

How are we Doing? 2006



A Survey of Campers to Alberta's Parks and Protected Areas
Provincial Summary

Prepared by:

Parks, Conservation, Recreation and Sport Division
Parks Program Coordination Branch

March 2007

Table of Contents:

About this Survey:	1
Supplemental Questions:.....	2
In-Season Changes:	2
2006 Results:	3
Satisfaction Measures:	4
Summary of Camper Satisfaction	5
Areas of High Satisfaction:	7
Areas of Improvement:	9
Areas of Concern:	10
Additional Comments Analysis:	13
Performance Measure:	14
Performance Analysis:	15
Camper Profiles:	18
Party Size:	18
Origin:	18
Trip Type:.....	19
Reservation Service:	20
Satisfaction:.....	20
Use:	20
Camper Segment Profiles:	22
Appendix 1. 2006 Survey Distribution/Collection Quotas	23
Appendix 2. Supplemental Questions - Detailed Summary	27
Appendix 3. Questionnaire.....	35
Appendix 4. Satisfaction Score Results - Detailed Summary	39
Appendix 5. Traffic Light Summary by Survey Locations.....	43
Appendix 6. Comments Analysis Summary	47

About this Survey:

Initiated in 2002, the Camper Satisfaction (CS) Survey program includes a representative cross-section of 93¹ 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) were initially included in the program.

Campers are surveyed at approximately 24 campgrounds per year on a 4-year rotational cycle². Each campground included in the program will be surveyed at least once every 4-year cycle.

The objectives of the 2006 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.

Respondents for the 2006 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 27 pre-selected survey locations from June 1st to September 4th, 2006.

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 Prior to 2005, the CS Survey program included a cross-section of 106 Provincial Parks or Recreation Area campgrounds.

² Prior to 2005, campgrounds were surveyed based on a 3-year rotational cycle.

Supplemental Questions:

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. For a detailed summary of the supplemental questions for each year, please see Appendix 2.

In-Season Changes:

Although 27 campgrounds were initially identified for sampling in the 2006 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 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 2 campgrounds (Table 1) were removed entirely from the provincial summary and any further analysis for the reason identified. A total of 2,510 surveys were returned province-wide, of which 41 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
Bow Valley Provincial Park – Lac Des Arcs	14	14	Inadequate sample size
Bow Valley Provincial Park – Three Sisters	27	27	Inadequate sample size
Total Survey - ALL campgrounds	2,510	41	
Total Survey - Revised campgrounds	2,469	N/A	Included in Provincial Analysis

2006 Results:

- This report provides provincial summary results from the 2006 CS Survey based on surveys collected at 27 campgrounds throughout Alberta (Table 2).
- A total of 2,510 surveys were returned province-wide, of which 2,469 are included in this analysis (see Table 1 for an explanation of exclusions).
- The 2006 provincial summary results have a 1.85% margin of error at the 95% confidence level.
- 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 5) 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.
- A detailed account of the sampling rationale, design and methodology is described in the 2006 Visitor Satisfaction Survey Planning Report.³
- Individual reports detailing the specific survey results for each campground with an adequate sample size (i.e., >95) are also released subsequent to the provincial summary.

**Table 2:
2006 Survey Locations included in
Provincial Summary***

Provincial Parks:	# Surveys Returned
Big Knife	108
Bow Valley – Lac Des Arcs (KC) *	14
Bow Valley – Three Sisters (KC) *	27
Crimson Lake	46
Cypress Hills – Beaver Creek	184
Cypress Hills – Reesor Lake	153
Dillberry	45
Dinosaur	78
Garner Lake	59
Kinbrook Island	101
Little Bow	70
Long Lake	112
Moonshine Lake	144
Peter Lougheed – Canyon (KC)	166
Peter Lougheed – Interlakes (KC)	204
Ram Falls	43
Red Lodge	128
Rochon Sands	97
Saskatoon Island	42
Tillebrook	97
Wabamun Lake	107
William A. Switzer – Gregg Lake	106
Provincial Recreation Areas:	
Bleriot Ferry	138
Elbow Valley – Gooseberry (KC)	56
Highwood/Cataract – Etherington Creek (KC)	118
Lundbreck Falls	37
Prairie Creek	30
Total Returned	2,510
Total Usable	2,469

(KC) denotes Kananaskis Country locations.

* Excluded from provincial analysis due to inadequate sample sizes (see Table 1).

³ Copies of this report are available upon request by contacting the Research Assessment Section at: (1-866-427-3582).

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 3) 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 or 5=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:

- A green light indicates **High Satisfaction** (all 3 measures meet set thresholds)
- An amber light indicates **Moderate Satisfaction** (1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds)
- 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:

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

Park Services and Facilities	Red (R)			Amber (A)			Green (G)		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006
Control of Noise							●	●	●
Cleanliness of Washrooms			●1				●2	●	
Friendliness and Courtesy of Staff							●	●	●
Availability of Firewood				●	●1	●1			
Condition of Facilities					●	●	●		
Safety and Security							●	●	●
Cleanliness of Grounds							●	●	●
Value of Camping Fee	●	●	●1						
Responsiveness of Staff to Visitor Concerns							●	●	●
Park Information Services		●	●	●1					
Overall , how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities?							●	●	●1

Legend	
● (G)	High Satisfaction (all 3 measures meet set thresholds)
● (A)	Moderate Satisfaction (1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds)
● (R)	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

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

In the 2006 season, campers were highly satisfied on average with 5 out of 10 services and facilities province-wide. Campers were least satisfied with park information services, the value for the camping fee, cleanliness of washrooms, condition of facilities, and availability of firewood.

Camper satisfaction with the cleanliness of washrooms was very low in 2006 and, in fact, was lower than in any previous year.

Three services in 2006 received a red, low satisfaction score. Two of these, cleanliness of washrooms and value of camping fee barely passed one of three set thresholds as denoted in the table above (note that some traffic lights are followed by a 1 or 2 indicating how many of the measures were barely met). Availability of Firewood, although scoring moderate satisfaction, barely did so. An Amber score is an area for improvement, rather than one of moderate satisfaction.

CAMPER SATISFACTION REPORT 2006

In 2004 and 2005, campers were **highly satisfied** with the **Overall** quality of services and facilities but 2006 is marked with a slight drop in overall satisfaction. Only 4 survey locations in 2006 received a red light score for the overall quality of services and facilities, although 10 locations received an amber light score indicating there is room for improvement.

For a detailed summary of ratings and satisfaction measures / thresholds for the province, please see Appendix 4.

Areas of High Satisfaction: ○○●

Responsiveness to Visitor Concerns

46% of campers were very satisfied with this attribute in 2006 compared to 57% in 2005. However in both 2005 and 2006, just over a third (34%) of all responses to this attribute indicated that it was ‘not applicable’.

Although this attribute had a high level of satisfaction provincially, 4 campgrounds received a moderate level of satisfaction (amber light) for this attribute and 8 campgrounds received a low level of satisfaction (red light) for this attribute.¹

Of the 135² comments regarding staff, only 8% (an increase of 3% from 2005) were related to staff responsiveness. It was the lowest issue about staff cited by campers. Unfriendly or rude staff ranked the highest at 32% followed by additional staff needed (19%) and no staff seen/available (16%). Each of these may be related to responsiveness issues.³

Of note, 20% of the 1,027 positive comments in 2006 were made about good staff, hosts and operators.

Cleanliness of Grounds

Similar to results from previous years, over half (52%) of all campers in 2006 were very satisfied with the cleanliness of grounds. Only 3 campgrounds received a red light for this attribute.

127 comments (3% of all comments) were received concerning the cleanliness of grounds and campsites.

Of the related comments, those regarding dirty campsites (24%), fire pits full/dirty (21%), and garbage overflow (15%) were the most common.

Clean/well run campground/clean washrooms accounted for 10% of all positive comments made.

Control of Noise

Nearly half (45%) of the campers were very satisfied with this attribute (a drop of only 3% from 2005). However, 10 out of 25 campgrounds did not receive a green light for controlling noise.

Noise complaints only accounted for 5% of all negative comments received.

Campers were most concerned with late-night noise levels (25% of all noise complaints – a drop of 10% from 2005). Generator noise followed second at 22% while general noise control was at 21%.

Comments regarding the quietness of the campgrounds (n=40) accounted for 4% of all the positive comments made.

Safety and Security

Nearly half (44%) of the campers surveyed were generally satisfied with safety and security (a drop of only 2% from 2005). Only 3 campgrounds received a red light, however amber light scores (8) more than quadrupled compared to 2005 (2).

Comments regarding safety and security accounted for 4% of all comments received. Of the 180 related comments, those regarding other enforcement/safety issues accounted for (38%) of comments of this category (a drop of 20% from 2005). Excessive speed in campgrounds was the most frequent concern of the other enforcement/safety issues (26%).

¹ Traffic light summaries for each survey location are included in Appendix 5.

² A rank order listing of negative comments is provided in Table 4.

³ A summary of the comments analysis is included in Appendix 6.

19% of campers would like more security patrols. The other comments for this attribute addressed enforcement issues complaints about dogs off leash (11%), control of parking (6%) and the need for boat control (1% which is down 6% from 2005).

There were 18 positive comments regarding safety/security issues. Accounting for 2% of all positive comments made.

Friendliness and Courtesy of Staff

60% of campers were very satisfied with this attribute (down from 70% in 2005) and only two campgrounds received an amber light while all others received green light scores for this attribute.

Since 2002, campers have consistently rated their satisfaction with friendliness and courtesy of staff the highest of all measured services and facilities.

In 2006, 32% of comments related to staff concerned rude or unfriendly staff. However, only 3% of all comments were staff-related (n=135).

20% of all positive comments were related to good staff/hosts/operators.

It should be noted that this survey attribute did not distinguish between departmental staff and contractor staff.

Areas for Improvement ○●○

Availability of Firewood

Consistent with results from the past 4 years, 46% of campers in 2006 were very satisfied with wood availability. However, as in 2005, 12% of campers were considered dissatisfied, making this the highest rate of dissatisfaction of all attributes.

Firewood comments accounted for the third most comments in any category (7%). Of the 313 firewood-related comments (down from 636 last year), those regarding the cost (44%), poor access (13%), quantity (12%) and delivery service (12%) were most common.

Firewood comments accounted for 23% of all surveys with negative comments. This is a dramatic drop from the 48% in 2005.

Condition of Facilities

Only 39% of all campers were very satisfied with the condition of facilities. 8 campgrounds received an amber light for this attribute and 7 campgrounds received a red light for this attribute.

13% of all negative comments received in the 2006 survey were related to the deteriorating condition of facilities. Comments of this nature were made on 39% (46% in 2005) of all the surveys received with negative comments.

Campers are consistently concerned with the deteriorating condition of facilities as indicated by the number of comments received. In the last 5 years, including 2006, the majority of negative comments received from campers were related to the deteriorating facilities.

Of the 535 comments concerning the condition of facilities, the most common

issue in 2006 were the need for landscaping work (grass needs cutting, trim overgrowth, need more trees/shrubs). Other frequently mentioned complaints were, the washrooms and shower facilities deteriorating, overall general deterioration of the campground and the dusty roads/the need to pave the roads in the campground and access roads.

3% of all positive comments made were regarding nice facilities (e.g. campground, campsites, and/or grounds) compared to 17% in 2005.

Areas of Concern: ●○○○

Value of Camping Fee

Value for camping fees has consistently been an issue for campers since 2002, receiving the poorest scores of all attributes in all years. Only 3 campgrounds in 2006 received a green light for this attribute.

In 2006, slightly less than one-third (28%) (33% in 2005) of all campers were very satisfied with the value for camping fees. It scored the lowest average score (3.8) out of all attributes.

Although campers were dissatisfied with the value for camping, related comments only accounted for 4% (only up 2% from 2005) of all comments received.

Campers were primarily concerned with the high or increasing cost of camping (n=126, up from 54 in 2005), accounting for 71% of negative comments for this category. 17% of comments in this category were in regard to not having a reservation fee.

Park Information Services

Approximately one-quarter of campers rated Park Information Services average or less (27%), down slightly from 2005 (34%). Only 4 campgrounds received a green light score for this attribute. Only 6% of campers were dissatisfied with information services (down from 12% in 2005).

Similar to 2005, it is interesting to note that 14% of all responses to this attribute indicated that it was 'not applicable', potentially pointing to some confusion with park information services.

Of the 187 relevant comments, the majority were concerned with inadequate signage within the campground (21%), other information services in general (21%), and a

need/better campground maps (15%). Inaccurate information in the campground guide, website, signs and maps came in at 11%.

Cleanliness of Washrooms

2006 marks a dramatic drop in visitor satisfaction with the cleanliness of washrooms. In 2005, washroom cleanliness received a green light score with almost half (46%) of campers being very satisfied with this attribute while 6% were considered dissatisfied. In contrast, in 2006 only 35% of campers were very satisfied and 9% were considered dissatisfied. 13 campgrounds received a red light score compared to only 8 in 2005.

Once again, washrooms and showers are a key concern for many campers as indicated by the number of comments consistently received since 2002.

Almost one quarter (21%) of all negative comments received were related to washrooms and showers in general, making it the most common general category (n=880, up from 648 in 2005).

Complaints related to the cleanliness or odours of washrooms and showers (n=250) accounted for 28% of all cleanliness of washroom comments.

If all washroom and shower-related comments are amalgamated, then poor washroom cleanliness and offensive odours (each at 13%), the need to install shower facilities (11%), the need for flush toilets and running water (8%), and the need of supplies (soap, hand sanitizer, toilet paper) (7%) were the most common concerns.

Campsite Reservation System

Although not a camper satisfaction attribute, complaints regarding the campsite reservation system were very common (n=416). Of the 416 comments

regarding the reservation system, the difficulty of reserving was the highest cited issue (28%) followed by campers wanting more first-come-first-served campsites (21%). 15% were concerned with needing a reservation system while 13% commented on other reservation issues such as the reservation policy not being consistently applied.

Table 4: Rank Order of Negative Comments

General Category	# of Comments	% of All Comments	% of All Surveys Represented
Condition of Facilities: Washrooms/showers, Roads, Campsite, Grounds Maintenance, Beach/Lake, Trails, Playground	535	12.6	39.3
Reservation System	416	9.8	30.6
Firewood	313	7.4	23.0
Hook-ups/Dump stations/Water	301	7.1	22.1
Washroom - Other	283	6.7	20.8
Washroom & Showers: Cleanliness/Odours	250	5.9	18.4
Showers - Other	245	5.8	18.0
Noise Complaints	195	4.6	14.3
Information Services	187	4.4	13.8
Safety and Security	180	4.3	13.2
Value for Camping	178	4.2	13.1
Campground Facilities	164	3.9	12.1
Campground Operations/Policy	144	3.4	10.6
Miscellaneous	140	3.3	10.3
Campsite Preferences	136	3.2	10.0
Staffing/C.O.'s/Hosts	135	3.2	9.9
Grounds/Campsite Cleanliness	127	3.0	9.3
Animal/Insect Complaints	69	1.6	5.1
Playground/Play Areas	57	1.3	4.2
Trails	54	1.3	4.0
Beach/Lake	44	1.0	3.2
Interpretive Programs	38	0.9	2.8
Fishing	22	0.5	1.6
Fire bans	18	0.4	1.3
Total	4,231	100.0	311.1

Note: Percent of all surveys represented add up to >100% as many respondents made comments that applied to more than one general category and/or more than one subcategory (1,360 Surveys Represented).

Additional Comments Analysis:

Unsolicited comments supplied by campers in the completed surveys provide valuable insight into potential issues in Alberta's provincial parks and recreation areas (Appendix 6). A single unsolicited comment is potentially more important than is apparent from the frequency of the comment. As such, it is important to highlight all of the issues that came out of camper's feedback and to understand that every comment is potentially important.

In addition to the comments associated with services and facilities highlighted in the previous section, several additional types of comments were frequently mentioned in the completed surveys. The most common of these included firewood too expensive (n=138), camping fees too high (n=126), difficulty with reservation system (n=118), poor washroom cleanliness (n=118), offensive washroom/shower odours (n=117), install or get additional power campsites (n=104), and install shower facilities (n=96).

Moderately cited concerns dealt with general campground operations/policy issues (n=77), flush toilets/running water needed (n=73), landscaping (grass needs cutting, trim overgrowth, need more trees/shrubs (n=72), other enforcement issues (n=68), supplies needed (paper, soap, and specifically some requests for hand sanitizers) (n=65), washroom facility deterioration (n=62), and excessive speed in campgrounds (n=47).

Specific comment summaries for each campground surveyed are outlined in the individual campground reports.

Performance Measure:

As mentioned previously, 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 established in 2004. The target was set at 91% based on the average of 2003 and 2004 results. A stretch factor was not applied because three years of data was not available (see note below).

Table 5: Performance Measure: Overall Satisfaction with Quality of Services and Facilities

Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities?			Performance Measure:
2006 (n=2,079)	Very Satisfied	41%	89%
	Satisfied	48%	
2005 (n=2,050)	Very Satisfied	46%	91%
	Satisfied	45%	
2004 (n=3,136)	Very Satisfied	52%	91%
	Satisfied	39%	
2003 (n=3,006)	Very Satisfied	46%	90%
	Satisfied	44%	
2002 (n=5,336)	Very Good (~'Very Satisfied')	43%	87%
	Good (~'Satisfied')	44%	

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.

In the 2006 season, 89% of the 2,079 respondents who rated their overall satisfaction with quality of services and facilities were either 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied'. Of those, 41% of respondents were considered 'very satisfied', while 48% were considered 'satisfied' (Table 5).

Performance Analysis:

In 2005 the parks and protected areas program (PPA) established a dual target for all camper satisfaction attributes. That is, PPA expects 91% of campers to be at least ‘satisfied’ and 50% to be very satisfied (N.B. The thresholds used in this analysis are for internal comparison only). Applying these thresholds to each of the 10 measured attributes lends perspective to the overall satisfaction measure and highlights problem areas that may not necessarily be apparent in the generalized traffic light summary results outlined previously. Table 6 highlights the number of survey locations in 2006 that either met or exceeded targets based on these thresholds.

Table 6: Number of Survey Locations Meeting or Exceeding Targets in 2006 (n=15¹)

Targets		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
91% of campers satisfied or very satisfied	2006	0	10	0	4	3	6	2	4	0	4	9
	2005	2	7	0	6	0	6	4	4	0	1	7
50% of campers very satisfied	2006	2	10	1	5	4	7	3	4	0	6	5
	2005	3	9	1	5	2	8	5	4	0	6	4

Although overall satisfaction was relatively high at several (60%) of the survey locations in 2006, fewer than half of the survey locations failed to meet or exceed the 91% ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ target for all attributes except one, friendliness and courtesy of staff. In fact, survey locations in 2006 were only most likely to meet or exceed both the 91% and 50% satisfaction targets when campers were asked to rate their satisfaction with the friendliness and courtesies of staff.

While control of noise, safety and security, cleanliness of grounds and responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns received green light scores provincially, these may still be areas of concern or improvement at many of the survey locations.

¹ Of 25 survey locations only 15 had an adequate sample size (i.e., >95) required for site specific analysis.
 Note: Of 21 survey locations, in 2005, only 10 had an adequate sample.

Table 7: Percentage of Locations Meeting or Exceeding Targets for all Years

Targets		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
2006 (n=15)	91% of campers satisfied or very satisfied	0%	67%	0%	27%	20%	40%	13%	27%	0%	27%	60%
	50% of campers very satisfied	13%	67%	7%	33%	27%	47%	20%	27%	0%	40%	33%
2005 (n=10)	91% of campers satisfied or very satisfied	20%	70%	0%	60%	0%	60%	40%	40%	0%	10%	70%
	50% of campers very satisfied	30%	90%	10%	50%	20%	80%	50%	40%	0%	60%	40%
2004 (n=18)	91% of campers satisfied or very satisfied	22%	56%	6%	33%	28%	56%	33%	39%	11%	6%	61%
	50% of campers very satisfied	44%	67%	11%	56%	44%	67%	44%	50%	28%	61%	50%
2003 (n=13)	91% of campers satisfied or very satisfied	8%	69%	15%	38%	38%	54%	31%	46%	8%	23%	62%
	50% of campers very satisfied	31%	85%	15%	46%	38%	54%	46%	46%	23%	38%	38%
2002 (n=25)	91% of campers satisfied or very satisfied	4%	60%	0%	28%	16%	52%	4%	12%	0%	24%	36%
	50% of campers very satisfied	8%	84%	4%	52%	28%	48%	12%	8%	4%	40%	28%

CAMPER SATISFACTION REPORT 2006

Compared to 2005, fewer campgrounds in 2006 met or exceeded the 91% satisfied or very satisfied target for 6 of the 10 attributes (Table 7). In 2006, 9 attributes had fewer than half of the survey locations that met or exceeded the 91% 'satisfied' target. Half of the sites met or exceeded the 50% 'very satisfied' target for only 1 attribute in 2006, compared to 5 attributes in 2005. 60% of locations in 2006 met or exceeded the 91% target for overall satisfaction compared to 70% in 2005.

Camper Profiles:

Party Size:

- The average party size (defined as the number of campers included on an overnight permit) for all campgrounds surveyed in 2006 was 3.2 campers.
- In 2006, most camping parties were made up of either 2 (46%) or 4 campers (22%) on an overnight permit.
- Intriguingly, although the maximum number of people allowed on a permit (site) is 6, campers reported that their party size (the number of people included on one overnight permit) ranged from 1 camper to 12 campers per permit. Nonetheless, only 2.4% of campers reported party sizes greater than 6.

Origin:

- Similar to previous results, 97.3% of **all** campers in 2006 are from Canada (United States=1.1% and ‘Other Country’=1.6%). Table 8 presents the specifics.
- The origin of Canadian campers in 2006 is virtually identical to previous years. In 2006, 91.5% of **Canadian** campers are from Alberta, 4% are from British Columbia, 2% are from Saskatchewan, 2% are from Ontario and less than 1% are from the rest of Canada.
- The largest single centres of camping origin in the province were Calgary (27%, up 7% since 2005) and Edmonton (13%, 0% change since 2005), mirroring the two largest population centres of the province. The next largest centres of origin were Medicine Hat (9%, up 6% since 2005), Grand Prairie (3%, down 2% since 2005), and Red Deer (3%). Together, these five cities accounted for 55% of all Alberta campers to surveyed campgrounds in 2006.

Table 8: Origin Profiles of campers and Canadian campers

All Campers				
Origin	2006 (n=2,446)	2005 (n=2,136)	2004 (n=3,222)	2003 (n=3,043)
Canada	97.3%	95.5%	97.5%	96.6%
United States	1.1%	2.6%	1.5%	2.3%
Other International	1.6%	1.9%	1.0%	1.1%

Canadian Campers				
Origin	2006 (n=2,304)	2005 (n=1,937)	2004 (n=2,997)	2003 (n= 2,869)
Alberta	91.5%	94.2%	92.9%	92.9%
British Columbia	3.7%	2.8%	2.5%	3.1%
Saskatchewan	2.3%	1.3%	1.6%	2.0%
Ontario	1.6%	0.8%	1.5%	1.1%
Other Canada	0.9%	0.8%	1.5%	1.3%

Trip Type:

- Campers from Ontario stay at a campground that is either an unplanned stopover (39%) or more than one planned destination (50%). In contrast, the majority of Albertans and campers from Saskatchewan stay at a campground that is the main destination of their trip (76% and 62% respectively) (Table 9).
- Campers from British Columbia stay at a campground that is either the main destination (40%) or more than one destination (30%).

Table 9: Trip Types for all campers by selected Provinces

	All Campers		Alberta		British Columbia		Ontario		Saskatchewan	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
The main destination of your trip	1,732	71	1,591	76	33	40	1	3	32	62
Just an unplanned stopover en route	185	8	116	6	16	19	14	39	6	12
A planned stopover en route	174	7	137	7	9	11	3	8	1	2
One of several planned destinations	335	14	244	12	25	30	18	50	13	25
Total	2,426	100	2,088	100	83	100	36	100	52	100

Note: Percent figures rounded to the nearest 1.

Reservation Service - Satisfaction:

Campers were asked to indicate whether they had ever made a reservation for a campsite in one of Alberta's Parks. Slightly over half (54%) reported having placed a reservation.

- Compared to campers from Alberta, fewer campers from other provinces had ever made a reservation for a campsite in one of Alberta's Parks (Table 10).

Table 10: Reservation by Province

	Have you ever made a reservation for a campsite in one of Alberta's Parks?	
	Yes (%)	No (%)
Alberta	57	43
British Columbia	19	81
Ontario	39	61
Saskatchewan	32	68

Campers who said they had made a reservation for a campsite in one of Alberta's Parks were asked how satisfied they were, overall, with the reservation service. The majority (74%) were satisfied, either very satisfied or satisfied with the reservation service. However, a number of campers (11%) were dissatisfied.

Reservation Service - Use:

"We are considering developing a centralized campsite reservation system for Alberta's Parks. Reservation services could be provided by calling a single toll-free number or by accessing the system via the Internet." To the question, "How often would you use such a reservation system?", almost half (46%) said they would use it occasionally, while 31% said frequently (Table 11).

Table 11: Frequency of Centralized Campsite Reservation Use

	n	%
Frequently	719	31
Occasionally	1,077	46
Holiday weekends only	232	10
Never	306	13
Total	2,334	100

To the question, “What would your preferred way to make a reservation be?”, most campers (63%) would prefer to make a reservation with a phone and internet service combination (Table 12).

Table 12: Preferred way to make a Reservation

	n	%
Phone and Internet combination	1,403	63
Telephone only	585	26
Internet only	213	9
Other	43	2
Total	2,244	100

Camper Segment Profiles:

Campers were asked a series of correlated questions, when analysed against a set logic (determined by Alberta Economic Development – Travel Alberta) divided camper's profiles into predetermined segments: (Findings are similar to those from 2005 - Table 13).

- **Real Relaxers** accounted for 42% of camper's profiles. Real Relaxers desire tranquility and peace and quiet. They prefer to do nothing.
- **Comfort Seekers** accounted for 45% of camper's profiles. Comfort Seekers have a strong preference for familiar and rural locations. They desire relaxation and strengthening family bonds.
- The smallest segment was **Accomplishers** which accounted for only 13% of camper's profiles. Accomplishers desire unfamiliar places to visit and new things to do.

Table 13: Camper Segment Profiles

Segment	2005		2006	
	n	%	n	%
Accomplishers	240	13	275	13
Comfort Seekers	794	43	982	45
Real Relaxers	829	44	922	42
Total	1,863	100	2,179	100

Appendix 1.

2006 Survey Distribution / Collection Quotas

Distribution and Collection Guidelines and Final Response
Number of Surveys by Survey Location
(includes returns from survey locations not included in final analysis)

2006 Park / PRA	Adjusted Population (OCN/3) ¹	Sample Target to be Collected ²	Sample Target to be Distributed ³	Sample Targets								Actual Returns	
				Collected				Distributed				Surveys Processed	% of Collection Target Achieved
				June	July	August	September	June	July	August	September		
Big Knife	518	145	260	27	39	21	8	86	117	92	10	108	74
Bleriot Ferry	538	145	265	17	62	47	12	47	134	98	20	138	95
Bow Valley - Lac Des Arcs	330	125	225	5	5	7	0	21	25	37	3	14	11
Bow Valley - Three Sisters	764	160	285	4	10	9	0	25	53	53	7	27	17
Crimson Lake	3,102	185	340	15	9	22	0	68	70	93	0	46	25
Cypress Hills - Beaver Creek	673	155	280	21	96	68	0	40	124	80	0	184	119
Cypress Hills - Reesor Lake	499	145	260	38	70	38	7	47	95	55	40	153	106
Dillberry Lake	361	130	235	8	8	28	0	22	44	36	NR	45	35
Dinosaur	2,909	185	335	12	22	36	7	70	117	126	35	78	42
Elbow Valley	1,236	170	310	27	18	14	0	70	74	80	5	56	33
Garner Lake	875	165	295	7	38	NR	NR	30	74	NR	NR	59	36
Highwood/Cataract	396	135	240	23	17	49	28	43	37	80	75	118	87
Kinbrook Island	3,544	190	340	5	6	75	14	36	36	182	18	101	53
Little Bow	3,294	190	340	18	27	25	NR	86	160	140	NR	70	37
Long Lake	4,704	190	345	22	43	36	11	73	106	90	20	112	59
Lundbreck Falls	1,145	170	305	22	15	0	0	35	19	0	0	37	22
Moonshine Lake	1,217	170	310	27	44	53	20	52	91	119	31	144	85
Peter Lougheed Park - Canyon	657	155	275	24	64	68	5	58	158	126	11	166	107
Peter Lougheed Park - Interlakes	1,362	175	315	27	57	76	36	59	107	114	41	204	117
Prairie Creek	421	135	245	11	9	18	0	33	71	44	0	30	22
Ram Falls	397	135	240	3	7	25	0	33	71	62	0	43	32
Red Lodge	1,951	180	325	45	33	46	4	85	101	114	11	128	71
Rochon Sands	896	165	295	34	30	22	NR	59	95	60	NR	97	59
Saskatoon Island	1,804	180	325	18	4	15	3	77	35	79	9	42	23
Tillebrook	1,955	180	325	22	39	34	0	47	103	65	8	97	54
Wabamun Lake	2,739	185	335	57	30	0	0	73	44	0	0	107	58
William A Switzer - Gregg Lake	1,569	175	320	9	44	29	19	45	136	110	29	106	61
Provincial Total	39,856	4,420	7,970									2,510	57

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 ±7% margin of error at a 95% confidence interval.

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

NR Not Recorded.

Appendix 2.

Supplemental Questions – Detailed Summary

CS Survey

Year Added Year Deleted

Supplemental Questions

2002 2003

3. Did you get the type of campsite that you wanted?

- Yes
- No - Which type of campsite would you have preferred? (Mark all that apply)
 - Larger
 - More wooded / shaded
 - More grass cover
 - More private
 - Electrical
 - Electrical & water & sewer
 - Other (specify) _____

2003 2004

6. How would you rate the quality of the following campsite features at this campground? (mark ALL that apply)

	Very Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
Fire pit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Picnic table	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Levelness of site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Privacy of site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campground lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cleanliness of the site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
General condition of trees and/or vegetation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Garbage and recycling facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CS Survey

Year Added Year Deleted

Supplemental Questions

2004 2005

2. Did anyone in your group participate in any of the following activities while visiting this park? (mark ALL that apply). If you and someone else in your group did an activity, you should mark both boxes. Not all listed activities may be available or permitted at this park.

Activities:

I DID Someone else in my group DID

	I DID	Someone else in my group DID
A. Attending staff-led presentations / activities / amphitheatre programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Visiting viewpoints / lookouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Using Playground Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Swimming / beach use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Picnicking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Motorboating / waterskiing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Fishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Birdwatching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Viewing / photographing nature or wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Canoeing / kayaking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Mountain biking (off road)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
L. Other bicycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M. Day hiking (unguided)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
N. Guided hikes / walks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
O. Backcountry recreation (e.g., hiking, camping)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P. Casual play (e.g., frisbee, horseshoes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q. Resting / relaxing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
R. Other (specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Which ONE activity listed above did YOU spend the MOST time doing? Please choose the letter that identifies that activity and write it in the box below (e.g., spent most time fishing = G).

Please specify only one letter from the list above:

CS Survey

Year Added Year Deleted

Supplemental Questions

2005

2. In thinking of your camping trips, please answer the following questions:

a) From the following list, please select the **THREE** most important reasons you have for going on a camping trip: (*mark only three*)

- To get away from the daily routine
- To strengthen our family bonds
- To relax
- To do things that I've never done before
- To see new places
- For some peace and quiet
- To have fun with friends

b) When thinking of your camping trips, which word best describes your destination preference? (*mark only one*)

- Unfamiliar OR Familiar

c) When thinking of your camping trips, which word best describes your destination preference? (*mark only one*)

- Excitement OR Tranquil

d) How well does the following statement describe you: "I like to challenge myself when I am on a camping trip"? (*mark only one*)

- Does not describe me OR Describes me

e) Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "We carefully plan our camping trip before actually going"? (*mark only one*)

- Disagree OR Agree

CS Survey

Year Added Year Deleted

2002 2006

Supplemental Questions

4. Was this your *FIRST* visit to *THIS* park?

- Yes No

If NO, please indicate the number of previous visits to this park in the past two years:

- None in the past 2 years 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more

5. How many nights did you stay at this campground during this visit?

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

6. What type(s) of camping shelter did your group use during this visit? (*mark ALL that apply*)

- Tent
 Tent Trailer
 Camperized Van
 Truck Camper

- | | 5th Wheel
Trailer: | Travel
Trailer: | Motor
Home: |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| mark
size: | <input type="radio"/> <20' | <input type="radio"/> <20' | <input type="radio"/> <20' |
| | <input type="radio"/> 20'-24' | <input type="radio"/> 20'-24' | <input type="radio"/> 20'-24' |
| | <input type="radio"/> 25'-29' | <input type="radio"/> 25'-29' | <input type="radio"/> 25'-29' |
| | <input type="radio"/> 30'-34' | <input type="radio"/> 30'-34' | <input type="radio"/> 30'-34' |
| | <input type="radio"/> 35'-40' | <input type="radio"/> 35'-40' | <input type="radio"/> 35'-40' |
| | <input type="radio"/> >40' | <input type="radio"/> >40' | <input type="radio"/> >40' |

Other (*specify*): _____

CS Survey

**Year
Added** **Year
Deleted**

Supplemental Questions

2006

3. With respect to this trip, is this site:
(mark *only one*)

- The main destination of your trip?
- Just an unplanned stopover en route?
- A planned stopover en route?
- One of several planned destinations?

CS Survey

Year Added Year Deleted

Supplemental Questions

2006

5. Have you ever made a reservation for a campsite in one of Alberta's Parks?

- Yes No

If YES, Overall how satisfied were you with the reservation service?

(considering: customer service on the telephone; your campground choices; meeting your information needs; fees and policies; and confirmation of your reservation)

Overall, how satisfied were you with the reservation service?

We are considering developing a centralized campsite reservation system for Alberta's Parks. Reservation services could be provided by calling a single toll-free number or by accessing the system via the Internet. Your opinions are valuable in helping us give you the best possible service.

6. How often would you use such a reservation system?

- Frequently Holiday weekends only
 Occasionally Never

7. What would your preferred way to make a reservation be?

- Phone and Internet combination
 Telephone only
 Internet only
 Other (specify): _____

Appendix 3.

Questionnaire

What could we have done to make your visit better?

Horizontal lines for handwritten feedback.

Thank-you for your cooperation.

4045

Your participation is very important in evaluating our services.

We appreciate your help.

Please do not write in this space

Alphanumeric grid for data entry with letters A-Z and numbers 0-9.

FOR PARK USE ONLY

Please return your completed survey to any of our staff, or drop it off at the check-in station or in a self-registration vault or visitor comment box.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT Parks and Protected Areas Division

How Are We Doing?

Dear Visitor,

We are dedicated to providing a high quality experience to our visitors. As part of our efforts to continually improve services, we are asking for your help.

Please take a few minutes at the END OF YOUR VISIT to complete this short survey. Depending on your location, your completed survey can be returned by one of the following options: return the survey in person to any of our staff (Conservation Officers, Campground Hosts, or Campground Operators), drop it off at the main check-in station, or deposit it in a self-registration vault or visitor comment box.

Welcome! to Alberta's Provincial Parks and Recreation Areas.

Please complete this survey just before you leave the park near the end of your stay. We ask **ONLY ONE** adult (18 years or older) in your immediate group who most recently had a birthday to complete this survey.

Please mark your choice by completely filling in the response circle. ○ ● ○

We welcome your comments, however please write them on the back of the survey.

1. How would you rate each of the following?
(mark N/A for any items that did not apply to this visit)

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR	N/A
a) 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	○	○	○	○	○	○

b)

Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of services and facilities?

VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
○	○	○	○	○

2. In thinking of your camping trips, please answer the following questions:

a) From the following list, please select the **THREE** most important reasons you have for going on a camping trip: (mark only three)

To get away from the daily routine	○
To strengthen our family bonds	○
To relax	○
To do things that I've never done before	○
To see new places	○
For some peace and quiet	○
To have fun with friends	○

b) When thinking of your camping trips, which word best describes your destination preference? (mark only one)

○ Unfamiliar OR ○ Familiar

c) When thinking of your camping trips, which word best describes your destination preference? (mark only one)

○ Excitement OR ○ Tranquil

d) How well does the following statement describe you: "I like to challenge myself when I am on a camping trip"? (mark only one)

○ Does not describe me OR ○ Describes me

e) Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "We carefully plan our camping trip before actually going"? (mark only one)

○ Disagree OR ○ Agree

3. With respect to this trip, is this site: (mark only one)

- The main destination of your trip?
- Just an unplanned stopover en route?
- A planned stopover en route?
- One of several planned destinations?

4. Indicate the number of people that are included on your overnight camping permit (single permit only).

Please specify: (include yourself)

5. Have you ever made a reservation for a campsite in one of Alberta's Parks?

○ Yes ○ No

If YES, Overall how satisfied were you with the reservation service?

(considering: customer service on the telephone; your campground choices; meeting your information needs; fees and policies; and confirmation of your reservation)

VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
○	○	○	○	○

Overall, how satisfied were you with the reservation service?

We are considering developing a centralized campsite reservation system for Alberta's Parks. Reservation services could be provided by calling a single toll-free number or by accessing the system via the Internet. Your opinions are valuable in helping us give you the best possible service.

6. How often would you use such a reservation system?

○ Frequently ○ Holiday weekends only
○ Occasionally ○ Never

7. What would your preferred way to make a reservation be?

- Phone and Internet combination
- Telephone only
- Internet only
- Other (specify): _____

8. I live in:

○ Canada → Canadian Postal Code:

○ United States

○ Other Country (specify): _____

please place comments on back →

Appendix 4.

Satisfaction Score Results – Detailed Summary

**How Would You Rate Each of the Following?
Satisfaction with 10 Park Services and Facilities
2006 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	% poor + very poor	% very good	#
Cleanliness of washrooms	148	6.1	84	3.5	117	4.8	433	17.8	845	34.8	802	33.0	2,429	3.9	8.8	35.2	2,281
Friendliness and courtesy of staff	85	3.5	12	0.5	18	0.7	162	6.7	736	30.4	1412	58.2	2,425	4.5	1.3	60.3	2,340
Park information services	321	13.8	38	1.6	83	3.6	431	18.5	809	34.7	652	27.9	2,334	4.0	6.0	32.4	2,013
Responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns	795	33.7	27	1.1	51	2.2	197	8.4	576	24.4	713	30.2	2,359	4.2	5.0	45.6	1,564
Condition of facilities	22	0.9	24	1.0	83	3.5	356	14.8	988	41.2	925	38.6	2,398	4.1	4.5	38.9	2,376
Cleanliness of grounds	1	0.0	18	0.7	52	2.1	247	10.2	842	34.8	1260	52.1	2,420	4.4	2.9	52.1	2,419
Control of noise	132	5.5	45	1.9	64	2.7	321	13.4	824	34.4	1011	42.2	2,397	4.2	4.8	44.6	2,265
Safety and security	152	6.4	12	0.5	39	1.6	277	11.6	924	38.7	985	41.2	2,389	4.3	2.3	44.0	2,237
Value for camping fee	6	0.2	68	2.8	158	6.5	653	27.0	853	35.3	680	28.1	2,418	3.8	9.4	28.2	2,412
Availability of firewood	392	16.5	118	5.0	116	4.9	258	10.8	574	24.1	921	38.7	2,379	4.0	11.8	46.4	1,987

* 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
2006 Provincial Summary**

Overall Satisfaction	Rating										Number of Respondents	Average Score	LowBox	TopBox	Evaluation Score 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?	21	0.90	53	2.27	180	7.72	1120	48.01	959	41.11	2,333	4.26	3.17	41.11	2,333

**Satisfaction Measures: Thresholds and Traffic Light Scores for 10 Park Services and Facilities
2006 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	3.95	Fail	8.81	Pass	35.16	Fail	● Red	1
Friendliness and courtesy of staff	4.50	Pass	1.28	Pass	60.34	Pass	● Green	
Park information services	3.97	Fail	6.01	Pass	32.39	Fail	● Red	
Responsiveness of staff to visitor concerns	4.21	Pass	4.99	Pass	45.59	Pass	● Green	
Condition of facilities	4.14	Pass	4.50	Pass	38.93	Fail	● Amber	
Cleanliness of grounds	4.35	Pass	2.89	Pass	52.09	Pass	● Green	
Control of noise	4.19	Pass	4.81	Pass	44.64	Pass	● Green	
Safety and security	4.27	Pass	2.28	Pass	44.03	Pass	● Green	
Value for camping fee	3.80	Fail	9.37	Pass	28.19	Fail	● Red	1
Availability of firewood	4.04	Pass	11.78	Fail	46.35	Pass	● Amber	1

**Overall Satisfaction Measure: Thresholds and Traffic Light Scores
2006 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?	4.26	Pass	3.17	Pass	41.11	Pass	● Green	1

Traffic Light Evaluation	
● (Green) High Satisfaction:	All 3 measures meet set thresholds
● (Amber) Moderate Satisfaction:	1 of 3 measures fail to meet thresholds
● (Red) Potentially Low Satisfaction:	2 or 3 measures fail to meet thresholds

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

Appendix 5.

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

2006 Camper Satisfaction Survey – Traffic Light Summary of All Sites

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	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Red	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Red	● Amber
Bleriot Ferry PRA	● Red	● Green	● Red	● Green	● 1 Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green
Crimson Lake PP *	● Red	● Green	● 1 Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Amber	● 1 Green	● Green
Cypress Hills PP - Beaver Creek	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Red	● Red	● Red	● Amber	● 1 Amber	● Red	● Red	● 1 Red
Cypress Hills PP - Reesor Lake	● Red	● Green	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber	● 1 Green	● Red	● Red	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber
Dillberry Lake PP *	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber	● 1 Green	● 1 Amber	● 1 Amber	● Red	● Red	● Amber
Dinosaur PP *	● Red	● Green	● Amber	● 1 Amber	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Red	● 1 Amber	● Green
Elbow Valley PRA KC – Gooseberry *	● Red	● Green	● 2 Green	● Green	● Amber	● Green	● 1 Green	● Green	● Red	● 2 Green	● Amber
Garner Lake PP - Garner Lake *	● Red	● 1 Green	● Red	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber	● Red	● Red	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber
Highwood/Cataract PRA KC - Etherington Creek	● 2 Amber	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● 1 Red	● Green	● Green
Kinbrook Island PP	● Red	● 1 Amber	● Red	● 1 Red	● Red	● 1 Red	● 1 Amber	● Amber	● Red	● Red	● Red
Little Bow PP *	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Amber	● Red	● Green	● Red	● 1 Amber	● Red	● Green	● Green
Long Lake PP	● Red	● 1 Amber	● 1 Red	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber	● 1 Amber	● Amber	● Red	● Red	● Red
Lundbreck Falls PRA *	● Red	● Green	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green
Moonshine Lake PP	● 1 Green	● Green	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Green	● Green
Peter Lougheed PP KC - Canyon	● Green	● Green	● Amber	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Green	● Green
Peter Lougheed PP KC - Interlakes	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Green
Prairie Creek PRA *	● 1 Green	● Green	● Red	● Red	● Amber	● Amber	● 1 Amber	● 1 Green	● Red	● Red	● Amber
Ram Falls PP *	● Red	● Green	● Red	● Red	● Amber	● Green	● 1 Green	● 1 Amber	● Red	● Red	● 1 Amber
Red Lodge PP	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Red	● Amber	● Amber	● Green	● Green	● Amber	● 1 Red	● Red	● Green
Rochon Sands PP	● Red	● Green	● 1 Red	● 2 Green	● 2 Green	● Green	● Red	● Red	● 2 Green	● 1 Red	● 1 Amber
Saskatoon Island PP *	● Amber	● Green	● Red	● 1 Green	● Amber	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Green	● Amber
Tillebrook PP	● Red	● Green	● Amber	● Green	● Red	● Red	● Green	● Amber	● Red	● Red	● 1 Red
Wabamun Lake PP	● Green	● Green	● Red	● Green	● 1 Green	● Green	● Green	● Green	● Red	● 1 Red	● Amber
William A Switzer PP - Gregg Lake	● Red	● Green	● 1 Amber	● Amber	● Red	● Green	● 1 Amber	● Green	● Red	● Green	● 1 Green

* 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)
 ○ ● ○ **Moderate Satisfaction** (1/3 measures fail to meet thresholds)
 ● ○ ○ **potentially Low Satisfaction** (2/3 measures fail to meet thresholds)

Pass Level: 1 At least one of the three measures barely passed set thresholds
 2 Two of the three measures barely passed set thresholds

Appendix 6.

What Could We Have Done to Make Your Visit Better? Comment Analysis Summary

Comment Analysis:

As completed surveys were received over the 2006 survey season, all comments were entered and coded according to a comprehensive, pre-coded list. This list was developed based on comments received in 2002 and 2003, with minor additions from subsequent years. This list consists of both general and sub-categories of comments as outlined in the table in the following pages. For analysis purposes, negative and positive comments were analysed separately. Negative comments were reported to provide additional insight into the traffic light analysis for each of the 10 measured attributes. Additional comments that did not fall into one of the 10 attribute categories were also reported briefly.

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Reservation System	Difficulty with Reservation System (couldn't get, online etc.)	118	28.4	2.8	8.7
	More First-Come-First-Served	87	20.9	2.1	6.4
	Need Reservation System	64	15.4	1.5	4.7
	Other (reservation policy is not consistent etc.)	54	13.0	1.3	4.0
	Improper Reservation Use (site held with chair, tent, stayed too long, pay extra nights to keep site)	32	7.7	0.8	2.4
	Overbooked / Did Not Get the Site that was Reserved	26	6.3	0.6	1.9
	Want to Reserve a Specific Site (power, site#)	19	4.6	0.4	1.4
	More Sites Needed for Reservation	16	3.8	0.4	1.2
	Subtotal	416	100.0	9.8	30.6
	Grounds Maintenance	Landscaping (grass needs cutting, trim overgrowth, need more trees/shrubs)	72	20.9	1.7
Washroom Facilities Deteriorating		62	18.0	1.5	4.6
Poor Condition of Beach / Swimming Area (sand, size, weeds, raking)		41	11.9	1.0	3.0
Shower Facilities Deteriorating		40	11.6	0.9	2.9
General Deterioration / Needs Work, Upgrading		39	11.3	0.9	2.9
Tree Hazards / Dead Fall		29	8.4	0.7	2.1
Trails/Pathways Deteriorating / Needed / Poor Positioning		16	4.7	0.4	1.2
Playgrounds Run Down / Need Upgrading / More Equipment		14	4.1	0.3	1.0
Dock Facilities Deteriorating / Needed / Other		14	4.1	0.3	1.0
Boat Launch Deteriorating / Location / Needed		8	2.3	0.2	0.6
Needs Maintenance (sand, leaves, weeds etc.)		5	1.5	0.1	0.4
Fish Cleaning Station Deteriorating / Needed / Other		4	1.2	0.1	0.3
Subtotal		344	100.0	8.1	25.3

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Firewood	Cost (too expensive, should be free)	138	44.1	3.3	10.1
	Poor Access (location, timing)	40	12.8	0.9	2.9
	Firewood Quantity (not enough/no wood)	38	12.1	0.9	2.8
	Firewood Delivery Needed and other)	37	11.8	0.9	2.7
	Poor Quality (too long, wet)	32	10.2	0.8	2.4
	Firewood Should be Included in Fees	25	8.0	0.6	1.8
	Firewood Shelter Needed/Upgraded	3	1.0	0.1	0.2
	Subtotal	313	100.0	7.4	23.0
Hook-ups / Dump stations / Water	Install or Additional Power Campsites	104	34.6	2.5	7.6
	Sewage Dump-stations Needed / Dirty / Full	41	13.6	1.0	3.0
	Poor Drinking Water Quality / Need Potable Water	38	12.6	0.9	2.8
	More Taps / Water Locations	35	11.6	0.8	2.6
	Other (specific amperage, water filling station needed)	26	8.6	0.6	1.9
	Full Power-Water-Sewer Hook-ups Needed	23	7.6	0.5	1.7
	Water Hook-ups Needed	14	4.7	0.3	1.0
	Running Water Needed (not washroom related)	14	4.7	0.3	1.0
	Grey-water Disposal Needed	6	2.0	0.1	0.4
	Subtotal	301	100.0	7.1	22.1
Washroom - Other	Flush Toilets / Running Water Needed	73	25.8	1.7	5.4
	Supplies needed (paper, soap)	65	23.0	1.5	4.8
	Additional upgrades needed	38	13.4	0.9	2.8
	More Washroom Facilities Needed	33	11.7	0.8	2.4
	Washroom Lighting Needed (indoor, outdoor)	30	10.6	0.7	2.2
	Other (water, disrupted)	23	8.1	0.5	1.7
	Timing of Cleaning	14	4.9	0.3	1.0
	Poor Accessibility (disabled, general)	7	2.5	0.2	0.5
	Subtotal	283	100.0	6.7	20.8
Washroom & Showers: Cleanliness/Odours	Poor Washroom Cleanliness	118	47.2	2.8	8.7
	Offensive Odours	117	46.8	2.8	8.6
	Poor Shower Cleanliness	15	6.0	0.4	1.1
	Subtotal	250	100.0	5.9	18.4

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Showers - Other	Install Shower Facilities	96	39.2	2.3	7.1
	Should be Free / Less Expensive	44	18.0	1.0	3.2
	Additional Shower Facilities Needed	41	16.7	1.0	3.0
	Problems with Temperature / Pressure / Time Allotment	33	13.5	0.8	2.4
	Upgrades Needed (shelves, mats, disabled access)	22	9.0	0.5	1.6
	Poor Accessibility	9	3.7	0.2	0.7
	Subtotal	245	100.0	5.8	18.0
Noise Complaints	Late Night Parties / Other Campers	47	24.1	1.1	3.5
	Generator Noise	42	21.5	1.0	3.1
	Need Better Noise Control	41	21.0	1.0	3.0
	Music (too loud, disallow)	30	15.4	0.7	2.2
	Other - Noise Complaints	22	11.3	0.5	1.6
	Dogs Barking	13	6.7	0.3	1.0
	Subtotal	195	100.0	4.6	14.3
Information Services	Additional / Better Campground Signs	40	21.4	0.9	2.9
	Other - Information Services	40	21.4	0.9	2.9
	Need / Better Campground Maps	27	14.4	0.6	2.0
	Campground Guide / Website / Signs / Maps Inaccurate	21	11.2	0.5	1.5
	Lack of General Information about Area	16	8.6	0.4	1.2
	Additional / Better Access Road or Highway Signs to Park	15	8.0	0.4	1.1
	Need / Update Website	15	8.0	0.4	1.1
	Needed / Improved Trail Maps	13	7.0	0.3	1.0
	Subtotal	187	100.0	4.4	13.8
Safety and Security	Other Enforcement Issues	68	37.8	1.6	5.0
	Excessive Speed in Campground	47	26.1	1.1	3.5
	Need More Security Patrols	34	18.9	0.8	2.5
	Dogs Off-Leash (grounds or beach)	19	10.6	0.4	1.4
	Control of Parking (on roads, campsites, boats etc.)	10	5.6	0.2	0.7
	Boats Need Control (speeding, alcohol)	2	1.1	0.0	0.1
	Subtotal	180	100.0	4.3	13.2

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Value for Camping	Camping Fees Too High (poor value for services provided)	126	70.8	3.0	9.3
	Shouldn't Have the \$6 Reservation Fee	30	16.9	0.7	2.2
	Charges for Additional Camping Units on a Campsite are Too High	21	11.8	0.5	1.5
	Free Camping for Preferred Visitors	1	0.6	0.0	0.1
	Subtotal	178	100.0	4.2	13.1
Campground Facilities	Store Needed / Have More Supplies / Too Expensive	44	26.8	1.0	3.2
	More Garbage Bins Needed	24	14.6	0.6	1.8
	Need / Additional Phone Booth	22	13.4	0.5	1.6
	Other - Campground Facilities	20	12.2	0.5	1.5
	Need More Facilities (fire pits, marina etc.)	16	9.8	0.4	1.2
	Recycle Bins Needed	16	9.8	0.4	1.2
	Boat/Seadoo Rentals Needed	8	4.9	0.2	0.6
	Need / Better Area Campground Lighting	8	4.9	0.2	0.6
	Need / Additional Laundry Facilities	6	3.7	0.1	0.4
Subtotal	164	100.0	3.9	12.1	
Campground Operations/Policy	Other (tent specific sites, check-out times)	77	53.5	1.8	5.7
	Fee Discounts Needed (seniors, weekdays)	26	18.1	0.6	1.9
	Opposed to Contracted Operations (should be Government run)	19	13.2	0.4	1.4
	Fee Structure (should have day-use and seasonal fees)	9	6.3	0.2	0.7
	Poor Refund Policy	6	4.2	0.1	0.4
	Extended Booth Hours	6	4.2	0.1	0.4
	More Payment Options (Visa, Interac, cheque)	1	0.7	0.0	0.1
	Subtotal	144	100.0	3.4	10.6

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Miscellaneous	Subtotal	140	100.0	3.3	10.3
Campsite Preferences	Need Additional Campsites	31	22.8	0.7	2.3
	Too Small / Narrow	27	19.9	0.6	2.0
	More Private	18	13.2	0.4	1.3
	More Shaded / Wooded	12	8.8	0.3	0.9
	More Grass Cover	12	8.8	0.3	0.9
	Other Preferences	11	8.1	0.3	0.8
	Need Tent Pads	11	8.1	0.3	0.8
	Closer to Lake / Water	11	8.1	0.3	0.8
	Need Pull-through Campsites	3	2.2	0.1	0.2
	Subtotal	136	100.0	3.2	10.0
Staffing / C.O.'s / Hosts	Unfriendly / Rude	43	31.9	1.0	3.2
	Additional Staff Needed	26	19.3	0.6	1.9
	No Staff Seen / Available	22	16.3	0.5	1.6
	Other - Staffing/CO/Hosts	19	14.1	0.4	1.4
	Un-informed Staff	14	10.4	0.3	1.0
	Poor Response to Concerns	11	8.1	0.3	0.8
	Subtotal	135	100.0	3.2	9.9
Grounds/Campsite Cleanliness	Campsite Dirty (garbage in site)	30	23.6	0.7	2.2
	Firepits Full / Dirty	26	20.5	0.6	1.9
	Garbage Overflowing / More Frequent Removal Needed / Offensive Odours	19	15.0	0.4	1.4
	Beach / Swimming Area Dirty	19	15.0	0.4	1.4
	Dog Feces Not Picked Up	15	11.8	0.4	1.1
	Campsite Needs Raking	10	7.9	0.2	0.7
	Grounds dirty	8	6.3	0.2	0.6
	Subtotal	127	100.0	3.0	9.3
Campsite Maintenance	Firepits Deteriorating / Need Holes / Bigger	32	31.1	0.8	2.4
	Picnic Tables Deteriorating	27	26.2	0.6	2.0
	Campsites Need Levelling	16	15.5	0.4	1.2
	Campsite Needs to be Rearranged (position of firepit, posts)	13	12.6	0.3	1.0
	Campsite-Other	8	7.8	0.2	0.6
	Campsites Need More Gravel	7	6.8	0.2	0.5
	Subtotal	103	100.0	2.4	7.6

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Roads	Dusty Roads / Pave Roads (campground and access roads)	39	44.3	0.9	2.9
	Roads-Other	20	22.7	0.5	1.5
	Poor Campground Road Conditions (potholes, washboard)	18	20.5	0.4	1.3
	Poor Access Road Conditions (potholes, washboard)	11	12.5	0.3	0.8
	Subtotal	88	100.0	2.1	6.5
Animal/Insect Complaints	Other - Animal/Insect Complaints	34	49.3	0.8	2.5
	Wildlife Complaints (skunks, bears, gophers)	13	18.8	0.3	1.0
	Mosquito Complaints	10	14.5	0.2	0.7
	Dog Complaints (shouldn't allow dogs)	9	13.0	0.2	0.7
	Bird Complaints	2	2.9	0.0	0.1
	Leeches	1	1.4	0.0	0.1
Subtotal	69	100.0	1.6	5.1	
Playground/Play Areas	Other (e.g., more activities)	25	43.9	0.6	1.8
	Need / Additional Playgrounds	17	29.8	0.4	1.3
	Need more Play Fields / Green Areas	10	17.5	0.2	0.7
	Horseshoe Pitches Needed / Upgrades	5	8.8	0.1	0.4
	Subtotal	57	100.0	1.3	4.2
Trails	Other - Trails	21	38.9	0.5	1.5
	Need / Upgrade Trail Signage	19	35.2	0.4	1.4
	Trails Deteriorating	14	25.9	0.3	1.0
	Subtotal	54	100.0	1.3	4.0
Beach/Lake	Swimming Area / Beach Area Too Small / Needed	23	52.3	0.5	1.7
	Poor Lake Water Quality	12	27.3	0.3	0.9
	Other - Beach/Lake	9	20.5	0.2	0.7
	Subtotal	44	100.0	1.0	3.2
Interpretive Programs	Need Programs / Re-open Programs or Amphitheatre	25	65.8	0.6	1.8
	Need More Children's Activities / Programs	5	13.2	0.1	0.4
	Additional Programs	4	10.5	0.1	0.3
	Need / Upgrade Interpretive Trail Signage	4	10.5	0.1	0.3
	Subtotal	38	100.0	0.9	2.8

2006 Comment Analysis - Negative Comments Only
 (Total Surveys Represented – 1,360)

General Category	Sub-Category	# of Comments	% of Category	% of All Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented
Fishing	Poor Fishing	10	45.5	0.2	0.7
	Other - Fishing	7	31.8	0.2	0.5
	Should Stock the Lake	5	22.7	0.1	0.4
	Subtotal	22	100.0	0.5	1.6
Firebans	Subtotal	18	100.0	0.4	1.3
Total		4,231	100.0	100.0	311.1

2006 Comment Analysis - Positive Comments Only
(Total Surveys Represented – 330)

Comments	# of Comments	% of ALL Comments	% of ALL Surveys Represented *
General (e.g., nice time, enjoyed stay, nothing wrong)	230	22.4	69.7
Good staff, hosts, operator	202	19.7	61.2
Lovely area	175	17.0	53.0
Other	152	14.8	46.1
Clean /Well Run Campground / Clean Washrooms	99	9.6	30.0
Will Return to Campground	54	5.3	16.4
Quiet Campground	40	3.9	12.1
Nice facilities (e.g. campground, campsites, grounds)	35	3.4	10.6
No Safety/Security Issues	18	1.8	5.5
Good Trails	11	1.1	3.3
Good Interpretive/Amphitheatre Programs	6	0.6	1.8
Enjoyed Wildlife/ Good Fishing	5	0.5	1.5
Total	1,027	100.0	311.2

ALL Comments **

	#	% of ALL comments
Positive Comments	1,027	19.5%
Negative Comments	4,231	80.5%
TOTAL POSITIVE + NEGATIVE COMMENTS:	5,258	100.0%

* In both tables, totals for general categories and subcategories may add up to >100% as many respondents made comments that applied to more than one general category and/or more than one subcategory.

** A total of 1,690 surveys with comments were received. Of these, 203 included **only positive** comments, 1,119 included **only negative** comments and 368 included **both** positive and negative comments.