleriot Ferry PRA - Bleriot Ferry | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● |
| Bow Valley PP KC - Three Sisters | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● | ● 1 | ● |
| Crimson Lake PP - Crimson Lake | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Cypress Hills PP - Beaver Creek | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● |
| Dillberry Lake PP - Dillberry Lake | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Dinosaur PP - Dinosaur | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● |
| Etherington Creek PRA KC - Etherington Creek | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● |
| Franchere Bay PRA - Franchere Bay | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 |
| Goldeye Lake PRA - Goldeye Lake | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Gooseberry PRA KC - Gooseberry | ● 1 | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● |
| Kinbrook Island PP - Kinbrook Island | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● |
| Lakeland PRA - Pinehurst Lake | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● 1 |
| Little Bow PP - Little Bow | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● |
| Lundbreck Falls PRA - Lundbreck Falls | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Moonshine Lake PP - Moonshine Lake | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| North Buck Lake PRA - North Buck Lake | ● | ● 1 | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Peter Lougheed PP KC - Canyon | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Peter Lougheed PP KC - Interlakes | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 2 | ● | ● |
| Red Lodge PP - Red Lodge | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● 2 | ● |
| Rochon Sands PP - Rochon Sands | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● |
| Saskatoon Island PP - Saskatoon Island | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Tillebrook PP - Tillebrook | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● 1 |
| Wabamun Lake PP - Wabamun Lake | ● | ● | ● 1 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |

 Campground received less than 95 surveys. Results are considered not to be statistically valid and are provided for information only.

PP - Provincial Park; PRA - Provincial Recreation Area; KC - Kananaskis Country

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|--|-------------------|----------|---|----------|--|
| Legend | ● | ○ | ○ | High Satisfaction (3/3 measures meet set thresholds) | Pass Level | 1 | At least one of the three measures barely passed set thresholds | | |
| | ○ | ● | ○ | Moderate Satisfaction (1/3 measures fail to meet thresholds) | | | | 2 | Two of the three measures barely passed set thresholds |
| | ○ | ○ | ● | potentially Low Satisfaction (2/3 measures fail to meet thresholds) | | | | | |

