Campbell River Project Water Use Plan

Upper and Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs Survey

Implementation Year 6

Reference: JHTMON-2

Upper Campbell, Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perception Survey

Study Period: 2022

**Laich-Kwil Tach Environmental Assessment Limited Partnership
1441 A Old Island Hwy.
Campbell River, BC V9W 2E4
Ph: (250) 287-8868**

**EDI Environmental Dynamics Inc.
350-3480 Gilmore Way
Burnaby, BC V5G 4Y1
Ph: (604) 633-1891**

May 2023

JHTMON 2: Upper and Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perception Study - Year 6 Progress Report

Prepared For
BC Hydro Water License Requirements
6911 Southpoint Drive, 11th Floor
Burnaby, BC V3N 4X8

Prepared By
EDI Environmental Dynamics Inc.
350-3480 Gilmore Way
Burnaby, BC   V5G 4Y1

In Partnership With
Laich-Kwil Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership
1441 A Old Island Hwy.
Campbell River, BC   V9W 2E4

EDI Contact
Randy Morris, M.R.M., R.P.Bio.
Environmental Planner

EDI Project
18V0187
May 2023

Down to Earth Biology

EDI
ENVIRONMENTAL DYNAMICS INC.

This page is intentionally blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As an outcome of the Campbell River Water Use Plan (WUP) Consultative Committee process, an objective for recreation and tourism in the Campbell River system was articulated: to enhance and protect the quality of recreation and tourism amenities and increase the quality of recreation and tourism opportunities with sustainable carrying capacities. This process determined preferred reservoir elevation ranges and flow rates which were then adopted in the Campbell River WUP. Since then, it has been recognized that a more systematic and robust approach to valuing the recreation resource could be possible.

As part of the updated Campbell River WUP, the Upper and Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perceptions Study (JHTMON 2) is a 10-year study that monitors the use and perceptions of recreational users of the Campbell River Reservoir system. The project aims to monitor a selection of performance measures to gauge public perception and preferences and evaluate how they might relate to different water management regimes.

The study tools and methods were developed during the first year of implementation between May 2014 and July 2015. Five periods of data collection and analyses have been completed, beginning with Year 2 of the study (August 2015 to July 2016). Year 3 of the study ran between August 2016 and December 2017. This study period was extended in order to synchronize future reporting with the start of the calendar year. Year 4 of the study ran between January 2018 and December 2018, and Year 5 ran between January 2019 and December 2019. Following Year 5, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a two-year break in visitor sampling before beginning Year 6 in 2022. This report summarizes all results to date including Year 6 and provides comparisons of responses across the full study period.

A total of 504 visitors were surveyed in Year 6 and 4,664 since Year 1. Due to a technical error, 66 survey responses received in Winter 2022 were lost, leaving 438 survey responses for Year 6. Sampling was focused on eight sites in the project area.

The management questions addressed by the monitoring program explore how different operating regimes influence public use and perceptions for river and reservoir users. A summary of the management questions, null hypotheses and results is outlined in Table 1.

The management question on reservoirs use focused on determining if there was a relationship between the performance measures of public perceptions and average daily water elevations. Data were analysed in aggregate across all study years. Significant relationships were noted between daily average water elevation and all performance measures, although not always for each reservoir. At Buttle Lake, in particular, higher water elevations were associated with increased satisfaction.

For rivers, the key management question focused on identifying if there was a relationship between river discharge and the performance measures of public perceptions at riverine locations. A significant relationship was identified at Campbell River where increased discharge tended to have a positive influence on recreation experience. No other significant relationships were noted for Campbell or Quinsam Rivers.

The final management question focused on determining how riverine discharge might influence the recreation experience at Elk Falls. When visitor impressions and satisfaction were examined in relation to water flows, no significant relationships were identified. Rather, responses were overwhelmingly positive in all flow conditions.

A discrete choice experiment (DCE) was implemented to model the relationship between river flows operations and public perceptions for Campbell River. The DCE was developed based on several key river attributes that could be graphically depicted based on photo imagery gathered from Campbell River, including river elevation, river flow rate, shoreline conditions, in-stream boulders, and large wood debris. The Campbell River DCE identified a strong negative preference for very high river elevations and a preference for lower-than-average river levels. This differed from the results of the reported preferences where higher water flows were typically preferred by respondents while recreating. Further analysis will be completed in Year 7 to explore this relationship. A Decision Support System for the river DCE will be developed following another year of data collection in Year 7.

Table 1. JHTMON2 - Status of management questions and hypotheses for 2022 (Year 6) Study Period

Management Question	Null Hypotheses	2022 Status
For Reservoirs: What is the relationship between reservoir operations and overall recreation benefit, and does it lead to competing trade-offs between reservoir based and river-based benefits?	$H_{0\text{-}A}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience, if they occur, are not related to reservoir operations.	1) *Influence on recreation experience* – **Significant relationship**[1] **noted at Buttle Lake and Lower Campbell Reservoir** between water levels and recreation experience with a **positive correlation**.
		2) *Satisfaction with shoreline conditions* – **Significant relationship noted at Buttle Lake and Lower Campbell Lake** between water levels and satisfaction with shoreline conditions at reservoir locations with a **positive correlation**.
		3) *Perception of safety* – **Significant relationship noted at Buttle Lake** between water levels and perception of safety with a **positive correlation**.
		4) *Satisfaction with access to beach* – **Significant relationship noted at Buttle Lake** between water levels and satisfaction with beach access at reservoir locations with a **positive correlation.** *Satisfaction with access to water via boat launch* – **Significant relationship noted at Buttle Lake and Lower Campbell Lake reservoirs** between water levels and satisfaction with water access via boat launch with a **positive correlation**. *Satisfaction with access to water via shoreline* – **Significant relationship noted at Buttle Lake and Lower Campbell Reservoir** between water levels and satisfaction with water access via shoreline with **positive correlation**.
For Rivers: What is the relationship between river	$H_{0\text{-}B}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation	1) *Influence on recreation experience* – **Significant relationship noted at Campbell River** between

---

[1] Statistical significance of relationships assumes an alpha of 0.05 or 95% confidence.

discharge and respective riverine recreation/tourism benefits and is it such that it would necessitate trade-offs between recreation, fish and power benefits?	experience, if they occur, are not related to riverine discharge.	river discharge and influence on recreation experience with a **weak, positive correlation**.
		2) *Satisfaction with shoreline conditions* – **No significant relationships noted at either river** between river discharge and satisfaction with shoreline conditions.
		3) *Perception of safety* – **No significant relationships noted at either river** between river discharge and perception of safety.
For Elk Canyon Falls: Is there a specific relationship between recreational value and incidence of high spill events and does this support the presently held belief that higher flows should be considered in the future?	$H_{0\text{-}C}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience of visitors to Elk Canyon Falls is not related to riverine discharges (i.e., spill events).	1) *Impressiveness of falls* – **No significant relationship** noted between riverine discharge and impressiveness of falls.
		2) *Satisfaction with experience* – **No significant relationship** noted between riverine discharge and satisfaction with experience at falls.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Study Team

Randy Morris, M.R.M., RPBio, EDI Environmental Dynamics Inc.

Kim Duncan, Laich-Kwil Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership

Derek Leboeuf, Laich-Kwil Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership

Dr. Steve Conrad, Ph.D

Jenz Grove, Grove Media

Dr. Carl Schwarz, Ph.D.

BC Hydro Personnel

Heather Armstrong, BC Hydro

Jeffrey Walker, BC Hydro

Dr. Guy Martel, BC Hydro, Ph.D.

AUTHORSHIP

This report was prepared by EDI Environmental Dynamics Inc. Staff who contributed to this project include:

Randy Morris, M.R.M, RPBio.	Primary Author
Dr. Steve Conrad, Ph.D,	Discrete Choice Experiment (Lead)
Dr. Carl Schwarz, Ph.D.	Mixed Linear Modelling (Lead)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION ... 1

1.1 MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES ... 2

1.2 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESES ... 2

2 METHODOLOGY ... 4

2.1 STUDY DESIGN ... 4

2.1.1 Determination of Performance Measures and Influential Factors ... 4

2.1.2 Sampling Plan and Site Selection ... 5

2.1.2.1 Sampling Locations ... 5

2.1.2.2 Sampling Frequency ... 5

2.2 SURVEY DELIVERY ... 6

2.3 SURVEY DESIGN ... 7

2.3.1 Public Use and Perceptions Survey ... 8

2.3.2 Future River Visits Discrete Choice Experiment ... 9

2.3.3 Impact Hypotheses and Survey Design ... 14

2.4 DATA ENTRY AND MANAGEMENT ... 15

2.5 DATA ANALYSIS ... 16

2.5.1 Basic Questionnaire ... 16

2.5.1.1 Relationship of satisfaction scores with lake elevation, river flow, or falls flow ... 16

2.5.1.2 Relationship of satisfaction scores with weather ... 17

2.5.1.3 Changes in responses over time ... 18

2.5.2 Discrete Choice Experiment ... 18

2.6 POWER ANALYSIS AND REFINEMENT OF SAMPLING PLAN ... 19

3 RESULTS 21

3.1 GENERAL ... 21

3.2 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESIS – LAKES/RESERVOIRS ... 23

3.2.1 Water Elevation of Reservoirs ... 24

3.2.2 Influence of Water Level on Recreation Experience ... 25

3.2.3 Satisfaction with Shoreline Conditions *27*

3.2.4 Perception of Safety *29*

3.2.5 Satisfaction with Access *31*

3.2.5.1 Access to Beach 31

3.2.5.2 Access to Water via Boat Launch 33

3.2.5.3 Access to Water via Shoreline 35

3.3 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESIS – RIVERS 37

3.3.1 Flow Rates of Rivers *38*

3.3.2 Influence of Water Flow on Recreation Experience *39*

3.3.3 Satisfaction with Shoreline Conditions *41*

3.3.4 Perception of Safety *42*

3.4 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESIS – FALLS 44

3.4.1 Impressiveness of Falls *45*

3.4.2 Satisfaction with Experience at Falls *46*

3.5 CAMPBELL RIVER CHOICE EXPERIMENT 48

3.5.1 Single-Class Multinomial Logit Model *48*

3.5.2 Known Class and Latent Class Models *50*

4 DISCUSSION 51

5 REFERENCES 54

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. DISCRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENT DESIGN MATRIX

APPENDIX B. SUMMARY TABLES OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

APPENDIX C. SCATTERPLOTS DEPICTING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND WEATHER

APPENDIX D. CAMPBELL RIVER DECISION CHOICE EXPERIMENT KNOWN AND 4-CLASS MODEL RESULTS

APPENDIX E. CAMPBELL RESERVOIRS PUBLIC USE AND PERCEPTIONS SURVEY

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. JHTMON2 - Status of management questions and hypotheses for 2022 (Year 6) Study Period ii
Table 2. Water management issues and related performance measures 4
Table 3. Year 6 (January 2022 – December 2022) sampling schedule for each season 6
Table 4. Attribute values in choice experiment 11
Table 5. Campbell 'River' DCE Water Levels and corresponding water elevations. 11
Table 6. Campbell River flow levels and corresponding flow rates. 12
Table 7. Summary of water elevation data (in meters) for reservoirs in Year 6 (Jan 2022-Dec 2022) 24
Table 8. Summary of water flow data (in cubic meters/second) for rivers in Year 6 (Jan 2022 - Dec 2022) 38
Table 9. Results of the 1-Class multinomial logit model testing effects of river features (n=428) 49

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Map of sample locations (adapted from iMapBC) 6
Figure 2 Representation of River DCE Photo Set 12
Figure 3 Illustration of historical river flow for the river DCE 13
Figure 4. Total number of questionnaires completed by study year (n=4,664) 21
Figure 5. Percent of survey responses per sample location in Year 6 (n=438) 22
Figure 6. Mean number of days per trip by study year 22
Figure 7. Percentage of day visitors and overnight visitors by study year (n=4664) 23
Figure 8. Scatterplots of influence of water levels on recreation experience and daily average water elevation for each reservoir 26
Figure 9. Frequency of responses for influence of water level on recreation experience at reservoirs by study year (n=1831) 27
Figure 10. Scatterplots of satisfaction with shoreline condition and daily average water elevation for each reservoir 28
Figure 11. Frequency of responses for satisfaction with shoreline conditions at reservoirs by study year (n=1831) 29
Figure 12. Scatterplots of perception of safety and daily average water elevation for each reservoir 30
Figure 13. Frequency of responses for perception of safety while recreating at reservoirs by study year (n=1834) 31
Figure 14. Scatterplots of satisfaction with access to beach and daily average water elevation for each reservoir 32
Figure 15. Satisfaction with access at reservoirs to beach for all respondents by study year (n=1669) 33
Figure 16. Scatterplots of satisfaction with access to water via boat launch and daily average water elevation 34
Figure 17. Satisfaction with access at reservoirs to water via boat launch for all respondents by study year (n=1689) 35
Figure 18. Scatterplots of satisfaction with access to water via shoreline and daily average water elevation 36
Figure 19. Satisfaction with access at reservoirs to water via shoreline for all respondents by study year (n=1747) 37

Figure 20. Influence of water flows on recreation experience for all study years 39
Figure 21. Frequency of responses for influence of river flow on experience while recreating at the river by study year (n=866) 40
Figure 22. Satisfaction with riverine shoreline conditions for all study years 41
Figure 23. Frequency of responses for satisfaction with shoreline conditions at rivers by study year (n=861) 42
Figure 24. Perception of safety for all study years 43
Figure 25. Frequency of responses for perception of safety while recreating at rivers by study year (n=853) 44
Figure 26. Impression of falls for all study years (n=1863) 45
Figure 27. Frequency of responses for impressiveness of Elk Falls by study year (n=1863) 46
Figure 28. Satisfaction with viewing experience at falls for all study years (n=1860) 47
Figure 29. Frequency of responses for satisfaction with experience at Elk Falls by study year (n=1860) 48
Figure 30. Utility graphs for respondent river preferences* 50

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Meaning
$\bar{x}$	Sample median
μ	Population median
DCE	Discrete Choice Experiment
DSS	Decision Support System
EDI	EDI Environmental Dynamics Inc.
H_0	Null hypothesis
JHTMON2	Upper and Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perceptions Study
LKT	Laich-Kwil Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership
MFLNRO	Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations
n	Sample size
p	p-value
s	Standard deviation of the sample
χ^2	Pearson’s Chi Squared
WUP	Water Use Plan
Z	Z-score

GLOSSARY

Term	Definition
Decision Support System	A computerized program (e.g., Microsoft Excel) used to improve a company's decision-making capabilities by analyzing different management scenarios and presenting anticipated outcomes. For JHTMON2, decision support systems have been built using the results from the Upper Campbell Reservoir, Lower Campbell Reservoirs, and Campbell River discrete choice experiments.
D-Efficiency	Provides a measure of how effective a sampling design is when compared to a hypothetical orthogonal design. The ideal D-efficiency score is 100% but a number above 80% is considered reasonable.
Discrete Choice Experiment	A quantitative surveying method to elicit preferences from participants without directly asking them to state their preferred options. It allows researchers to uncover how individuals value selected attributes of a scenario by asking them to state their choice over different hypothetical alternatives.
Likert Scale	A type of rating scale used in survey research that measures respondents' attitudes towards a certain subject. Likert-type questions are typically presented on a 5-point and 7-point scale and are considered ordered-categorical data.
Mixed Linear Model	A statistical model that estimates the effects of one or more explanatory variables on a response variable, but accounts for both fixed and random effects. This contrasts with a standard linear regression model that has only fixed effects.
Multinomial Logit Model	A classification method that generalizes logistic regression to multiclass problems, i.e. with more than two possible discrete outcomes. Variations of multinomial logit model (e.g. single-class, known-class, 4-class) have been used to model the results from the DCE.
One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	A non-parametric alternative to one-sample t-test when the data cannot be assumed to be normally distributed. It's used to determine whether the median of the sample is equal to a known standard value.
p value	The probability under the assumption of no effect or no difference (null hypothesis), of obtaining a result equal to or more extreme than what was actually observed.
Pearson's Chi Squared Test	A statistical test applied to sets of categorical data to evaluate how likely it is that any observed difference between the sets arose by chance.
Performance Measure	Metrics used to determine the effectiveness and overall satisfaction with the provision of services by an individual, group, organization or system. For this study, performance measures focus on gauging public perceptions and satisfaction considering key recreational values such as experience, safety, and access.
Respondent	Any individual who answered a survey as part of the study.
Z-score	A statistical measurement that describes a value's relationship to the mean of a group of values. Z-score is measured in terms of standard deviations from the mean. If a Z-score is 0, it indicates that the data point's score is identical to the mean score.

1 INTRODUCTION

As an outcome of the Consultative Committee process (Campbell River Water Use Plan Consultative Committee, 2004), an objective for recreation and tourism in the Campbell River system was articulated: to enhance and protect the quality of recreation and tourism amenities and increase the quality of recreation and tourism opportunities with sustainable carrying capacities. This process determined preferred reservoir elevation ranges and flow rates which were then adopted in the Campbell River Water Use Plan (WUP). During the Consultative Committee process, preferred elevations, flow rates, weighting, seasons, etc. were determined first using professional judgement and local experience, and second, through a public perceptions study and interviews with local experts (BC Hydro, 2013). Following this approach, it was recognized that a more systematic and robust approach to valuing the recreation resource could be possible (BC Hydro, 2013).

This project aims to systematically establish performance measures for a full range of recreational factors and evaluate the recreation and tourism opportunities through an on-going perception study. The Upper and Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perceptions Study (JHTMON 2) is a 10-year study that will monitor the use and perceptions of recreational and tourism users of the reservoirs, rivers and Elk Falls site within the Campbell River Reservoir system. This study is one of a series of monitoring programs that fulfills BC Hydro's obligations under the Campbell River WUP as approved by the Comptroller of Water Rights.

The study has included: the determination of performance measures in consultation with applicable government agencies, the development of impact hypotheses to address the management questions outlined in the project Terms of Reference (BC Hydro, 2013), sampling design and site selection, questionnaire and discrete choice experiment design, data collection, data entry and management, data analysis, and reporting.

This report summarizes and synthesizes the results of data collection completed to date (2015 to 2019, and 2022). The management questions are analysed in aggregate for all study periods. In addition, general descriptive results are presented for 2022. Data collection from 2022 is referred to as "Year 6". Additionally, data for management questions are presented categorized by study year to indicate changes in responses through time.

Previous reports have summarized data collected in the years between August 2015 and July 2016, referred to as Year 2 in this report, August 2016 and December 2017, referred to as Year 3, January 2018 and December 2018, referred to as Year 4, and January 2019 and December 2019, referred to as Year 5. Year 3 was extended to align the study with the calendar year (i.e., January to December). Year 1 of the study focused on the development and testing of the sampling design and study tools.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and public health concerns, the project was put on hold in 2020 and 2021, beginning data collection again in March 2022.

1.1 MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

The management questions, objectives and hypotheses to the program were stated in the Terms of Reference (BC Hydro, 2013) and in the Year-1 implementation report (LKT and EDI, 2015). As described in these reports, the Campbell River Recreation Technical Committee identified three management questions to address through the monitoring study. The key management questions were:

1. For Reservoirs: What is the relationship between reservoir operations and overall recreation benefit, and does it lead to competing trade-offs between reservoir based and river-based benefits?
2. For Rivers: What is the relationship between river discharge and respective riverine recreation/tourism benefits, and is it such that it would necessitate trade-offs between recreation, fish and power benefits?
3. For Elk Canyon Falls: Is there a specific relationship between recreational value and incidence of high spill events and does this support the presently held belief that higher flows should be considered in the future?

These research questions stem from the main objectives for this study which are to 1) develop a more rigorous approach to determining recreation and tourism performance measures for future WUP reviews and 2) carry out an explicit evaluation of the recreation quality achieved, and the trade-offs made during this WUP.

1.2 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESES

In response to the management questions, we devised the following research hypotheses to be tested by the monitoring program:

For Reservoirs:

The first research hypothesis addresses the relationship between reservoir operations and overall recreation benefits. For the purposes of this study, recreation benefits are assumed to be synonymous with positive perceptions of their recreational experience. Testing of this hypothesis is informed by responses to the public use and perceptions survey in association with reservoir operations data available from BC Hydro.

- **$H_{0\text{-}A}$**: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience at reservoirs, if they occur, are not related to reservoir operations.

The second part of the management question asks if reservoir operations lead to competing trade-offs between reservoir based and river-based operations. This component of the management question will be explored by comparing the results of any relationship found between reservoir levels and satisfaction of reservoir recreationists with those of any relationship between riverine flows and satisfaction of riverine-based recreationists.

For Rivers:

This research hypothesis is associated with addressing the relationship between river discharge operations and riverine recreation benefits, as measured by satisfaction with the riverine recreation experience. Testing of these hypotheses is informed by responses to the public use and perceptions survey in association with riverine discharge data available from BC Hydro.

- **$H_{0\text{-}B}$**: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience at rivers, if they occur, are not related to riverine discharge.

For Elk Canyon Falls:

The final research hypothesis is associated with addressing the relationship between recreational value and incidence of high spill events at Elk Falls. Testing of these hypotheses is informed by responses to the public use and perceptions survey in association with riverine discharge data available from BC Hydro.

- **$H_{0\text{-}C}$**: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience of visitors to Elk Canyon Falls is not related to riverine discharges (i.e., spill events).

2 METHODOLOGY

The management questions and associated hypotheses are addressed by measuring specific parameters using a public use and perceptions survey along with available water level/river discharge data. This monitor has scheduled annual sampling for 10 years, with sampling occurring across all four seasons. The first year of the project (2014/2015) focused on the study design. Data collection has occurred over four study years to date, including Year 2 (August 2015-July 2017), Year 3 (August 2015-December 2017), Year 4 (January 2018-December 2018) and Year 5 (January 2019-December 2019). This report picks up after a 2-year hiatus in the study due to the COVID-19 pandemic, summarizing all data collected between January 2022 and December 2022, referred to as Year 6 in this report.

2.1 STUDY DESIGN

2.1.1 DETERMINATION OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND INFLUENTIAL FACTORS

This study utilizes performance measures as a means of gauging success in the provision of quality recreational opportunities as they relate to water management in the Campbell River Reservoir system. Performance measures were determined in discussion with recreation managers from BC Parks, Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (Forest Recreation Sites and Trails Branch), and City of Campbell River, with input and review by BC Hydro.

Key informants from BC Parks and Recreation Sites and Trails Branch were engaged by a combination of phone calls, emails and a written exercise designed to address study questions. The compiled responses were then used to develop draft performance measures. These draft performance measures were developed specific to recreational issues associated with water management, as identified by the management agencies. These were subsequently discussed with the same key informants as well as with representatives from BC Hydro, until a final list of performance measures was established. The final performance measures are outlined in Table 2. Further details on the determination of performance measures are described in the Year 1 Implementation report (LKT and EDI, 2015).

Table 2. Water management issues and related performance measures

Management Issue	Performance Measure	Applies to: Reservoir/River/ Both	Applicable Management Hypotheses*
Public safety	▪ Perception of safety while engaged in water-based recreation	Both	$H_{0\text{-}A}$ (reservoirs) $H_{0\text{-}B}$ (rivers)
Maintaining accessibility	▪ Satisfaction with accessibility to boat launch ▪ Satisfaction with accessibility to shoreline ▪ Satisfaction with accessibility to beach	Reservoir	$H_{0\text{-}A}$ (reservoirs)

Management Issue	Performance Measure	Applies to: Reservoir/River/ Both	Applicable Management Hypotheses*
Protecting shoreline condition for recreation	▪ Satisfaction with shoreline condition for recreation	Both	$H_{0\text{-}A}$ (reservoirs) $H_{0\text{-}B}$ (rivers)
Maintaining quality recreation experience	▪ Influence of water levels/flows on recreation	Both	$H_{0\text{-}A}$ (reservoirs) $H_{0\text{-}B}$ (rivers)

* Management hypotheses outlined in Section 1.2

2.1.2 SAMPLING PLAN AND SITE SELECTION

2.1.2.1 Sampling Locations

Sample sites were selected with the aim of maximizing sample size at locations where BC Hydro has operational influence on water conditions (e.g., elevation, flow rate). BC Parks, Recreation Sites and Trails Branch of MFLNRO, and the City of Campbell River were consulted to identify the busiest recreation sites within the study area. Sampling was only conducted at sites that were officially open. As such, sampling did not occur at some locations during the off-season.

Eight locations were originally selected for conducting surveys within the Campbell Reservoir system (see Figure 1). An additional sampling location was added at Strathcona Lodge on Upper Campbell Reservoir to gather additional data of visitor use for this reservoir in Year 4. Subsequently, McIvor Lake was removed as a sampling site in Year 4 as water elevation data is not available at this location, thus preventing analysis of the management questions.

2.1.2.2 Sampling Frequency

Sampling over the course of the monitoring program has been scheduled to occur across as many of the seasons of the year as possible while still aligning with the operational season of the various recreation areas. Sampling was completed between March 15 to April 2 (winter), May 17 to June 29 (spring), August 4 to August 27 (summer) and September 1 to September 29 (fall). As with previous study years, timing of sampling was adjusted to coincide with the operational dates of the provincial campgrounds and recreation sites.



Figure 1. Map of sample locations (adapted from iMapBC)

Total sampling effort was set to 128 interview days per calendar year, providing approximately four interview days per site for the eight major sites across four recreation seasons. Interview days were distributed across the sampling periods and sampling sites, with an effort to sample the various locations on as many different days (and thus different water elevations/flows) as was practical. Additionally, sampling dates were selected to overlap with public holidays and weekends to maximize sampling during periods of high visitation. Two sites were generally sampled concurrently by two surveyors in the morning, and two different sites were surveyed concurrently in the afternoon to promote spatial and temporal coverage. Surveying was completed by employees from the Laich-Kwil-Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership (LKT), based in Campbell River, BC.

Table 3. Year 6 (January 2022 – December 2022) sampling schedule for each season

Season	Scheduling
Winter (2022)	March 18-April 2, 2022 (Mar 18-22, Mar 24-28, Apr 1-5)
Spring (2022)	May 20-June 30, 2022 (May 20-23, May 27-30, Jun 2-5, Jun 9-12, Jun 17-20, Jun 23-26, Jun 29-30)
Summer (2022)	August 6-August 29, 2022 (Aug 6-9, Aug 12-15, Aug 18-22, Aug 26-29)
Fall (2022)	September 2-September 26, 2019 (Sept 2-5, Sept 8-11, Sept 16-19, Sept 22-26)

2.2 SURVEY DELIVERY

The public use and perceptions survey was designed to be delivered as an onsite survey, administered to visitors at sample sites. As practical, all parties at a sample site were approached for inclusion in this study. A party was considered a singular person visiting the area alone or a collection of recreationists that were visiting and recreating in the area as a group. A person from each party was asked to participate in the survey and asked to complete the questionnaire onsite. Sampling sessions were scheduled to occur on site between 9AM and 5PM. When possible, participation was requested after engaging in recreational activities although the survey was designed to be administered at any point during their trip. People who refused to participate were thanked for their time and no longer engaged; an invitation to participate was then extended to another willing representative of the same party. Surveyors tracked the number of individuals they asked to complete the survey, and the number who refused or were ineligible in order to calculate a response rate.

A standard introduction statement that summarized the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire was made to all prospective respondents. If asked how the surveys would be used, people were told that the information would provide insights into public use and preferences for water management for BC Hydro. Contact information for the BC Hydro technical lead was provided on the survey in the event that anyone had questions or concerns about the project. The length of time required to complete the survey ranged depending on the visitation of the respondent, with most respondents completing the survey within 15-25 minutes.

2.3 SURVEY DESIGN

The key components during the original design phase of the base questionnaire and discrete choice analysis (DCE) included the following:

- Consultation with BC Hydro and the associated management agencies
- Determination of the Discrete Choice Experiment framework based on Upper Campbell Reservoir
- Design of the questionnaire and DCE survey tool
- Survey testing and refinements

In addition, several other additional scope items have since been added to the study, including:

- Digitization of survey for delivery using electronic tablets (*implemented in Year 4*)
- Development of Decision Support System for Upper Campbell Reservoir based on the results from the original DCE (*implemented in Year 4*)
- Design and delivery of a new DCE survey based on Lower Campbell Reservoir (*implemented in Year 4*)
- Development of Decision Support System for Lower Campbell Reservoir based on the results of this version of the DCE (*implemented in Year 5*)
- Design and delivery of a new DCE survey based on Campbell River (*implemented in Year 6*)

- Development of Decision Support System for Campbell River based on the results of the river version of the DCE (*to be implemented in Year 7*)

2.3.1 PUBLIC USE AND PERCEPTIONS SURVEY

The main component of the public use survey was developed following social science best principles including those found in Dillman (2007) and Vaske (2008). Considerations were given towards ease of understanding and maximizing survey completion and return rates. The survey was designed to follow a logical flow of questioning and providing instructions to respondents that were clear and concise as possible. A key challenge to the development of the survey was that the same survey needed to be able to collect information about visitors' experiences at various types of waterbodies (e.g. reservoir, river, falls). The survey was designed so that respondents could relay perceptions about their experiences at multiple waterbody types, rather than just the one they were encountered at; individuals were asked to reply based on their experiences at the place they were encountered at that day (e.g., at a reservoir), as well as for other waterbody types they may have visited most recently on the same trip (e.g., at a river the previous day). This approach allowed for gathering more responses regarding each location type, as respondents often visited multiple waterbody types and locations during the same trip.

Testing of a draft survey was completed in April 2015 with a small focus group. The aim of the testing was to use a small number of test surveys to reveal overarching problems, such as awkward wordings, missing response categories, leading statements and issues with duration (e.g., survey too long). Following these revisions, several iterations of the survey were circulated and reviewed between May and July 2015 in order to discuss question content, ordering, wording, range of answer options and question instructions. Review was conducted primarily by representatives from BC Hydro, BC Parks and BC Recreation Sites and Trails. The survey went through numerous drafts and formats until a preferred design was established. The questionnaire was printed in a booklet-style, with each page of the booklet being 5.5" by 8.5" (i.e., an 8.5" by 11" page, folded in half).

The questionnaire utilized a variety of survey question types, including check-list, Likert scale, and some open-ended quantitative questions. The full questionnaire has been designed to take a maximum of 15 minutes although most respondents will typically complete it much faster as only some sections will apply.

Questions were included in the survey to ensure that the impact hypotheses, outlined in Section 1.2 are addressed. The specific questions and how the questions relate to the impact hypotheses are described in further detail in Section 2.3.3. Questions were also included in the survey to directly address the performance measures developed in consultation with the regulatory agencies. Performance measures were addressed using Likert-type rating scales where respondents' attitudes are measured directly. Likert-type scales use fixed choice response formats and are designed to measure attitudes or opinions, typically on a 5- to 7-point scale. These ordinal scales measure levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction, positive/negative influence, agreement/disagreement, etc.

In order to provide further context to recreational use within the study area, supplemental data were collected, both in the survey and through external data sources. Within the survey, questions were included to characterize respondents in terms of their demographics, recreational interests and habits. Further supplemental data are collected by surveyors in the field such as water levels and weather. Data for these influential factors are also gathered directly from BC Hydro (e.g., reservoir water levels and discharge, as available).

The questionnaire is composed of seven sections:

Section A: Current visit to the Campbell River Reservoir System

Section B: Visit to a Lake/Reservoir

Section C: Future River Visits

Section D: Visit to Elk Falls

Section E: Visit to a River

Section F: Past Visits to Campbell River Reservoir System

Section G: About You and Your Party

2.3.2 FUTURE RIVER VISITS DISCRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENT

In addition to the standard line of questioning, the survey integrated a stated preference feature (e.g., discrete choice experiment) to measure attitudes and preferences for different levels of environmental conditions that could hypothetically be encountered while recreating at the reservoirs (e.g., water levels, shoreline conditions).

The project uses stated preference surveys to examine decision influences by presenting respondents with hypothetical but realistic situations that may influence their choice to recreate. The project utilized a discrete choice experiment (DCE) tool to identify preferences for recreational features affected by water use operations and to gather information about public use and perceptions on recreation in the Campbell Reservoirs to inform BC Hydro’s Campbell River Water Use Plan. A DCE was developed based on Upper Campbell Reservoir in Year 1, and a second DCE was developed based on Lower Campbell Reservoir in Year 4 and delivered in Year 5. A third DCE, based on Campbell River, was initiated in Year 6.

Choice experiment methods were chosen as they allow respondents to simultaneously evaluate different conditions one might observe in a watershed and address associated trade-offs in a comprehensive fashion. Choice experiments are used widely in resource management problems and environmental valuation settings (Adamowicz et al., 1998), as well as in limited water resource contexts (Haider and Rasid, 2002; Willis et al., 2005; Barton & Bergland, 2010; Thacher, 2011).

The results from the Upper Campbell Reservoir DCE are discussed in the JHTMON-2 Year 2-4 Progress Reports (2015-2018). In 2021, the research team designed a third DCE, based on the Campbell River which was implemented in 2022. This new choice experiment followed a similar framework as the previous DCE, and used the following steps:

1. Adapt key recreational performance measures for application in a choice experiment

This step involved the translation of performance measures to variables that can be presented to survey respondents. The project completed this task by working with technical experts, recreation groups, and through extensive testing. Initial options were reviewed and prioritized in technical focus groups and refined in recreational and non-recreational focus groups. One-on-one testing further refined the attributes in the choice experiments described in step 2.

2. Design the survey instrument, including the stated preference choice sets

The project utilized the prioritized list of performance measures from step 1 to develop a recreational questionnaire. The primary purpose of the questionnaire is to present the stated preference choice experiment and collect relevant data into public use and preferences for water management. Design of the questionnaire included preparing questions to collect current recreational activities, satisfaction with their recreation experiences, and preferences as well as "warm" respondents to the conditions expressed in the choice experiment. Draft surveys were pre-tested to ensure lucidity and clarity of the questionnaire and choice experiment.

Campbell River Discrete Choice Experiment Design Summary

The Campbell River DCE (like the preceding DCEs) is a discrete choice experiment in which respondents indicate their preference for recreating in hypothetical conditions (presented as a choice set) that might be found along the Campbell River.

In each choice set, each respondent will select their preferred site of two site alternatives (or select 'neither') shown with systematically varied river attributes. River conditions will be presented in a different way in each of the alternatives for river level, river flow, river substrate, shoreline conditions, and debris. Photographic representation will represent each site and respondents will choose: 1) which of the two sites they would prefer to recreate at, or 2) if they would prefer not to recreate at either.

Within the choice experiment section of the survey, respondents are presented with the following scenario:

You will now refer to the photo book you received, where you will be presented with six pairs of photos representing different hypothetical river conditions for Campbell River.

The conditions of Site A and Site B will differ in each of the following photo pairs. While some of the photos may not seem ideal or likely to occur, each should be considered as a realistic option. In the photos, current river flow conditions are presented within the range of the past 50 years of hydrological conditions.

For each set of pictures please review all provided information and select whether you would choose to recreate in the area represented in Site A or Site B, or neither of them.

There is no right or wrong answers to these special types of research questions, but it is important to regard them as real-world situations, in which the selected conditions are available to you. You will be asked to complete a total of six evaluations.

Photos were digitally manipulated from a source photo to represent the varying levels, and conditions shown in Table 4 were chosen in consultation of the above-described process and are explained in the following:

Table 4. Attribute values in choice experiment

Attribute	Levels
Wood Debris	1) Present 2) Not Present
Water Level	1) Low Low 2) Low 3) Average 4) High 5) High High
River Flow	1) Low Low 2) Low 3) Average 4) High 5) High High
Shoreline Conditions	1) Gravel substrate 2) Vegetated
River Substrate	1) Natural substrate 2) High boulder cover

In regards specifically to the attribute of "Water Level", five categories of water level were considered, ranging from Low Low to High High. These five categories of water levels were then related to actual water depths at the river study site based on the distribution of historic riverine elevation data. The following elevations (measured in meters) are described in Table 5.

Table 5. Campbell 'River' DCE Water Levels and corresponding water elevations.

Water Level	Depth (m)
Low low	<0.53
Low	0.53-.072

Water Level	Depth (m)
Average	0.72-0.93
High	0.93-1.13
High high	>1.13

For the attribute "River Flow", five categories of river flow were considered, ranging from Low Low to High High. These five categories of levels were then related to actual flow conditions at the river study site based on the distribution of historic riverine data. The following flow levels (measured in cubic meters per second) are described in Table 6.

Table 6. **Campbell River flow levels and corresponding flow rates.**

River Flow	Elevation (m3/s)
Low Low	<40
Low	41-60
Average	61-100
High	101-128
High High	>129

Final operationalization of the choice experiment was using a statistical design that presented two photos in choice sets. Each choice set presents two recreational alternatives consisting of 5 elements. An "opt out" option was also given. Figure 1 presents the photo elements as well as their levels and coding. Figure 2 provides an example of the photos presented.

Figure 2 **Representation of River DCE Photo Set**

The attributes of wood debris (2 levels), water level (5 levels), river flow (5 levels), river substrate (2 levels) and shoreline (2 levels) represent a 2x5x5x2x2 design with 200 possible combinations. To reduce the number of different combinations we used the SAS 9.3 experimental design macro *MktEx* to produce an orthogonal main effects fractional factorial design with minimal overlapping of attribute levels. Use of this macro reduced the number of possible combinations to 60 combinations (see), blocked into five different versions of six choice sets (2 photos per set). These 60 combinations were evaluated using a D-efficiency score, which tests how well these 60 combinations represent the full range (i.e., 200 combinations) of possible combinations during analysis. The set of 60 combinations was determined to have >95% D-efficiency. Optimal designs maximize the D-efficiency, which is a criterion on the variance of the parameter estimates. The D-efficiency of the standard fractional factorial is 100%, but it is not possible to achieve 100% D-efficiency without all variances of the attributes, so reduced options are used. Anything above 80% is considered good and acceptable.

Pretesting of the river DCE design resulted in the representation of the river flow conditions as a flow meter showing the historical range of river from slow to fast (see Figure 3) and overlayed on the photos.



Figure 3 Illustration of historical river flow for the river DCE

Photo book preparation

The resulting 60 combinations are represented in Appendix A. To prepare the photo representation of each combination, we utilized a base photo (and a series of reference photos) taken on Campbell River, just upstream from the confluence with Quinsam River, and layered in digital representations of each level. Visual representations of water levels were prepared from historical operational levels providing a more realistic presentation of conditions but reduced visual variance between water levels. The result was a set of 60 photos numbered 1 – 60. Utilizing Adobe InDesign, we prepared 5 photobooks containing photos 1-12, 13-24, 25-36, 37-48, and 49-60. Photo sets were matched to Q15-Q20 in the questionnaire.

Data Collection

Data collection for the river DCE (like the reservoir DCEs) occurred through the use of the field survey. Recreationists participating in the study were shown a blocked set of six photo pairs from four blocked sets. For the next respondent, another block of six choice pairs were drawn, until the pool of blocked sets was exhausted; upon which another round of the photo sets gets started. Respondents selected the recreation site they would most like to visit (or neither) and continued to the next set until they completed six choice sets. The full questionnaire and sampling are described in the previous section.

2.3.3 IMPACT HYPOTHESES AND SURVEY DESIGN

The survey was designed to address the impact hypotheses while also incorporating the performance measures determined at the initial stages of the study design. The impact hypotheses have been divided according to location type within the reservoir system, including: reservoirs, rivers, and Elk Falls.

For Reservoirs:

$H_{0\text{-}A}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience at reservoirs, if they occur, are not related to reservoir operations.

We used a two-pronged approach to address the changes in overall recreation benefits as they relate to reservoir operations. The first approach for testing this hypothesis uses respondents' perceptions and opinions regarding the performance indicators as gauges for recreation benefits. Questions Q9, Q10, Q11, Q12 and Q14 in Section B: Visit to a Lake/Reservoir (Appendix E) of the survey present respondents with an opportunity to reflect on the conditions encountered and rate their experiences in relation to the performance measures. These performance measures, indicators of key elements of water management within the reservoirs, include perceptions as they relate to water levels, shoreline conditions, safety and access.

Additionally, the discrete choice experiment provides an alternative approach to addressing this hypothesis, albeit using a stated preference approach instead. The stated preference approach presents respondents with hypothetical scenarios of reservoir operations, represented by digitally altered pictures of a reservoir. Unlike the revealed preference approach which rely on respondents recounting their experience while recreating at the reservoirs and rivers, the stated preference approach, which is based on hypothetical photo scenarios, provides opportunities to explore a broad range of water management scenarios without actually having to release (or retain) water. This approach addresses practical challenges when trying to a) test the extreme ends (e.g., high high or low low) of the reservoir levels; and b) test multiple water levels with the same recreationist whereby that person can actually trade-off difference scenarios with one another. Neither of these opportunities can be practically achieved in a real-life setting. This approach presents an alternative method to determining how changes to reservoir operations may change the desire for a recreationist to visit an area. Questions Q15-Q20 in Section C: Future Lakes/Reservoir Visits provide the opportunity to evaluate changes in overall recreation benefits associated with reservoir operations using this approach.

For Rivers:

$H_{0\text{-}B}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience at rivers, if they occur, are not related to riverine discharge.

The approach for testing this hypothesis uses respondents' perceptions and opinions regarding the performance indicators as gauges for recreation benefits. Questions Q30, Q31, and Q32 in Section E: Visit to a River of the survey present respondents with an opportunity to reflect on the conditions encountered on rivers in the reservoir system and rate their experiences in relation to relevant performance measures. These performance measures, indicators of key elements of water management within the reservoirs, include perceptions as they relate to water flows, shoreline conditions and safety.

For Falls:

$H_{0\text{-}C}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience of visitors to Elk Canyon Falls is not related to riverine discharges (i.e., spill events).

The approach for testing this hypothesis uses respondents' perceptions and opinions as gauges for recreation benefits. Questions Q23 and Q24 in Section D: Visit to Elk Falls of the survey present respondents with an opportunity to reflect on the conditions encountered at the falls and rate their experiences. The proxy measures of benefits focus on satisfaction of their experience and how impressive they found the viewing experience to be.

Supporting Questions

Throughout the survey, a number of questions do not directly contribute to answering the impact hypotheses; rather, these other questions support the survey in a variety of manners. Some questions are included to guide respondents to the relevant sections of the survey. These skip logic instructions guide respondents through the questionnaire, directing respondents past sections that may not apply to them (e.g., Q5, Q21, Q25 and Q34). With the digitization of the survey in this study year, these skip logic questions automatically move respondents through the questionnaire without having to follow instructions. Other questions are included to provide opportunities to relate the respondents' answers to specific times and places (e.g., Q7, Q22 and Q27). This will allow respondents' experiences to be associated to actual BC Hydro data on reservoir/river conditions. Additional questions have been included to allow for additional segmentation and as explanatory variables, such as the activities respondents' participated in and demographic questions. Others allow for more detailed exploration of some of the perceptions of respondents, including the types of safety hazards encountered and activities that were precluded due to water conditions.

2.4 DATA ENTRY AND MANAGEMENT

The task of data entry and management is a key component of this project and required an organized database to store and manage data and facilitate statistical analyses. In previous years, data from the questionnaires and discrete choice experiment were manually entered into a common database (i.e., Microsoft Excel) by a technician, ideally as the surveys were collected. With the move away from paper surveys to a digitized survey administered using an electronic tablet in this study year, data entry was automated, occurring daily when the electronic devices were synchronized with the database at the end of each survey day. The database was examined periodically to ensure that surveys were being synchronized with the database and to highlight any potential data collection issues.

The database was designed to be easily exported to the preferred statistical analysis software packages – i.e., IBM SPSS Statistics (IBM 2023) and Latent Gold (Statistical Innovations 2023) and required appropriate variable labeling and coding of responses. Data were entered by technicians and checked by the study lead. Once all data were entered, the data were examined for outliers, protest votes and any obvious erroneous entries. Outliers were determined using an examination of box and whisker plots, a method for identifying data points that fall outside the usual range of values. A qualitative assessment was then used to determine whether to throw out the outlying data. In particular, the variables that seemed to be prone to extreme or unrealistic answers were associated with respondents recounting whether they had visited any other locations on their current trip. Based on the outliers, it is evident that some respondents were reporting visits to different locations based on completely different trips in the study area, rather than their current trip. For example, a local visitor who was visiting Elk Falls just for the day should only be answering questions related to places they visited that day. If they visited a different location in the study area a week or month before, they should not be reporting on it, as this is considered a different trip.

In general, all responses that referred to visits occurring greater than seven days in the past were removed. This approach was implemented for two reasons. First, experiences that occur in the past are prone to recall bias which can lead to recollection error. Second, this approach helps ensure that respondents were only referring to their current trip. In total, three responses regarding visitor experiences at the reservoirs, and two responses regarding experiences at the falls were removed during the analysis of the management questions due potential recollection error, or due to extreme, unrealistic answers.

2.5 DATA ANALYSIS

2.5.1 BASIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Data analysis of the basic questionnaire questions focused on providing basic descriptive statistics and comparative analysis as was appropriate for the different types of data. Descriptive statistics were tabulated for each question. Categorical data was tabulated according to frequency of each potential response. Mean response, standard deviation and standard error were calculated for all questions that used interval (i.e., numeric) data. For the management questions, data have been presented in aggregate for the entire study as well as by study year in order to provide some context to changes in responses through time. All questionnaire responses, including frequency tables and basic descriptive statistics, are presented in Appendix B. When appropriate to the discussion of results, some data have been tabulated or presented graphically in the body of the report.

2.5.1.1 Relationship of satisfaction scores with lake elevation, river flow, or falls flow

Analysis of the management questions involved identifying potential relationships between the performance indicators and the respective reservoir operations metrics. For reservoirs, questions that asked respondents about their perceptions of safety, satisfaction and experience (measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1-very dissatisfied to 5-very satisfied) were related to reservoir elevations on the day of their visit. For rivers and Elk Falls, indicators of safety, satisfaction and experience were related to river discharge on the day of their visit.

Day-specific reservoir elevations were obtained directly from BC Hydro as daily averages (m) for Upper Campbell Reservoir, Lower Campbell Reservoir and Buttle Lake. Day-specific data for river flow discharge

(m^3/s), used in the analysis for rivers and Elk falls, were obtained through the Water Office of Environment Canada. The reference water stations used for river discharge were:

- CAMPBELL RIVER NEAR CAMPBELL RIVER (08HD003)
- QUINSAM RIVER NEAR CAMPBELL RIVER (08HD005)

In previous years, correlational analyses were used to examine these relationships. While being the conventional method, this approach only accounts for variation between person-to-person in their satisfaction scores at a particular day and water condition. As noted by Dr. Carl Schwarz (pers. comm. April 12, 2018), respondents do not only vary in their perceptions and satisfaction when visiting the location on the same date; there may also be day-specific effects. For example, respondents may tend to generally give higher scores on sunny days than on rainy days for the same lake elevation, river flow, or falls flow. In this case, multiple respondents measured on the same day are pseudo-replicates (Hurlbert, 1984) and resulting standard errors of the slope will be under-reported and reported p-values will tend to be too small (i.e., too many false positives).

One robust approach to address this additional variation is using a mixed linear model. For example, if the relationship between ratings for satisfaction and lake elevation is of interest, the mixed linear model is:

$$Score \sim Elevation + \mathrm{DateOfVisit}(R)$$

where $Score$ represents the satisfaction rating; $Elevation$ represents the lake elevation; and $DateOfVisit(R)$ represents the (random) effect of the date the lake was visited. The random day-specific-effects account for effects that change at the day level (e.g., respondents may generally be more satisfied when the weather is fine than when the weather is poor). Using R software (R Core Team 2023), we have applied the mixed linear model in the subsequent analyses for the management questions.

2.5.1.2 Relationship of satisfaction scores with weather

As part of the mixed linear models, we also investigated the impact of weather and elevation on the satisfaction score. Weather was recorded into six categories while administering the survey: sun; cloud; mixed sun and cloud; rain; snow; and wind. Given the few observations for snowy and windy conditions, these were dropped from the analysis. Note that it is possible that the weather recorded at the time the respondent answered the questionnaire may not correspond exactly with the weather on the date that the respondents visited the lake, river, or falls. This mismatch may tend to add noise to the relationship and make it harder to detect effects.

We considered a mixed linear model again, with the addition of the (reduced) weather variable. Two models were fit. First is a model to see if there is evidence that the effect of elevation is different under different weather conditions (non-parallel slopes):

$$Score \sim Elevation + Weather(C) + Elevation\colon Weather(C) + \mathrm{DateOfVisit}(R)$$

where $\mathsf{Weather(C)}$ is the effect of the categorical weather variable and the $\mathsf{Elevation{:}Weather(C)}$ term represents the interaction between the effect of elevation and the effect of weather (i.e. non-parallel slopes). If the p-value for this term is small, it indicates evidence that the slopes are non-parallel.

If there is no evidence of non-parallelism, then the parallel-slope model:

$$Score \sim Elevation + Weather(C) + \mathrm{DateOfVisit}(R)$$

is fit. The p-value with the $\mathsf{Weather(C)}$ term now indicates if there is evidence that the mean score differs among the weather classes after adjusting for the effect of elevation.

Note that certain weather conditions have larger sample sizes than other weather conditions; for weather conditions with large sample sizes, the power to detect non-parallelism and effects of weather on the mean score will be higher than for weather conditions with small sample sizes.

2.5.1.3 Changes in responses over time

To provide a context of change in responses through time, comparisons across the different study years have also been provided for the management questions. The statistical tests used for investigating any significant differences were determined based on such factors as the type of data, nature of the distribution, and the homogeneity of variance. The management questions, using Likert Scale rating categories, are considered categorical data (e.g., satisfaction with recreational experience) and were examined using Pearson Chi-Square to identify if the proportion of responses was significantly different between years. Post-hoc pairwise comparison tests using the Bonferroni correction were then run to identify which responses were significantly different between years.

2.5.2 DISCRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENT

As discussed in Section 2.3.2, a discrete choice experiment based on Campbell River was developed and implemented in Year 6 to examine choice behaviours related to recreation in the riverine environment. A preliminary design framework was completed, photos were collected in 2019, and the design refinement, testing and implementation undertaken in early 2022. The Campbell River DCE was originally scheduled for 2020 but due to COVID-19, Year 6 of data collection was postponed until 2022.

For 2022, analysis was completed for the Campbell River Discrete Choice Experiment. A Decision Support System for Campbell River will be developed in the final study year based on the data from 2022 and 2023. DCE data has been analyzed using Latent Gold 5.0 to estimate multiple multinomial logit models.

Joint analysis of the previous DCE reservoir models from Year 2-5 is still recommended to allow for further analysis of classes presented in earlier analysis. This would simply be a repeat of earlier analysis but using the full 2-5 year dataset. A latent class model relates preferences for the reservoir features in the discrete choice experiment to a set of latent variables. A class is characterized by similarities among recreationists that indicate like preference for reservoir features.

2.6 POWER ANALYSIS AND REFINEMENT OF SAMPLING PLAN

A power analysis was completed by Dr. Carl Schwarz using data from Year 2 and Year 3 to help provide further direction regarding the necessary sampling effort to avoid a Type II error. A Type II error is the probability of accepting the null hypothesis when we actually should have rejected it. In this study, a Type II error would mean we concluded that there was no relationship between a performance measure and water elevation/flow when in fact there was. The standard target power of 0.80 was used.

A couple conclusions were drawn based on a review of the data and the power analysis. First, a review of the data suggests that the current approach to data analyses (i.e., correlational analysis), while being the conventional method, may not be the most appropriate approach. Correlational analysis, as utilized in this study, accounts for variation between person-to-person in their satisfaction scores at a particular day (and water level). However, an additional source of variation may be associated with day-specific effects, and not solely associated with water level. These day-specific effects could be related to external factors such as weather or season. A more sophisticated and appropriate approach to analysis would be the application of a linear mixed model (pers. comm., Dr. C. Schwarz, April 12, 2018). Linear mixed models were used for analyses of the management questions in Year 5 and Year 6.

Power analyses were completed for each management question at each location with available hydrometric data. This included Upper Campbell Reservoir, Lower Campbell Reservoir and Buttle Lake, Campbell River and Quinsam River, and Elk Falls. To determine the amount of sampling effort required to achieve a power of 0.80, a range of total number of respondents and total number of sampling days were considered while using the trends observed (from Year 2 and Year 3) for each management question. The number of respondents tested ranged from 500 to 1500 at each location, while the total number of sampling days tested ranged from 20 to 60 days at each location, which are not achievable given limited time, budget and operational constraints. The analyses assumed that number of sampling days were allocated as evenly as possible across the full range of water elevation/flow conditions experienced at each location. For the power analysis, water conditions were grouped into periods of low, medium and high. For example, for Buttle Lake, while testing the power that is achievable using 20 days of sampling, the model would assume that 7 days were allocated to low water level periods, 7 days were allocated to high water levels and 6 were allocated to medium water levels).

Following evaluations of the data by Dr. Carl Schwarz using the results from linear mixed models for each management question and location, it was determined that a target power of 0.80 was not achievable regardless of the total number of interviews or sample days for the reservoir management questions. The evaluation identified that responses at the reservoirs were characterized by large day effects, resulting in a lot of variation. Several models were investigated to try and explain the large day-specific variation, including weather and season, but none improved the fit of the model.

In regard to the riverine management questions, it is not possible to reach a power of 0.80 with only 20 days of sampling at each river location. Forty (40) days of sampling, over approximately 900 respondents at each riverine location would be required to achieve a power of 0.80 in the evaluation of most riverine management questions. Two exceptions were noted for the riverine management questions (i.e., Q30 – Perceptions of river safety at Quinsam River and Q32 – Influence of river flow at Campbell River), where a power of 0.80 is not achievable regardless of the total number of interviews or sample days. Similar to the reservoirs, day-specific effects were too large to achieve the desired power, and these effects could not be explained by attributes such as weather and season.

Lastly, the power analyses for the management questions associated with water flows and Elk Falls were also evaluated for required sampling days and total respondents. Q23 (i.e., Impressiveness of falls) could achieve a power of 0.80 with 500 respondents and 20 days of sampling split across the range of flow conditions. Q24 (i.e., Satisfaction with experience at falls) is estimated as requiring at least 40 days of sampling split evenly across water flow levels and 500 respondents to achieve this power.

Based on these findings, the level of sampling required to achieve the desired power of 0.80 will be either very difficult or impossible to implement. In the case of all reservoir-related management questions and some riverine management questions, the high day-effects coupled with the low effect of water conditions on the performance measures, makes achieving the power prohibitive regardless of the number of sampling days or number of respondents. In the cases where the power may be attainable with enough sampling effort, we are also faced with logistical and operational obstacles. These include: limitations to budget to increase number of sampling days, seasonal closures of parks and recreational sites that prevent sampling during the highest and lowest water conditions, and the conflict of coordinating sampling efforts across different location types and varying water levels (e.g. when it is optimal timing based on water flows to sample at river sites, it may not be optimal timing to sample at reservoir sites).

In our best effort to address these short-comings, field sampling considered the predicted range of reservoir elevations provided by BC Hydro to help time surveying to high, medium and low water conditions. Sampling, however, was still limited to the operational season of the parks and recreation areas. The provincial campsites and recreation sites generally open April or May, and close in mid-September to October. To increase the number of days, sampling at each location was split into half-days, so that the same amount of sampling effort at each location could be spread across more days.

3 RESULTS

3.1 GENERAL

Over the course of Year 6, 1,663 individuals were asked if they would complete the survey, of which 504 people agreed, representing a response rate of 30%. This is higher response rate than experienced in Year 4 and Year 5, which had response rates closer to 20%, but lower than the earlier study years. Despite the small increase in the response rate in Year 6 from the previous two study years, the total number of surveys completed was lower than other study years (Figure 4). The reason for the decreasing recruitment for the survey is uncertain and may be associated with several factors, including survey fatigue and differences between surveyors. In total, 4,664 individuals have responded to the survey since 2015.



Figure 4. Total number of questionnaires completed by study year (n=4,664)

Due to a technical error in the database while updating the survey tool in May 2022, data collected in March 2022 (i.e., winter season) was inexplicably overwritten and unable to be retrieved by IT staff, resulting in the loss of 66 survey responses. During the winter season, surveys are only conducted at 2 of the 8 survey locations (both in Elk Falls Provincial Park) as none of the other locations are open. No surveys were completed at the reservoir locations. This loss of data was reviewed by EDI and Dr. Carl Schwarz to identify the potential implications to the study. The main effects of losing the winter data are the reduced number of samples overall and narrower range of river flows experienced, which can reduce the power of the study. In review with Dr. Carl Schwarz, it was concluded that the loss of winter data was unlikely to influence the results of the management questions, particularly given that the responses were aggregated for the full study period (i.e., all years' results combined).

Surveys were focused on eight locations across the study area. In Year 6, Quinsam Camp (Elk Falls Provincial Park campsite) had the highest number of survey responses (n=101) (Figure 5). This location is close to Campbell River, stays open year-round, receives both overnight and day users, is adjacent to an extensive trail system and a popular area for walking for both locals and visitors. The area with the second highest survey responses was Elk Falls Lookout (Elk Falls Provincial Park Campsite) which is also close to town, is a popular day use area, and is open year-round.



Figure 5. Percent of survey responses per sample location in Year 6 (n=438)

The average trip length spent in the Campbell River reservoir system by respondents was 3.68 days in Year 6 (Figure 6, n=438, s=9.5), with a median of 2 and mode of 1 day.



Figure 6. Mean number of days per trip by study year (n=4,664)

In Year 6, 69% of respondents reported being overnight visitors while 31% of respondents reported being day visitors only (Figure 7). Day visitors were comprised of both residents and non-local visitors who just were passing through for the day. When respondents were asked their city of residence, almost a third (36%) in Year 6 reported they were from Campbell River.



Figure 7. **Percentage of day visitors and overnight visitors by study year (n=4664)**

The most popular forms of overnight accommodation in Year 6 were tent (33%), followed by trailer (31%). As in previous study years, camping was most frequently noted (34%) as the most important activity in respondents' decision to visit the Campbell River reservoir system, followed by hiking and walking in the area (21%).

As with previous study years, most respondents in Year 6 tended to spend multiple days in the area each year; 67% of them reported having visited the study area before while 33% were visiting for the first time. The highest frequency of return visits was in the summer; 57% of these reported visiting 4 days or more on average annually each summer.

The frequencies for all survey questions are summarized in the appendices, with responses being categorized by study year. In addition, the following sections examine those survey questions that specifically address the management hypotheses for this project.

3.2 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESIS – LAKES/RESERVOIRS

The management hypothesis for lakes/reservoirs in the Campbell River reservoir systems is stated as:

$H_{0\text{-}A}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience at reservoirs, if they occur, are not related to reservoir operations.

We tested this hypothesis by comparing perceptions of safety, satisfaction and experience with average daily water elevations at three reservoirs: Buttle Lake, Upper Campbell Reservoir and Lower Campbell Reservoir.

Responses to Questions Q9, Q11, Q12 and Q14 in Section B: Visit to a Lake/Reservoir (Appendix E) of the survey were graphed using scatterplots in relation to the average daily elevation.

In 2022, correlations between water elevations and the various performance measures were tested using a mixed linear model. In previous analyses, we used a Spearman's correlation. The mixed linear model is a more robust method as it addresses two sources of variation: between respondents and between days. Additionally, the management questions were examined with a mixed linear model for relationships with weather to determine if this was an influential variable in satisfaction scores. The impact of weather on these relationships was also investigated after adjusting for lake elevation on respondents' recreation experience. Scatterplots have been used to depict these relationships and are presented in Appendix C.

Pearson Chi-Square tests were used to identify if the proportion of responses were significantly different between years. Post-hoc pairwise comparison tests using the Bonferroni correction were then used to identify which responses were significantly different.

It is important to note that lake elevation is highly confounded with year, i.e. lower elevations were generally found in 2015 and 2022 and higher elevations generally found in 2017 or 2018 for Buttle Lake, and similarly for other lakes/reservoirs. Consequently, while testing to see how public perceptions are influenced by lake elevation, we acknowledge that other year-specific factors might also influence perceptions. Determining how much of influence is attributed to lake elevations versus other year-specific factors is difficult and conclusions must be interpreted carefully because year-specific effects could be contributing to the changes in visitor perceptions as well as waterbody elevation.

3.2.1 WATER ELEVATION OF RESERVOIRS

Water levels, measured as daily average elevation in metres, were gathered from BC Hydro Generation Operations. Water levels were only available for three reservoirs in the study area: Buttle Lake, Lower Campbell Reservoir and Upper Campbell Reservoir. Analyses were completed separately for each reservoir as differences in operational water levels (e.g., maximum reservoir elevation) and topography prevent direct comparisons between reservoirs. A summary of water elevations from the BC Hydro data set are provided in Table 7.

Using monitoring data attained through BC Hydro, the mean daily average elevations for the entirety of 2022 were 216.48 m for Buttle Lake, 216.34 m for Upper Campbell Reservoir, and 176.86 m for Lower Campbell Reservoir. Buttle Lake and Upper Campbell Reservoir are expected to share similar water elevations due to their direct connectivity.

Table 7. Summary of water elevation data (in meters) for reservoirs in Year 6 (Jan 2022-Dec 2022)

	Upper Campbell Reservoir (meters)	Buttle Lake (meters)	Lower Campbell Reservoir (meters)
Mean	216.34	216.48	176.86
Median	216.14	216.15	177.11

Std. Deviation	1.83	1.61	.61
Variance	3.36	2.60	.37
Minimum	212.22	213.59	175.15
Maximum	219.43	219.44	177.76

Water elevations encountered during the sampling at each reservoir were compared to the water elevations recorded throughout the year to identify how representative sampling was of the true range of water elevations. As water elevation data was not normally distributed, a One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was used to determine if the median daily water elevations that were encountered during sampling were the same as those observed for the entire year. Significant differences in median water elevation were observed between the dates sampled in 2022 and the actual water elevations throughout the year for Buttle Lake (n=30, p<0.001), Upper Campbell Reservoir (n=18, p<0.001) and Lower Campbell Reservoir (n=17, p<0.001). This means that our sampling tended to capture slightly more lower water elevations than experienced overall through the year. This was expected given that sampling was completed during the active recreational season (i.e., March to October), and does not capture periods in the off-season (i.e., November to February) that are often characterized by higher water levels.

3.2.2 INFLUENCE OF WATER LEVEL ON RECREATION EXPERIENCE

In Question 9 of the survey, respondents were asked to rate how water levels influenced their recreation experience at the time of their visit on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very negative" and 5 being "very positive"). Across all study years, about half (51%) of respondents reported that water levels at the time of their visit had either a "somewhat positive" or "very positive" influence on their recreation experience at the reservoir. In Year 6 specifically, the distribution of responses was comparable, with about 55% of respondents reporting a positive influence.

Relationship between Recreation Experience and Water Elevation

Significant correlations were identified between the recreation experience and water elevations for two reservoirs. Respondents reported a tendency to report a more positive influence on their recreation experience when water levels were higher for Buttle Lake (p=<0.001) and Lower Campbell Reservoir (p=<0.001) although this relationship may be somewhat confounded with year-specific effects. No strong trends were evident at the Upper Campbell Reservoir (p=0.890). Scatterplots depicting the influence of water levels on recreation experience in relation to daily average water elevation for the reservoirs are presented in Figure 8.



Figure 8. Scatterplots of influence of water levels on recreation experience and daily average water elevation for each reservoir

The impact of general weather conditions (e.g. overcast, sunny, raining) was also investigated after adjusting for lake elevation on respondents' recreation experience (Appendix C – Figure 1). There was no evidence of an effect of elevation depending on broad weather categories (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect were large); and there was no evidence of a difference in mean score depending on weather for any reservoir. As such, it is unlikely that broad weather categories have had significant influences on respondents' recreational experience in Campbell Reservoir system within the context of the management questions.

Differences in Responses between Study Years

Significant differences are noted in respondents' satisfaction with their recreational experience between study years (Pearson's χ^2= 194.327, p=<0.001) (Figure 9). A post-hoc pairwise comparison of each category (using the Bonferroni correction) was used to identify what these differences were. Year 5 is noted as having lower satisfaction for respondents in general, with a significantly greater proportion of "no influence" responses (Z=9.602, p=0.000) and a lower proportion of "somewhat positive" (Z=-6.519, p=0.000) and "very positive" (Z=-5.354, p=0.000) responses than other study years. Also, respondents in Year 2 had a significantly greater proportion of "very negative" responses compared to other years (Z=6.634, p=0.000), while in Year 3, respondents had a significantly lower proportion of "very negative" responses (Z=-4.532, p=0.000) compared to other study years.



Figure 9. Frequency of responses for influence of water level on recreation experience at reservoirs by study year (n=1831)

The influence of weather does not appear to explain the differences in responses from year to year, although large year-specific variation is evident. Other explanatory factors were not explored, although possibilities could include differences in elevation between study years, a change in shoreline conditions experienced by respondents (although unlikely), a change in the population sample (e.g., a growing segment of visitors who may no longer be participating due to survey fatigue) or change in response associated with visitors completing the survey on a different medium (i.e., on an e-tablet).

3.2.3 SATISFACTION WITH SHORELINE CONDITIONS

In Question 11, respondents were asked to rate how satisfied they were with shoreline conditions while engaged in water-based recreation at the time of their visit on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being “very dissatisfied” and 5 being “very satisfied”). Across all study years, 68% of respondents reported that they were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” (Figure 10). When only responses from Year 6 are examined, this proportion was slightly lower, with 67% of respondents reporting that they were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied”.



Figure 10. Scatterplots of satisfaction with shoreline condition and daily average water elevation for each reservoir

Relationship between Satisfaction with Shoreline Conditions and Water Elevation

Respondents reported being more satisfied with shoreline conditions when water levels were higher for Buttle Lake (p=<0.001) and Lower Campbell Reservoir (p=<001). The relationship was not as strong for Lower Campbell Lake although still significant (although this may be confounded with year-specific effects). No significant relationship was noted at the Upper Campbell Reservoir (p=0.574). Scatterplots depicting the satisfaction with shoreline conditions in relation to daily average water elevation for the reservoirs are presented in Figure 10.

The impact of weather conditions was also investigated after adjusting for lake elevation on the satisfaction score (Appendix C – Figure 2). There was no evidence of a differential effect of elevation depending on weather (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect are large); and there was only evidence of a difference in mean score depending on weather after adjusting for elevation for Upper Campbell Lake.

Differences in Responses between Study Years

Differences in satisfaction with shoreline conditions are noted when responses are compared between study years (Pearson's χ^2=100.389, p=<0.001). Further investigation identifies that Year 3 had a significantly smaller proportion of respondents that replied they were "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (Z=-3.1380, p=0.002) than other years, whereas Years 4 (Z=-3.1380, p=0.002) and 5 (Z=3.3641, p=0.000) had a higher proportion.

Other changes include a disproportionately higher level of respondents being "very dissatisfied" with shoreline condition in Year 2 (Z=5.4580, p=0.000) and a significantly lower proportion of respondents in Year 3 (Z=-3.903, p=0.000) that they were "very dissatisfied". Despite the variability in responses over the years in the proportion of respondents replying they were "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied", these proportions were not identified as being significantly different.



Figure 11. Frequency of responses for satisfaction with shoreline conditions at reservoirs by study year (n=1831)

The influence of weather did not appear to explain the differences in responses from year to year, although large year-specific variation is evident. Other explanatory factors were not explored but could include differences resulting from changing site conditions, visitor demographics or even the survey tool (i.e., e-tablet).

3.2.4 PERCEPTION OF SAFETY

In Question 12, respondents rated how safe they felt engaging in water-based activities on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very unsafe" and 5 being "very safe") given water levels at the time of their visit. For all study years, the majority of respondents (53%) reported feeling "very safe" while recreating at a reservoir within the Campbell Reservoir system (Figure 12). In Year 6, the proportion of respondents reporting they felt "very safe" was 49%.



Figure 12. Scatterplots of perception of safety and daily average water elevation for each reservoir

Relationship between Perception of Safety and Water Elevation

Respondents from Buttle Lake tended to report feeling safer when water levels were higher ($p<0.001$). While a similar trend was noted for Lower Campbell Reservoir, the relationship was not significant ($p=0.072$). No strong trends were evident at the Upper Campbell Reservoir ($p=0.337$). Scatterplots were developed to depict the relationship between perception of safety and lake elevation for each reservoir with elevational data and are presented in Figure 12.

The impact of weather was also investigated after adjusting for lake elevation on the perception of safety score (Appendix C – Figure 3). There was no evidence of a differential effect of elevation depending on weather (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect are large); and no evidence of a differential mean score among weather conditions (after adjusting for elevation). Based on this, it is unlikely that general weather has had a significant influence on respondents' perception of safety.

Differences in Responses between Study Years

When responses were compared between study years, significant differences in distribution were detected (Pearson's $\chi^2=66.019$, $p=0.000$) (Figure 13). A pairwise comparison of each category using the Bonferroni correction identified several significant differences across the years. Significantly fewer respondents reported feeling "very safe" in Year 4 than in other years ($Z=-4.316$, $p=0.000$). Similarly, in Year 4, a greater proportion of visitors reported that they felt "neither safe nor unsafe" while recreating in the area ($Z=4.400$, $p=0.000$). In Year 3, a significantly lower proportion of respondents reported feeling "neither safe nor unsafe" (Z=-

3.463, p=0.001). Although other proportions are noted as fluctuating over time, these were not determined to be significant.



Figure 13. Frequency of responses for perception of safety while recreating at reservoirs by study year (n=1834)

As noted above, weather does not appear to explain the differences in responses from year to year. Other explanatory factors were not explored, although possibilities could be related to changes in demographics, unidentified changes site conditions or something unknown.

3.2.5 SATISFACTION WITH ACCESS

Question 14 of the survey asked respondents to rate how satisfied they were with access to the reservoir on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being “very dissatisfied” and 5 being “very satisfied”) at the time of their visit. Three options for access were rated, including access to beach, access to the water via a boat launch, and access to the water via the shoreline.

3.2.5.1 Access to Beach

A small percentage of respondents (7%) felt that the question was not applicable. For those that responded, the majority of respondents at reservoirs (69%) were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with access to the beach (Figure 14) across all study years. In Year 6, about 82% reported being “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied”.



Figure 14. Scatterplots of satisfaction with access to beach and daily average water elevation for each reservoir

Relationship between Satisfaction with Access to Beach and Water Elevation

Respondents from Buttle Lake reported a tendency to have a higher satisfaction with access to the beach when water levels were higher (p=<0.001). The relationship was not evident for Lower Campbell Lake (p=0.122) or Upper Campbell Reservoir (p=0.342). Scatterplots were developed to depict the relationship between satisfaction with access to the beach and lake elevation and are presented in Figure 14. As evident in the scatterplot, lake elevation is highly variable between years and may have some confounding influence on satisfaction.

The impact of general weather conditions (e.g. overcast, sunny, raining) was also investigated after adjusting for lake elevation on respondents' satisfaction with beach access (Appendix C – Figure 4). There was no evidence of a differential effect of elevation depending on weather (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect are large); and no evidence of a differential mean score among weather conditions (after adjusting for elevation).

Differences in Responses between Study Years

When responses are compared between study years, significant differences in distribution were detected (Pearson's χ^2=78.301, p=0.000) across years (Figure 15). Following the removal of respondents who said the question was not applicable, a pairwise comparison of each category was completed, revealing several significant differences across the years. In Year 5, the proportion of respondents reporting being "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" was significantly greater (Z=3.254, p=0.001) than other years. Additionally, a greater proportion of respondents reported they were "very dissatisfied" in Year 2 (Z=4.219, p=0.000) and a smaller proportion of respondents reported they were "very dissatisfied" in Year 3 (Z=-3.188, p=0.001). Lastly, in Year 4, we observed a smaller proportion of respondents reported they were "very satisfied" (Z=-3.394, p=0.001) compared to other years.



Figure 15. Satisfaction with access at reservoirs to beach for all respondents by study year (n=1669)

As noted above, the influence of weather does not appear to explain the differences in responses from year to year, although large year-specific variation is evident. Other explanatory factors were not explored but could include differences resulting from changing site conditions, visitor demographics or even the survey tool (i.e., e-tablet).

3.2.5.2 Access to Water via Boat Launch

When respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with access to the water via boat launches, the majority (43%) reported that this did not apply, implying that many of the people surveyed in 2022 did not use boat launches while recreating at reservoirs. After removing non-applicable responses, the majority of respondents (61%) reported that they were either "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with access to water via boat launches across all study years (Figure 16). In Year 6, about 70% of respondents reported being "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied".



Figure 16. Scatterplots of satisfaction with access to water via boat launch and daily average water elevation

Relationship between Satisfaction with Access to Water via Boat Launch and Water Elevation

For Buttle Lake (p=<0.001) and Lower Campbell Reservoir (p=0.004), respondents reported a tendency to have a higher satisfaction with access to the water via the boat launches when water levels were higher when data from all years were examined. Scatterplots were developed to depict the relationship between satisfaction with access to water via boat launch and lake elevation and are presented in Figure 16.

There was no evidence of a differential effect of elevation depending on weather (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect are large) for any of the reservoirs; and there was no evidence of a differential mean score among weather conditions (after adjusting for elevation) (Appendix C – Figure 5).

Differences in Responses between Study Years

When results are compared between study years, the proportion of responses are noted as being significantly different (Pearson's χ^2=129.646, p=0.000). Following removal of those that responded the question was not applicable, a pairwise comparison of each category using the Bonferroni correction identified only two significant differences across the years. Significant differences in distributions across the years included a greater proportion of respondents in Year 2 who reported being “very dissatisfied” (Z=4.572, p=0.000), and a lower proportion of respondents in Year 3 who reported being “very dissatisfied” with access to the water from boat launches at the time of their visit (Z=-4.574, p=0.000) (Figure 17).



Figure 17. Satisfaction with access at reservoirs to water via boat launch for all respondents by study year (n=1689)

As noted above, weather does not appear to explain the differences in responses from year to year. Other explanatory factors were not explored, although possibilities could be related to a change in the population sample (e.g. higher proportion of day visitors surveyed), or an unidentified change in site conditions.

3.2.5.3 Access to Water via Shoreline

In 2022, about 5% of respondents replied that the question did not apply. These were subsequently removed from the analysis. Across all study years, the majority of respondents (67%) reported feeling “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” when respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with access to the water via the shoreline within the Campbell Reservoir system across all study years (Figure 18). In Year 6, about 78% of respondents reported being “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied”.



Figure 18. Scatterplots of satisfaction with access to water via shoreline and daily average water elevation

Relationship between Satisfaction with Access to Water via Shoreline and Water Elevation

Respondents from Buttle Lake (p=<0.001) and Lower Campbell Reservoir (p=0.009) reported a tendency to have greater satisfaction with access to the water via the shoreline when water levels were higher when all study years were considered. The relationship was not as strong for Lower Campbell Lake (and may be confounded with year-specific effects). No significant trends were evident at the Upper Campbell Reservoir. Scatterplots were developed to depict the relationship between satisfaction with access to water via shoreline and lake elevation and are presented in Figure 18.

There was some weak evidence of a differential trend depending on weather for Lower Campbell Lake (p=0.039) and evidence of a difference in mean score depending on weather after adjusting for elevation for Lower Campbell Lake (p=0.016) (Appendix C – Figure 6).

Differences in Responses between Study Years

When results are compared between study years, the distribution of responses differed significantly across study years (Pearson's χ^2=112,951, p=0.000) (Figure 19). Following removal of those that responded the question did not apply, a post-hoc pairwise comparison identified multiple significant differences in the responses across the years. In Year 6, we observed a greater proportion of respondents who reported being "very satisfied" (Z=3.2546, p=0.001). In Year 5, we observed a greater proportion of respondents who reported being "neither satisfied or dissatisfied" (Z=3.8994, p=0.000). Other significant differences were noted in the proportion of respondents who were "very dissatisfied" with access to water via the shoreline, with a higher proportion in Year 2 (Z=4.3877, p=0.000) and a lower proportion in Year 3 (Z=-4.7424, p=0.000).



Figure 19. Satisfaction with access at reservoirs to water via shoreline for all respondents by study year (n=1747)

As noted above, weather may have had an influence on satisfaction scores although this significant relationship was only observed at Lower Campbell Reservoir. Other explanatory factors were not explored.

3.3 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESIS – RIVERS

The management hypothesis for rivers in the Campbell River reservoir systems is stated as:

$H_{0\text{-}B}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience at rivers, if they occur, are not related to riverine discharge.

We tested this hypothesis by comparing perceptions of safety, satisfaction and experience with average daily flow rates for two rivers in the study area: Quinsam River and Campbell River. Responses to Q30, Q31 and Q32 in Section E: Visits to Rivers (Appendix E) of the survey were graphed using scatterplots in relation to the average daily water flow.

To address the management questions, correlations between flow rates and the various riverine performance measures were tested using mixed linear models. Additionally, mixed linear models were used to determine if weather was an influential variable in satisfaction scores. Scatterplots have been used to depict these relationships and are presented in Appendix C. Pearson Chi-Square tests were used to identify if the proportion of responses were significantly different between years. Post-hoc pairwise comparison tests using the Bonferroni correction were then used to identify which responses were significantly different between years.

Similar to the reservoirs and water elevations, river flow rate is highly confounded with year for Quinsam River, where higher flows were generally found in 2016. There is less confounding effect for Campbell River because a wider range of flows were observed for all years.

3.3.1 FLOW RATES OF RIVERS

River discharge or flow rate, measured as daily average flow rate in cubic metres per second (m^3/s), was gathered for two rivers: Quinsam River and Campbell River. Water flow data have previously been attained from the following Water Survey of Canada (WC) stations:

- For Quinsam River: Quinsam R nr Campbell R (08HD005)
- For Campbell River: Campbell R nr Campbell R (08HD003)

In 2021, the Campbell River water station (08HD003) was decommissioned and replaced by a station at Campbell River near Campbell River Cableway (08HD035). The original location (08HD003) was prone to backwater effects that reduced data quality. In response, a new sample location was selected nearby to improve the quality of water flow data collected. To build a homogenous record of data for the full study period, a synthetic record was derived by subtracting discharges at 08HD003 from the 08HD035 data from 2021 onwards.

Analyses had to be completed separately for the two rivers as volumes differ greatly between the two systems, and thus were not directly comparable. Daily average flow rates are summarized in Table 8. Based on the monitoring data, the mean daily average flow rates for Year 6 of the study were 88.38 m^3/s for Campbell River and 6.72 m^3/s for Quinsam River.

Table 8. Summary of water flow data (in cubic meters/second) for rivers in Year 6 (Jan 2022 - Dec 2022)

	Campbell River (m^3/s)	Quinsam River (m^3/s)
Mean	88.38	6.72
Median	88.35	5.58
Std. Deviation	27.432	6.011
Variance	752.502	36.127
Minimum	43.00	1.69
Maximum	136.80	42.13

Water flows measured throughout the year were compared to flow rates encountered during the sampling at Campbell River and Quinsam River to identify how representative sampling was of the true range of water flows. As water flow data were not normally distributed, a One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was used to determine if the median daily water flow that were encountered during sampling were the same (and therefore representative) as those actually observed for the entire year. No significant difference in median water flow rates was observed between the dates sampled (median=113.86 m3/s) and actual water flows (median=88.35 m^3/s) observed throughout the year for Campbell River (n=16, p=0.642). At Quinsam River, flow conditions during the sampling were significantly different than the actual flow conditions (n=20, p=0.04). Sampling tended to capture more lower flow conditions (median=3.67 m^3/s) than encountered across the year (median = 6.58 m^3/s), which is to be expected given high waters often occur in the off-season when surveying is not being completed.

3.3.2 INFLUENCE OF WATER FLOW ON RECREATION EXPERIENCE

Question 30 asked respondents to rate how water flows influenced their recreation experience on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very negative" and 5 being "very positive") given river conditions at the time of their visit. Approximately 56% of respondents reported that water flow had either a "somewhat positive" or "very positive" influence on their recreation experience at the rivers (Figure 20). In Year 6, this proportion was slightly lower with 50% of respondents reporting water flows had a positive influence on their river experience (Figure 21).



Figure 20. Influence of water flows on recreation experience for all study years

Relationship between Recreation Experience and Flow Rates

Respondents showed a slight tendency to report a more positive influence on their recreation experience when flow rates were higher for Campbell River (p=0.047). The opposite tendency was observed for Quinsam River where satisfaction tended to be slightly lower at higher flows (p=0.020) although the results at Quinsam River seem likely to be confounded by year-specific effects. Scatterplots were developed to depict the influence of water flows on recreation experience in relation to daily average water flows for the rivers and presented in Figure 20. Analysis showed that higher flows on the Quinsam River (>20 m^3/sec) occurred only in 2016. We repeated the previous analysis removing observations taken at these very high flow values to see if they were confounding the results. Without the highest flows from 2016, there was no significant evidence that river flow had an influence on recreation experience (p=0.079).

The impact of weather was also investigated after adjusting for flow rates on respondents' recreation experience, both with and without 2016 high flows (Appendix C – Figures 7 & 8). There was no evidence of a differential effect of average flow rate depending on weather (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect are large); and there was no evidence of a difference in mean score among weather conditions for either river. As such, weather has not had a significant influence on respondents' recreational experience at the rivers.

Differences in Responses between Study Years

When the proportion of responses are compared between study years, significant differences are noted (Pearson's χ^2=113.944, p=0.000) (Figure 21). Using a pairwise comparison of each category (using the Bonferroni correction), several specific categories were identified as differing from each other. In Year 5, a significantly greater proportion of respondents replied that river flows had no influence on their experience (Z=7.156, p=0.000), while in Year 3 (Z=-5.408, p=0.000) and Year 4 (Z=-3.672, p=0.000), significantly fewer respondents reported "no influence". A greater proportion of respondents reported having a somewhat positive experience in Year 3 (Z=4.296, p=0.000) while in Year 4, a significantly greater proportion of respondents reported a very positive influence (Z=5.567, p=0.000).

Figure 21. Frequency of responses for influence of river flow on experience while recreating at the river by study year (n=866)

The influence of weather does not appear to explain the differences in responses from year to year, although large year-specific variation is evident. Other explanatory factors were not explored.

3.3.3 SATISFACTION WITH SHORELINE CONDITIONS

Question 31 asked riverine visitors to rate how satisfied they were with shoreline conditions while engaged in water-based recreation at the time of their visit on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very dissatisfied" and 5 being "very satisfied"). Respondents were generally satisfied with shoreline conditions along the rivers, with the majority (72%) of respondents reporting that they were either "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" (Figure 22). In Year 6, 70% of respondents reported similarly.



Figure 22. Satisfaction with riverine shoreline conditions for all study years

Relationship between Satisfaction with Shoreline Conditions and Flow Rates

No significant trends were noted between satisfaction with shoreline condition and water flow rates for either Campbell River (p=0.614) or Quinsam River (p=0.217). Scatterplots depicting satisfaction with shoreline conditions in relation to daily average water flows for the rivers are presented in Figure 22. Analysis was completed again for Quinsam River, removing outlier high flows from 2016 (>20 m^3/s), to examine if these higher flows were confounding the results. Without the high flows, there was still no evidence that river flow had an influence on satisfaction with shoreline conditions (p=0.637).

There was no evidence of a differential effect of average flow rate for the river depending on weather (i.e., all of the p-values for the non-parallel effect are large); and there was no evidence of a differential mean score among weather conditions (after adjusting for river flow) (Appendix C – Figure 9 & 10).

Differences in Responses between Study Years

The responses are noted as being significantly different across the years (Pearson's $\chi^2=28.458$, p=0.028). Overall, the data suggests that there is some statistically significant difference between satisfaction with shoreline conditions between study years, but a pairwise comparison of each category (using the Bonferroni correction) could not identify which specific categories differ significantly from each other. Figure 23 depicts the frequency of responses.



Figure 23. Frequency of responses for satisfaction with shoreline conditions at rivers by study year (n=861)

3.3.4 PERCEPTION OF SAFETY

In Question 32, respondents were asked to rate how safe they felt engaging in water-based activities at the rivers on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very unsafe" and 5 being "very safe") given water levels at the time of their visit. Approximately half of respondents (55%) reported feeling "very safe" while recreating at a river within the Campbell Reservoir system across all study years (Figure 24). In Year 6, this figure was lower, with 42% reporting feeling "very safe".

Relationship between Perception of Safety and Flow Rates

No significant relationships were noted between perception of safety and water flow rates for either Campbell River (p=0.153) or Quinsam River (p=0.159). Analysis was completed again for Quinsam River, removing flows greater than 20 m^3/s, to examine if these higher flows were confounding the results. Without the high flows, there was still no evidence that river flow had an influence on perceptions of safety (p=0.168). Scatterplots depicting perception of safety in relation to daily average water flows for the rivers are presented in Figure 24.



Figure 24. **Perception of safety for all study years**

Although there was evidence that the perception of safety as a function of river flow differed among weather conditions for Quinsam River (p=0.001), this appears to be due to a single data associated with outlier high water data in 2016 (see Appendix C – Figure 11). After removing the very high flows from the Quinsam River data set, there was no evidence that the perception of safety as a function of river flow differed among weather conditions (p=0.968) (see Appendix C – Figure 12).

Differences in Responses between Study Years

The responses are noted as being significantly different across the years (Pearson's χ^2=27.879, p=0.033). Using a post-hoc pairwise comparison of each category (using the Bonferroni correction), only one significant difference was noted across study years, with a disproportionate number of respondents reporting feeling "very safe" in Year 5 (Z=3.574, p=0.000) (Figure 25).



Figure 25. Frequency of responses for perception of safety while recreating at rivers by study year (n=853)

3.4 MANAGEMENT HYPOTHESIS – FALLS

The management hypothesis for rivers in the Campbell River reservoir systems is stated as:

$H_{0\text{-}C}$: Changes in overall satisfaction with the recreation experience of visitors to Elk Canyon Falls is not related to riverine discharges (i.e., spill events).

We tested this hypothesis by comparing visitor satisfaction and impressiveness at Elk Falls with average daily flow rates for Campbell River. Responses to Q23 and Q24 in Section D: Visit to Elk Falls (Appendix E) of the survey were graphed using scatterplots in relation to the average daily water flow.

To address the management questions, correlations between flow rates and the various riverine performance measures were tested using mixed linear models. Additionally, mixed linear models were used to determine if weather was an influential variable in satisfaction scores. Scatterplots have been used to depict these relationships. Pearson Chi-Square tests were used to identify if the proportion of responses for each management question were significantly different between years. Post-hoc pairwise comparison tests using the Bonferroni correction were then used to identify which responses were significantly different between years.

River discharge for Elk Falls, measured as daily average flow rate, was gathered from Water Survey of Canada for Campbell River using data combined from the "Campbell River near Campbell River" station and the new "Campbell River near Campbell River Cablecar" station.

3.4.1 IMPRESSIVENESS OF FALLS

Question 23 asks respondents to rate how impressive Elk Falls were at the time of their visit on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very unimpressive" and 5 being "very impressive"). Most respondents felt the falls were impressive with the majority (94%) of respondents reporting that they were "very impressive" or "somewhat impressive" (Figure 26). In 2022, about 86% of respondents reported similarly, although a smaller proportion of those reported the falls being "very impressive" than previous years.



Figure 26. Impression of falls for all study years

Relationship between Impressiveness of Falls and Flow Rates

No significant relationship was noted between respondents' impressions of the falls and daily average water flows (p=0.231). Scatterplots depict the relationship between water flows and the impressiveness of the falls in Figure 27.

There was no evidence the effect of flow rate on impressiveness of the falls varied across weather conditions (p=0.145) (Appendix C – 13). Other explanatory variables were not explored.

Differences in Responses between Study Years

A statistical difference was identified between the distribution of responses across the six study years (Pearson's χ^2=99.808, p=0.000) (Figure 27). Using a pairwise comparison of each category (using the Bonferroni correction), several specific categories were identified as differing from each other. In Year 6, a significantly lower proportion of respondents rated the falls as being very impressive (Z=-4.296, p=0.000). In contrast, a significantly greater proportion of respondents reported that the falls were very impressive in Years

4 (Z=3.786, p=0.000) and 5 (Z=3.913, p=0.000), with a corresponding drop in those responding that the falls were somewhat impressive (Z=-4.468, p=0.000, and Z=-4.969, p=0.000). Also, in Year 5 a small but significantly greater proportion of respondents reported the falls were very unimpressive (Z=4.747, p=0.000).



Figure 27. Frequency of responses for impressiveness of Elk Falls by study year (n=1863)

3.4.2 SATISFACTION WITH EXPERIENCE AT FALLS

In Question 24, respondents were asked to rate how satisfied they were with the viewing experience at Elk Falls on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being “very dissatisfied” and 5 being “very satisfied”). Respondents reported a high degree of satisfaction with their experience at Elk Falls with 96% stating they were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” (Figure 28). In Year 6, 96% of respondents reported similarly, although this included a slight reduction in the proportion of those reported being “very satisfied” with their experience at Elk Falls than previous years.



Figure 28. Satisfaction with viewing experience at falls for all study years

Relationship between Satisfaction with Falls and Flow Rates

No significant relationship was identified between water flows and satisfaction with the viewing experience at the falls (p=0.478). A scatterplot was developed to depict the relationship and is presented in Figure 28.

The impact of weather was also investigated after adjusting for the falls flow rate. There was no evidence the effect of flow rate on impressiveness of the falls varied across weather conditions (p=0.684) (Appendix C – Figure 14). Other explanatory factors such as differences in site conditions (e.g., change in the flow rates between years or other unidentified site changes), or changes in the population were not explored.

Differences in Responses between Study Years

A statistical difference was identified between the distribution of responses across the six study years (Pearson's χ^2=43.890, p=0.000) (Figure 29). Using a pairwise comparison of each category (using the Bonferroni correction), a significantly lower proportion of respondents reported that they were very satisfied (Z=-4.074, p=0.000) in Year 6. This was mirrored by a corresponding increased proportion of respondents in Year 6 who reported that they were only somewhat satisfied (Z=4.208, p=0.000).



Figure 29. Frequency of responses for satisfaction with experience at Elk Falls by study year (n=1860)

3.5 CAMPBELL RIVER CHOICE EXPERIMENT

The Campbell River Choice Experiment was introduced in Year 6 (2022) to evaluate choices and preferences based on conditions along the Campbell River. A total of 428 respondents completed the full choice experiment. This DCE was evaluated using three different modeling approaches:

1. 'Single-class' multinomial logit model – This model analysed the results of all respondents collectively as one group, or 'class'
2. 'Known class' multinomial logit models – These models analysed the results using known variables to define segmented groups into multiple known classes for analysis and comparison.
3. 4-Class Latent multinomial logit model – This model uses analysis techniques to automatically identify and group responses into 4 classes drawing on all variables and attributes in the dataset. This model is introduced but not discussed in the results.

Results for the general single-class model are presented below. Results for the known-class and 4-class latent models are discussed briefly, with the tabulated analysis provided in Appendix C.

3.5.1 SINGLE-CLASS MULTINOMIAL LOGIT MODEL

The single-class multinomial logit model of the responses (i.e. the model that uses all responses together) provided several interesting outcomes. First, similar to the reservoir DCE(s), respondents continued to indicate a preference for water levels that were not 'High High (i.e. the extremely highest water levels) (see Table 9 and Figure 30). Respondents were more likely to prefer 'Low' water levels for River system. It is important to note that the preference for 'Low' water levels in the general 1-class model for rivers represent about 75% of the respondents with other respondents preferring higher river conditions. This observation is noted by the 4-class latent model (see below in Section 3.5.2 and Appendix C). However, there is an overall more homogeneous preference for low water levels in the Campbell River than in the Upper and Lower Campbell reservoirs.

Like the 1-class model for Lower Campbell, respondents taking the river DCE indicated a preference for no woody debris (although the significance of this finding is at 89% and will be reviewed in the subsequent data collection period). Respondents of the River DCE had no preference river substrate but did prefer exposed substrate for shoreline conditions.

Table 9. Results of the 1-Class multinomial logit model testing effects of river features (n=428)

Attribute and Attribute Level[a]	Estimate[b]	p-value
Water Level		
(1)Low Low	0.2225	3.30E-122
(2)Low	**0.3245**	
(3)Average	0.03	
(4)High	-0.2363	
(5)High High	-0.3406	
River Flow		
(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	**0.1505**	1.50E-04
(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	0.072	
(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	0.0952	
(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	-0.1304	
(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	-0.1873	
River Substrate		
(1)Natural substrate	-0.0054	0.82
(2)High boulder cover	**0.0054**	
Shoreline Features		
(1)Exposed substrate	**0.1078**	3.90E-06
(2)Vegetated	-0.1078	
Wood Debris		
(1)Present	-1.5966	0.11
(2) Not Present	**1.5966**	

[a] Rho^2=.206

[b] Estimate indicates the strength of the preference (values further from 0 indicate a stronger preference) and whether it is a negative preference (-) or a positive preference (+)

River Flow was a unique attribute for the river DCE that was not tested in the earlier Upper and Lower Campbell Reservoir experiments. The 1-class model indicated an increasing negative preference for 'faster' rivers. While there were no risk indicators (e.g., the experiment attempted to present a risk neutral environment), this observation could indicate a general risk avoidance trend for respondents as a whole. As with water levels, the 4-class latent model (see below in Section 3.5.2 and Appendix C) presented a single class (class 3) that preferred faster river flows.

Utility graphs for respondent preferences are shown below in Figure 30.

Figure 30. Utility graphs for respondent river preferences*



* For interpretation, the x-axis 'part-worth utility' equates to 'importance' to respondents. The closer to zero (0), the less important an attribute is considered. Negative numbers indicate a negative influence or 'dislike' while positive numbers imply a positive influence or 'like'.

3.5.2 KNOWN CLASS AND LATENT CLASS MODELS

For the known class models, specific "chosen" user groups were investigated manually using an array of known respondent characteristics, such as preferred recreational activity and visitor status, to examine preferences. Tabulated results of this analysis are provided in Appendix D. Specific known classes that were investigated included: Beach Recreation; Kayakers; Swimmers; Campbell River residents; Non-Campbell River residents; Campers only; People planning on sightseeing at the falls; and Boaters.

In general, the preferences of boaters and respondents looking for beach recreation differed the most compared to the general 1-class model results. Beach recreationists only preferred average river flow levels. Boaters were mixed preferring 'Low Low' and 'Average' water levels. In contrast, several groups had no significant differences from the 1-class model (e.g. non-Campbell River residents and Campbell River residents). Swimmers preferred 'High' water levels and 'Low' river flows. The known class comparisons for the river DCE shows that respondents continue to be relatively homogenous in their negative perception of extremely high (i.e. 'High High') water conditions, with the exception of boaters that were positive in their preference for 'High High' conditions. However, given that boaters also most preferred 'Low Low' water levels this finding should be interpreted cautiously.

The other method of analysis evaluated the river DCE results was a 4-class latent model. This model assigns respondents to one of a designated number of classes (in this case, 4 classes were selected) based on similar groups of responses. In the developed 4-class latent model, all but river substrates are influential on the respondents' selections and differences between classes exist. The 4-class latent model suggests overall homogeneous preferences in that only one group of respondents differed from the 1-class model significantly with a strong preference for 'average' and 'High High' water conditions (Class 3). All latent classes expressed differences in their preferred water level but generally preferred lower water levels, with the exception of class 3 which preferred higher water flows.

4 DISCUSSION

Investigations of public use and perceptions of the Campbell Reservoir system have now been completed for 5.5 years (August 2015 to December 2019, and March to October 2022), revealing some insightful observations. In general, respondents have had favourable perceptions of their experiences at the reservoirs, rivers and waterfalls as gauged by the performance measures.

Perceptions at the reservoirs were generally positive for all performance measures. The performance measure with the highest overall frequency of positive responses was the perception of safety. In contrast, the performance measures with the highest frequency of negative responses across all study years were about access. In particular, access to the water via boat launches and via the shoreline had the highest frequencies of negative responses with 18-19% of respondents reporting they were either somewhat or very dissatisfied. Satisfaction with these two performance measures for access was comparable between Year 6 (2022) and earlier study years (Years 2-4) but considerably more positive when compared to Year 5 (2019).

Consistent with previous years, the majority of negative responses were from respondents at Buttle Lake. Part of this response is likely explained by a high frequency of negative responses during Year 2 of the study when Buttle Lake experienced very low water elevations that likely had a negative influence on visitors' access. Very low water elevations like this have not been observed in the other reservoirs or in different years. A high frequency of negative responses was also experienced in Year 5, particularly at both Buttle Lake and Upper Campbell Reservoir and to a lesser extent at Lower Campbell Reservoir, although the reason for this difference in Year 5 is unclear. Year 6 responses tended to be similar to the typical distribution of responses and were usually not significantly different when compared to responses in other years.

The management question for reservoirs focused on identifying and characterizing any significant relationships between water elevations and the selected performance measures of public use and recreational experience. Statistically significant positive relationships between water elevations and visitor perceptions were identified at Buttle Lake and Lower Campbell Reservoir, where higher water levels were generally correlated with more positive experiences. Significant relationships with water elevations were also noted at Buttle Lake and Lower Campbell Reservoir for "satisfaction with shoreline conditions", "satisfaction with access to the water via boat launches", and "access to the water via the shoreline". Other reservoir performance measures, including perception of safety and satisfaction with access to the beach, were only statistically significant at Buttle Lake but again with more positive perceptions associated with higher water elevations. No significant relationships were noted at Upper Campbell Reservoir. This suggests that public visitors are not as sensitive to changes in water elevation at Upper Campbell Reservoir. This could be tied to a variety of factors, including differences in the reservoir morphology (e.g., shoreline) or the types of visitors (e.g. lodge guests).

Some caution must be taken in interpreting the relationship between water levels and the performance measures because year-specific effects (e.g., weather conditions, temperatures) could be contributing to changes in visitor responses. The type of weather (e.g., sun, cloud, rain) was used to see how influential this might be on the relationship, but the effect was not statistically significant.

The management question for rivers was similar to reservoirs, focusing on the relationship between water flow rates and the selected measures of use and recreational experience. Respondents generally had positive perceptions about their recreational experience at riverine environments in the Campbell River reservoir system. The performance measure with the highest frequency of positive responses was perception of safety, with a total of 55% of respondents reported feeling "very safe" while recreating. As with the reservoirs, perception of safety has continued to be the performance measure with the highest frequency of positive responses from year to year at the river locations. Negative responses for performance measures at the riverine locations were generally low in Year 6 (i.e., less than 9%) and not significantly different than previous years.

The distribution of responses for all three riverine performance measures were statistically different among years. Further examination indicates that responses in Year 6 were within the typical observed range of responses overall and that significant differences between years are attributed to responses from previous study years.

The only significant positive relationship between river flow rate and the riverine performance measures was at Campbell River, where increased flow rates were positively correlated with recreation experience. A statistically significant negative correlation was noted between flow rates and recreation experience for Quinsam River although this result may be related to exceptionally high flows in 2016. When outlying water flows from 2016 were removed from the analysis, the relationship was no longer significant.

Results from the river DCE consistently indicate that very-high water elevations are not preferred, which was the same for respondents of the reservoir DCEs. Respondents were more likely to prefer 'low' water levels. The preference for 'Low' water levels in the general (i.e., 1-class) model was represented by about 75% of the respondents, with the remaining 25% of respondents preferring higher river conditions. Preliminary findings for preferences for river flow velocity might be indicative of personal risk management and should be investigated in the final data analysis period. Unlike the reservoir DCEs, variance between respondents in the first year was less substantial and suggests more homogenous preferences for river recreationists.

Elk Falls had the highest frequency of positive responses overall. Respondents overwhelmingly reported being both satisfied with their recreational experience and that the falls were impressive regardless of flow rates.

In addition to findings specific to each location type (i.e., reservoirs, rivers, falls), the study aims to identify any potential relationships and trade-offs for visitor experience between location types as a result of water management in the reservoir system. Water management of the reservoirs has a strong effect on downstream riverine flows. For example, retaining higher water elevations within the reservoirs will generally result in a reduction in water flows in the rivers downstream; similarly, maintaining base flows in the rivers may require drawing down reservoir water elevations. The hypothesis is that management of the reservoirs may result in a trade-off between reservoir levels and water flows in the rivers, and subsequently influence visitor experiences at riverine locations. As noted in the results, the relationship between water flows and satisfaction of riverine-based recreationists was not definitive. Results support that higher flow rates were associated with more positive recreation experiences, although this relationship was weak and only detected at Campbell River (not Quinsam River). No other performance measures at either location had a significant relationship with river flows.

In the context of trade-offs, this suggests that changes to reservoir water elevations can potentially have a minor but detectable influence on the visitor experience of riverine users. Maintaining higher water elevations in the reservoirs with corresponding lower flows in the rivers might increase satisfaction for reservoir users while slightly reducing satisfaction for river users. However, this observed relationship might not be entirely reflective of public preferences. Given the results from the Campbell River DCE, where respondents preferred low water elevations and avoided very-high water elevations, it is possible that water retention in reservoirs may improve riverine recreational experience. These relationships will be explored further in the final study year in the hopes of providing more clarity.

In conclusion, continued data collection has provided a deeper understanding of public perceptions of recreational use in the study area and revealed further insights into how different operating regimes may influence perceptions. The analyses have also provided a general characterization of the people, activities and patterns of use in the study area.

5 REFERENCES

Adamowicz, W., Louviere, J., & Swait, J. (1998). Introduction to Attribute-Based Stated Choice Methods (No. 43AANC601388) (pp. 1–47). NOAA.

Barton, D. N., & Bergland, O. (2010). Valuing irrigation water using a choice experiment: an “individual status quo” modelling of farm specific water scarcity. Environment and Development Economics, 15(03), 321–340. Cambridge University Press.

BC Hydro. (2013). Campbell River Project Water Use Plan Monitoring Program Terms of Reference: JHTMON-2 Upper Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perception Survey. September 20, 2013.

Campbell River Water Use Plan Consultative Committee (2004). Consultative Committee Report - Campbell River Water Use Plan. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from https://www.bchydro.com/content/dam/BCHydro/customer-portal/documents/corporate/environment-sustainability/water-use-planning/vancouver-island/campbell-river/wup-campbell-river-executive-summary.pdf

Dillman, D. A. (2007). Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.

Haider, W., & Rasid, H. (2002). Eliciting public preferences for municipal water supply options. Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 22(4), 337–360.

Hurlbert, S.H. (1984), Pseudoreplication and the Design of Ecological Field Experiments. Ecological Monographs, 54: 187-211.

IBM (2023). IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 29) [Computer Software]. https://www.ibm.com/spss

Lancaster, K.J., (1966). A New Approach to Consumer Theory. Journal of Political Economy, 74, 132–157.

LKT and EDI (2015). JHTMON 2: Upper and Lower Campbell and John Hart Reservoirs and Elk Canyon Public Use and Perception Study – Year 2 Progress Report. Laik-Kwil Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership and EDI Environmental Dynamics Inc.

McFadden, D., (1974). Conditional Logit Analysis of Qualitative Choice Behaviour, in: Frontiers in Econometrics. Academic Press, New York.

R Core Team (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing (Version 4.1.2) [Computer Software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/

Raosoft (2016). Sample Size Calculator. Retrieved April 21, 2016, from http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html

Statistical Innovations (2023). Latent Gold (Version 5.0) [Computer Software]. https://www.statisticalinnovations.com/latent-gold-5-1/

Thacher, J., Marsee, M., Pitts, H., Hansen, J., Chermak, J., & Thomson, B. (2010). Assessing Customer Preferences and Willingness to Pay: A Handbook for Water Utilities, 1–339.

Train, K.E., (2009). Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation. Cambridge University Press.

Vaske, J. J. (2008). Survey research and analysis: Applications in parks, recreation and human dimensions. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Vermunt, J. K., & Magidson, J. (2005). Structural equation models: Mixture models. In B. Everitt & D. Howell (Eds.), Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science (pp. 1922-1927). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Willis, K., Scarpa, R., & Acutt, M. (2005). Assessing water company customer preferences and willingness to pay for service improvements: A stated choice analysis. Water Resources Research, 41(2), W02019.

This page is intentionally blank.

APPENDIX A. DISCRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENT DESIGN MATRIX

CAMPBELL RIVER DICRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENT DESIGN MATRIX

Appendix Table 1. Resulting combinations of features presented in 'river' choice experiment

Photo Number	Water Level*	River Flow	River substrate	Shoreline conditions	Wood Debris
1	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
2	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
3	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
4	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
5	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
6	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
7	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
8	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
9	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
10	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
11	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
12	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
13	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
14	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
15	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
16	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
17	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
18	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
19	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
20	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
21	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
22	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
23	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
24	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
25	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
26	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
27	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
28	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
29	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
30	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
31	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
32	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
33	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
34	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
35	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
36	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
37	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
38	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
39	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
40	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
41	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
42	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present

43	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
44	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
45	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
46	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
47	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
48	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
49	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
50	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
51	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
52	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
53	(2)Low (0.53-0.72 m)	(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
54	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
55	(4)High (0.93-1.13 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present
56	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
57	(1)Low Low (<0.53 m)	(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(2)Not Present
58	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(1)Present
59	(3)Average (0.72-0.93 m)	(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	(1)Natural substrate	(1)Exposed substrate	(2)Not Present
60	(5)High High (>1.13 m)	(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	(2)High boulder cover	(2)Vegetated	(1)Present

* Water level categories (Low low, Low, Average, High, High high) have been aligned with specific ranges of water elevations in Lower Campbell Reservoir. Elevation ranges were determined based on distributions of historic water elevation data for the reservoir. The corresponding water elevations for each category are described in Section 2.3.2.

APPENDIX B. SUMMARY TABLES OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

1. a) Are you a day visitor or overnight visitor?

Day or Overnight Visitor

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Day Visitor	835	258	188	270	135	42.0	25.0	33.9	41.3	30.8	45.5	26.1	35.4	43.1	31.2	45.5	26.1	35.4	43.1	31.2
	Overnight Visitor	1002	731	343	356	298	50.4	70.9	61.9	54.4	68.0	54.5	73.9	64.6	56.9	68.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	1837	989	531	626	433	92.5	95.9	95.8	95.7	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing	System	150	42	23	28	5	7.5	4.1	4.2	4.3	1.1										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

b) How many days are you spending in the Campbell River Reservoir System on this trip?

Descriptive Statistics

		True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of days in area	N	1837	989	531	653	438
	Minimum	1	1	1	0	0
	Maximum	248	90	21	31	190
	Mean	3.59	4.40	3.94	2.74	3.68
	Std. Deviation	10.036	5.198	3.415	3.012	9.451
	Variance	100.713	27.016	11.659	9.074	89.316
Valid N (listwise)	N	1837	989	531	653	438

2. If staying overnight in the Campbell River system area, what type of accommodation are you using?

$Q2Accommodation Frequencies

		Responses										Percent of Cases				
		N					Percent									
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Accommodation[a]	Tent	226	231	89	105	101	21.4%	29.2%	24.8%	25.4%	32.5%	22.7%	30.7%	25.9%	29.7%	33.9%
	Motorhome	130	141	54	40	36	12.3%	17.8%	15.0%	9.7%	11.6%	13.1%	18.8%	15.7%	11.3%	12.1%
	Trailer	292	182	132	158	95	27.7%	23.0%	36.8%	38.3%	30.5%	29.4%	24.2%	38.5%	44.6%	31.9%
	Camper	204	112	41	29	48	19.3%	14.2%	11.4%	7.0%	15.4%	20.5%	14.9%	12.0%	8.2%	16.1%
	Cabin	62	24	32	39	9	5.9%	3.0%	8.9%	9.4%	2.9%	6.2%	3.2%	9.3%	11.0%	3.0%
	Other	26	37	1		4	2.5%	4.7%	0.3%		1.3%	2.6%	4.9%	0.3%		1.3%
	Hotel	38	36	6	15	10	3.6%	4.6%	1.7%	3.6%	3.2%	3.8%	4.8%	1.7%	4.2%	3.4%
	Friend/Family	73	22	3	20	4	6.9%	2.8%	0.8%	4.8%	1.3%	7.3%	2.9%	0.9%	5.6%	1.3%
	Rental/BnB	4	5	1	7	4	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	1.7%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.3%	2.0%	1.3%
Total		1055	790	359	413	311	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	106.1%	105.1%	104.7%	116.7%	104.4%

a. Group

3. What activity was the most important for you in your decision to visit the Campbell River Reservoir system for this trip?

Most Important Activity

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Beach	26	8	10	26	8	1.3	.8	1.8	4.0	1.8	1.5	.8	1.9	4.2	1.9	1.5	.8	1.9	4.2	1.9
	Boat	37	12	4	3	12	1.9	1.2	.7	.5	2.7	2.1	1.2	.8	.5	2.8	3.6	2.0	2.7	4.6	4.6
	Camp	569	533	247	203	152	28.6	51.7	44.6	31.0	34.7	32.3	53.7	47.1	32.5	35.2	35.8	55.7	49.8	37.2	39.8
	Canoe	6	2	2	7	7	.3	.2	.4	1.1	1.6	.3	.2	.4	1.1	1.6	36.2	55.9	50.2	38.3	41.4
	Dam	9	10		2		.5	1.0		.3		.5	1.0		.3		36.7	57.0		38.6	
	Dog	174	42	49	23	15	8.8	4.1	8.8	3.5	3.4	9.9	4.2	9.4	3.7	3.5	46.5	61.2	59.5	42.3	44.9
	Falls	431	178	33	69	20	21.7	17.3	6.0	10.6	4.6	24.4	17.9	6.3	11.1	4.6	71.0	79.1	65.8	53.4	49.5
	Fish	80	28	29	20	36	4.0	2.7	5.2	3.1	8.2	4.5	2.8	5.5	3.2	8.3	75.5	82.0	71.4	56.6	57.9
	Hike	278	54	81	176	92	14.0	5.2	14.6	26.9	21.0	15.8	5.4	15.5	28.2	21.3	91.3	87.4	86.8	84.8	79.2
	Kayak	13	7	7	11	22	.7	.7	1.3	1.7	5.0	.7	.7	1.3	1.8	5.1	92.0	88.1	88.2	86.5	84.3
	Other	29	1	8	5	7	1.5	.1	1.4	.8	1.6	1.6	.1	1.5	.8	1.6	93.7	88.2	89.7	87.3	85.9
	Picnic	10	3	6	9	3	.5	.3	1.1	1.4	.7	.6	.3	1.1	1.4	.7	94.2	88.5	90.8	88.8	86.6
	Sailing		1		1			.1		.2			.1		.2			88.6		88.9	
	Sight-seeing		38	36	57	40		3.7	6.5	8.7	9.1		3.8	6.9	9.1	9.3		92.4	97.7	98.1	95.8
	Swim	81	63	12	9	9	4.1	6.1	2.2	1.4	2.1	4.6	6.4	2.3	1.4	2.1	98.8	98.8	100.0	99.5	97.9
	Waterski	6	2		2		.3	.2		.3		.3	.2		.3		99.1	99.0		99.8	
	Wildlife	14	9		1	8	.7	.9		.2	1.8	.8	.9		.2	1.9	99.9	99.9		100.0	99.8
	Windsurf	1	1			1	.1	.1			.2	.1	.1			.2	100.0	100.0			100.0
	Total	1764	992	524	624	432	88.8	96.2	94.6	95.4	98.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		223	39	30	30	6	11.2	3.8	5.4	4.6	1.4										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

Other Activities:

Q3OtherActiv

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid		1987	1031	546	649	431	100.0	100.0	98.6	99.2	98.4	100.0	100.0	98.6	99.2	98.4	100.0	100.0	98.6	99.2	98.4
	Biking			2					.4					.4					98.9		
	Cycling					1					.2					.2					98.6
	Exercise					1					.2					.2					98.9
	Family					1					.2					.2					99.1
	Jogging				1					.2					.2					99.4	
	Kayaking					1					.2					.2					99.3
	Park				2					.3					.3					99.7	
	Park and Bike				1					.2					.2					99.8	
	Relaxing			1					.2					.2					99.1		
	Volunteer Work					1					.2					.2					99.5
	Visiting			4		1			.7		.2			.7		.2			99.8		99.8
	Wedding			1	1				.2	.2				.2	.2				100.0	100.0	
	Zip line					1					.2					.2					100.0
	Total			554	654	438			100.0	100.0	100.0			100.0	100.0	100.0					

4. Which areas in the Campbell River system have you visited or anticipate visiting for recreational activities for recreational activities on this trip?

$Q4Areas Frequencies

		Responses														
		N					Percent					Percent of Cases				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Q4 - Areas Visited on Trip[a]	Elk Falls	914	327	126	288	169	31.3%	22.6%	18.6%	29.0%	23.1%	50.9%	33.5%	24.2%	47.5%	39.9%
	Campbell River	359	132	79	181	103	12.3%	9.1%	11.7%	18.2%	14.1%	20.0%	13.5%	15.2%	29.9%	24.3%
	Lower Campbell	341	238	105	89	63	11.7%	16.5%	15.5%	9.0%	8.6%	19.0%	24.4%	20.2%	14.7%	14.9%
	Upper Campbell	163	99	63	105	75	5.6%	6.8%	9.3%	10.6%	10.3%	9.1%	10.1%	12.1%	17.3%	17.7%
	Quinsam River	370	236	128	153	71	12.7%	16.3%	18.9%	15.4%	9.7%	20.6%	24.2%	24.6%	25.2%	16.7%
	Salmon River	69	25	5	5	15	2.4%	1.7%	0.7%	0.5%	2.1%	3.8%	2.6%	1.0%	0.8%	3.5%
	McIvor Lake	314	133	37	28	52	10.8%	9.2%	5.5%	2.8%	7.1%	17.5%	13.6%	7.1%	4.6%	12.3%
	Buttle Lake	358	246	130	128	157	12.3%	17.0%	19.2%	12.9%	21.5%	19.9%	25.2%	25.0%	21.1%	37.0%
	Other	31	10	5	17	26	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%	1.7%	3.6%	1.7%	1.0%	1.0%	2.8%	6.1%
Total		2919	1446	678	994	731	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	162.6%	148.2%	130.4%	164.0%	172.4%

a. Group

5. Have you recreated on the water or on the shore of any lakes/reservoirs in the Campbell River system during this trip?

Visited Lake on Trip (y/n)

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	No	924	493	254	382	282	46.5	47.8	45.8	58.4	64.4	56.4	52.2	47.4	59.5	65.6	56.4	52.2	47.4	59.5	65.6
	Yes	714	451	282	260	148	35.9	43.7	50.9	39.8	33.8	43.6	47.8	52.6	40.5	34.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	1638	944	536	642	430	82.4	91.6	96.8	98.2	98.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing	3	349	87	18	12	8	17.6	8.4	3.2	1.8	1.8										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

6. Which lake/reservoir did you recreate at most recently on this trip?

Lake Most Recently Visited

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Buttle Lake	213	161	103	85	75	10.7	15.6	18.6	13.0	17.1	29.2	34.4	36.9	32.6	51.0	29.2	34.4	36.9	32.6	51.0
	Lower Campbell	239	181	99	84	27	12.0	17.6	17.9	12.8	6.2	32.8	38.7	35.5	32.2	18.4	62.0	73.1	72.4	64.8	69.4
	McIvor Lake	224	88	34	8	12	11.3	8.5	6.1	1.2	2.7	30.7	18.8	12.2	3.1	8.2	92.7	91.9	84.6	67.8	77.6
	Other	8	2	6	9	10	.4	.2	1.1	1.4	2.3	1.1	.4	2.2	3.4	6.8	93.8	92.3	86.7	71.3	84.4
	Upper Campbell	45	36	37	75	23	2.3	3.5	6.7	11.5	5.3	6.2	7.7	13.3	28.7	15.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	729	468	279	261	147	36.7	45.4	50.4	39.9	33.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
	Missing	1258	563		393	291	63.3	54.6		60.1	66.4										
	System			275					49.6												
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

7. When was your most recent visit to this lake/reservoir?

When Visited Lake

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Today	550	354	208	178	85	27.7	34.3	37.5	27.2	19.4	76.3	76.3	74.6	69.8	57.8	81.3	83.6	80.3	72.5	67.3
	Yesterday	105	57	44	64	44	5.3	5.5	7.9	9.8	10.0	14.6	12.3	15.8	25.1	29.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Two days ago	30	19	11	6	4	1.5	1.8	2.0	.9	.9	4.2	4.1	3.9	2.4	2.7	85.4	87.7	84.2	74.9	70.1
	Other	36	34	16	7	14	1.8	3.3	2.9	1.1	3.2	5.0	7.3	5.7	2.7	9.5	5.0	7.3	5.7	2.7	9.5
	Total	721	464	279	255	147	36.3	45.0	50.4	39.0	33.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1266	567		399	291	63.7	55.0		61.0	66.4										
	System			275					49.6												
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

8. During your most recent visit to this lake/reservoir, what activities did you participate in?

$Q8LakeActivities Frequencies

		Responses														
		N					Percent					Percent of Cases				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Q8 Lake Activities[a]	Camping	432	342	163	138	54	17.4%	17.9%	20.3%	14.4%	14.3%	58.4%	71.8%	59.9%	56.3%	39.1%
	Windsurfing	4	5	1	1		0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%		0.5%	1.1%	0.4%	0.4%	
	Waterskiing	19	19	3	1		0.8%	1.0%	0.4%	0.1%		2.6%	4.0%	1.1%	0.4%	
	Swimming	313	275	53	23	33	12.6%	14.4%	6.6%	2.4%	8.7%	42.3%	57.8%	19.5%	9.4%	23.9%
	Beach activities	259	204	59	134	34	10.4%	10.7%	7.4%	14.0%	9.0%	35.0%	42.9%	21.7%	54.7%	24.6%
	Viewing falls	110	70	10	4	9	4.4%	3.7%	1.2%	0.4%	2.4%	14.9%	14.7%	3.7%	1.6%	6.5%
	Power boating	97	88	31	24	5	3.9%	4.6%	3.9%	2.5%	1.3%	13.1%	18.5%	11.4%	9.8%	3.6%
	Fishing	174	142	86	72	27	7.0%	7.4%	10.7%	7.5%	7.1%	23.5%	29.8%	31.6%	29.4%	19.6%
	Kayaking	121	124	68	103	33	4.9%	6.5%	8.5%	10.8%	8.7%	16.4%	26.1%	25.0%	42.0%	23.9%
	Picnicking	97	89	62	26	22	3.9%	4.6%	7.7%	2.7%	5.8%	13.1%	18.7%	22.8%	10.6%	15.9%
	Dog walking	258	141	67	53	25	10.4%	7.4%	8.4%	5.5%	6.6%	34.9%	29.6%	24.6%	21.6%	18.1%
	Viewing dam	64	40		2	3	2.6%	2.1%		0.2%	0.8%	8.6%	8.4%		0.8%	2.2%
	Canoeing	50	44	11	42	7	2.0%	2.3%	1.4%	4.4%	1.9%	6.8%	9.2%	4.0%	17.1%	5.1%
	Hiking/Walking	305	209	88	151	62	12.3%	10.9%	11.0%	15.8%	16.4%	41.2%	43.9%	32.4%	61.6%	44.9%
	Wildlife Viewing	137	96	21	6	5	5.5%	5.0%	2.6%	0.6%	1.3%	18.5%	20.2%	7.7%	2.4%	3.6%
	Sailing	1	5		2		0.0%	0.3%		0.2%		0.1%	1.1%		0.8%	
	Other	16	5	4	4	1	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.6%	0.7%
	Sightseeing (general)	1		43	115	27	0.0%		5.4%	12.0%	7.1%	0.1%		15.8%	46.9%	19.6%
	SUP	5	6	9	22	13	0.2%	0.3%	1.1%	2.3%	3.4%	0.7%	1.3%	3.3%	9.0%	9.4%
	ATV	7	5	3	5	5	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	1.3%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	2.0%	3.6%

Biking	13	5	19	30	13	0.5%	0.3%	2.4%	3.1%	3.4%	1.8%	1.1%	7.0%	12.2%	9.4%
Total	2483	1914	801	958	378	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	335.5%	402.1%	294.5%	391.0%	273.9%

a. Group

9. Based on your most recent activities at the lake/reservoir, how did water levels influence your recreation experience?

Influence of Lake Level

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Positive	186	163	89	30	45	9.4	15.8	16.1	4.6	10.3	25.2	34.4	35.0	13.2	33.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Positive	170	127	73	13	30	8.6	12.3	13.2	2.0	6.8	23.1	26.8	28.7	5.7	22.2	74.8	65.6	65.0	86.8	66.7
	No influence	231	136	68	142	46	11.6	13.2	12.3	21.7	10.5	31.3	28.7	26.8	62.3	34.1	51.7	38.8	36.2	81.1	44.4
	Somewhat Negative	87	44	19	38	7	4.4	4.3	3.4	5.8	1.6	11.8	9.3	7.5	16.7	5.2	20.4	10.1	9.4	18.9	10.4
	Very Negative	63	4	5	5	7	3.2	.4	.9	.8	1.6	8.5	.8	2.0	2.2	5.2	8.5	.8	2.0	2.2	5.2
	Total	737	474	254	228	135	37.1	46.0	45.8	34.9	30.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing	System	1250	557	300	426	303	62.9	54.0	54.2	65.1	69.2										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

10. Thinking of the lake/reservoir that you recreated at most recently, were there any water-based or shore-based activities that you were going to participate in that you were unable to do specifically because of the water level?

Any activities unable to do (y/n)

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	No	651	446	251	218	122	32.8	43.3	45.3	33.3	27.9	84.8	94.3	96.9	94.0	94.6	84.8	94.3	96.9	94.0	94.6
	Yes	117	27	8	14	7	5.9	2.6	1.4	2.1	1.6	15.2	5.7	3.1	6.0	5.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	768	473	259	232	129	38.7	45.9	46.8	35.5	29.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing	System	1219	558	295	422	309	61.3	54.1	53.2	64.5	70.5										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

11. Based on your most recent activities at the lake/reservoir, how satisfied were you with the shoreline conditions while engaged in water-based recreation?

Lakeshore Satisfaction

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Satisfied	293	202	80	74	51	14.7	19.6	14.4	11.3	11.6	40.1	42.5	30.9	32.2	37.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Satisfied	203	166	83	51	40	10.2	16.1	15.0	7.8	9.1	27.8	34.9	32.0	22.2	29.4	59.9	57.5	69.1	67.8	62.5
	Neither	118	70	78	67	27	5.9	6.8	14.1	10.2	6.2	16.1	14.7	30.1	29.1	19.9	32.1	22.5	37.1	45.7	33.1
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	71	34	15	33	12	3.6	3.3	2.7	5.0	2.7	9.7	7.2	5.8	14.3	8.8	16.0	7.8	6.9	16.5	13.2
	Very Dissatisfied	46	3	3	5	6	2.3	.3	.5	.8	1.4	6.3	.6	1.2	2.2	4.4	6.3	.6	1.2	2.2	4.4
	Total	731	475	259	230	136	36.8	46.1	46.8	35.2	31.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1256	556	295	424	302	63.2	53.9	53.2	64.8	68.9										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

12. Based on your most recent activities at the lake/reservoir, how safe did you feel engaging in water-based recreation given water levels at that time?

Lake Safety Perception

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Safe	403	261	103	134	66	20.3	25.3	18.6	20.5	15.1	54.5	55.1	40.2	58.0	49.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Safe	169	140	80	44	42	8.5	13.6	14.4	6.7	9.6	22.9	29.5	31.3	19.0	31.3	45.5	44.9	59.8	42.0	50.7
	Neither	103	47	61	39	21	5.2	4.6	11.0	6.0	4.8	13.9	9.9	23.8	16.9	15.7	22.6	15.4	28.5	22.9	19.4
	Somewhat Unsafe	50	25	10	7	4	2.5	2.4	1.8	1.1	.9	6.8	5.3	3.9	3.0	3.0	8.7	5.5	4.7	6.1	3.7
	Very Unsafe	14	1	2	7	1	.7	.1	.4	1.1	.2	1.9	.2	.8	3.0	.7	1.9	.2	.8	3.0	.7
	Total	739	474	256	231	134	37.2	46.0	46.2	35.3	30.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing	System	1248	557	298	423	304	62.8	54.0	53.8	64.7	69.4										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

13. What conditions, if any, did you encounter during your time recreating at the lake/reservoir that posed a safety concern to you?

$Q13_Hazards Frequencies

		Responses														
		N					Percent					Percent of Cases				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Q13 Safety Concerns[a]	Floating Debris	74	23	5	3	1	7.8%	4.1%	1.7%	1.0%	0.7%	10.2%	5.0%	1.9%	1.4%	0.8%
	Visible Stumps	172	92	56	73	26	18.2%	16.4%	19.1%	23.8%	17.4%	23.7%	19.9%	21.5%	32.9%	20.0%
	Hidden Stumps	199	128	30	72	33	21.1%	22.9%	10.2%	23.5%	22.1%	27.4%	27.7%	11.5%	32.4%	25.4%
	Boat Launch Conditions	56	10	6	21	1	5.9%	1.8%	2.0%	6.8%	0.7%	7.7%	2.2%	2.3%	9.5%	0.8%
	Other	45	18	11	6	7	4.8%	3.2%	3.8%	2.0%	4.7%	6.2%	3.9%	4.2%	2.7%	5.4%

	No Safety Concerns	398	289	185	132	81	42.2%	51.6%	63.1%	43.0%	54.4%	54.7%	62.6%	70.9%	59.5%	62.3%
Total		944	560	293	307	149	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	129.8%	121.2%	112.3%	138.3%	114.6%

a. Group

Other safety concerns mentioned for lakes/reservoirs (cumulative across all study years):

Other Safety Concerns

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		4577	98.1	98.1	98.1
	Aquatic vegetation	2	.0	.0	98.2
	Broken fence on ridge	1	.0	.0	98.2
	Broken glass on beach	3	.1	.1	98.3
	Broken glass/garbage	11	.2	.2	98.5
	Chains at end of dock	5	.1	.1	98.6
	Corroding shoreline	1	.0	.0	98.6
	Cut trees	1	.0	.0	98.6
	Dead fish	1	.0	.0	98.7
	Debris	1	.0	.0	98.7
	Dogs	2	.0	.0	98.7
	Fuel floating on surfa	1	.0	.0	98.8
	Hazard tree	1	.0	.0	98.8
	Low levels	1	.0	.0	98.8
	Low water level	1	.0	.0	98.8
	Massive outflow	1	.0	.0	98.8
	More parking	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Mud	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Muddy bottom	14	.3	.3	99.2

	Mushy bottom	1	.0	.0	99.2
	No beach	2	.0	.0	99.2
	No dogs at the beach	1	.0	.0	99.3
	Other visitors	1	.0	.0	99.3
	Rocks	1	.0	.0	99.3
	Slippery conditions	4	.1	.1	99.4
	Steep shoreline	2	.0	.0	99.4
	Strong current	2	.0	.0	99.5
	Swimmers itch	5	.1	.1	99.6
	Swimmers itch and smell	1	.0	.0	99.6
	Too many dams	1	.0	.0	99.6
	Trail conditions	2	.0	.0	99.7
	Unsafe boating/jet ski	5	.1	.1	99.8
	Wildlife	3	.1	.1	99.8
	Winds	2	.0	.0	99.9
	Wood debris on beach	5	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

14. Given the water levels at the time, how satisfied were you during your most recent activities at the reservoir with access to…:

a) the beach?

Satisfaction with Access to Beach

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Satisfied	333	210	89	90	75	16.8	20.4	16.1	13.8	17.1	46.3	45.5	34.4	40.7	56.4	92.8	92.0	91.5	97.3	94.0
	Somewhat Satisfied	162	132	68	50	28	8.2	12.8	12.3	7.6	6.4	22.5	28.6	26.3	22.6	21.1	46.5	46.5	57.1	56.6	37.6
	Neither	59	43	32	37	9	3.0	4.2	5.8	5.7	2.1	8.2	9.3	12.4	16.7	6.8	23.9	18.0	30.9	33.9	16.5
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	53	28	34	30	7	2.7	2.7	6.1	4.6	1.6	7.4	6.1	13.1	13.6	5.3	15.7	8.7	18.5	17.2	9.8
	Very Dissatisfied	60	12	14	8	6	3.0	1.2	2.5	1.2	1.4	8.3	2.6	5.4	3.6	4.5	8.3	2.6	5.4	3.6	4.5
	Not Applicable	52	37	22	6	8	2.6	3.6	4.0	.9	1.8	7.2	8.0	8.5	2.7	6.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	719	462	259	221	133	36.2	44.8	46.8	33.8	30.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1268	569	295	433	305	63.8	55.2	53.2	66.2	69.6										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

b) the water via a boat launch?

Satisfaction with Launch Access

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Satisfied	151	115	47	18	32	7.6	11.2	8.5	2.8	7.3	21.6	28.0	18.9	8.9	25.2	62.1	67.6	68.7	36.9	56.7
	Somewhat Satisfied	111	76	46	13	19	5.6	7.4	8.3	2.0	4.3	15.9	18.5	18.5	6.4	15.0	40.6	39.5	49.8	28.1	31.5
	Neither	72	65	42	19	10	3.6	6.3	7.6	2.9	2.3	10.3	15.9	16.9	9.4	7.9	24.7	21.0	31.3	21.7	16.5
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	42	15	25	13	8	2.1	1.5	4.5	2.0	1.8	6.0	3.7	10.0	6.4	6.3	14.4	5.1	14.5	12.3	8.7

	Very Dissatisfied	59	6	11	12	3	3.0	.6	2.0	1.8	.7	8.4	1.5	4.4	5.9	2.4	8.4	1.5	4.4	5.9	2.4
	Not Applicable	265	133	78	128	55	13.3	12.9	14.1	19.6	12.6	37.9	32.4	31.3	63.1	43.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	700	410	249	203	127	35.2	39.8	44.9	31.0	29.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing	System	1287	621	305	451	311	64.8	60.2	55.1	69.0	71.0										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

c) the water via the shoreline?

Satisfaction with Shoreline Access

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Satisfied	264	182	81	77	70	13.3	17.7	14.6	11.8	16.0	37.2	41.2	31.9	36.5	53.4	86.3	90.7	94.1	98.1	94.7
	Somewhat Satisfied	151	125	64	39	26	7.6	12.1	11.6	6.0	5.9	21.3	28.3	25.2	18.5	19.8	49.1	49.5	62.2	61.6	41.2
	Neither	72	55	45	49	12	3.6	5.3	8.1	7.5	2.7	10.2	12.4	17.7	23.2	9.2	27.8	21.3	37.0	43.1	21.4
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	58	31	30	27	9	2.9	3.0	5.4	4.1	2.1	8.2	7.0	11.8	12.8	6.9	17.6	8.8	19.3	19.9	12.2
	Very Dissatisfied	67	8	19	15	7	3.4	.8	3.4	2.3	1.6	9.4	1.8	7.5	7.1	5.3	9.4	1.8	7.5	7.1	5.3
	Not Applicable	97	41	15	4	7	4.9	4.0	2.7	.6	1.6	13.7	9.3	5.9	1.9	5.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	709	442	254	211	131	35.7	42.9	45.8	32.3	29.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1278	589	300	443	307	64.3	57.1	54.2	67.7	70.1										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

15. NOTE: Questions 15-20 in the survey are associated with the Discrete Choice Experiment and are summarized in the body of the report.

21. Have you visited Elk Falls during this trip?

Recreate at Falls

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	No	837	576	357	364	274	42.1	55.9	64.4	55.7	62.6	47.7	63.7	66.5	56.8	63.3	47.7	63.7	66.5	56.8	63.3
	Yes	919	328	180	277	159	46.3	31.8	32.5	42.4	36.3	52.3	36.3	33.5	43.2	36.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	1756	904	537	641	433	88.4	87.7	96.9	98.0	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		231	127	17	13		11.6	12.3	3.1	2.0											
	System					5					1.1										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

22. When was your most recent visit to Elk Falls?

When Visited Falls

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Today	815	261	116	214	98	41.0	25.3	20.9	32.7	22.4	89.3	80.8	64.4	77.3	61.3	92.0	84.5	72.2	82.7	70.6
	Yesterday	46	33	34	30	33	2.3	3.2	6.1	4.6	7.5	5.0	10.2	18.9	10.8	20.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Two days ago	27	17	16	18	14	1.4	1.6	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.0	5.3	8.9	6.5	8.8	95.0	89.8	81.1	89.2	79.4
	Other	25	12	14	15	15	1.3	1.2	2.5	2.3	3.4	2.7	3.7	7.8	5.4	9.4	2.7	3.7	7.8	5.4	9.4
	Total	913	323	180	277	160	45.9	31.3	32.5	42.4	36.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1074	708	374	377	278	54.1	68.7	67.5	57.6	63.5										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

23. Just based on water flows you observed at the falls on your most recent visit, how impressive would you rate Elk Falls?

Impression of Falls

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Impressive	585	208	138	204	77	29.4	20.2	24.9	31.2	17.6	63.7	61.0	78.0	75.6	49.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Impressive	289	117	25	43	58	14.5	11.3	4.5	6.6	13.2	31.4	34.3	14.1	15.9	37.2	36.3	39.0	22.0	24.4	50.6
	Neither	35	9	11	10	12	1.8	.9	2.0	1.5	2.7	3.8	2.6	6.2	3.7	7.7	4.9	4.7	7.9	8.5	13.5
	Somewhat Unimpressive	7	5	2	3	6	.4	.5	.4	.5	1.4	.8	1.5	1.1	1.1	3.8	1.1	2.1	1.7	4.8	5.8
	Very Unimpressive	3	2	1	10	3	.2	.2	.2	1.5	.7	.3	.6	.6	3.7	1.9	.3	.6	.6	3.7	1.9
	Total	919	341	177	270	156	46.3	33.1	31.9	41.3	35.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1068	690	377	384	282	53.7	66.9	68.1	58.7	64.4										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

24. How satisfied were you with your viewing experience of Elk Falls?

Satisfaction with Falls

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Satisfied	754	275	138	223	107	37.9	26.7	24.9	34.1	24.4	82.1	80.9	77.5	83.5	68.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Satisfied	139	56	28	26	43	7.0	5.4	5.1	4.0	9.8	15.1	16.5	15.7	9.7	27.4	17.9	19.1	22.5	16.5	31.8
	Neither	17	6	8	11	3	.9	.6	1.4	1.7	.7	1.9	1.8	4.5	4.1	1.9	2.7	2.6	6.7	6.7	4.5
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	6	1	3	3	3	.3	.1	.5	.5	.7	.7	.3	1.7	1.1	1.9	.9	.9	2.2	2.6	2.5
	Very Dissatisfied	2	2	1	4	1	.1	.2	.2	.6	.2	.2	.6	.6	1.5	.6	.2	.6	.6	1.5	.6
	Total	918	340	178	267	157	46.2	33.0	32.1	40.8	35.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					

Missing	1069	691	376	387	281	53.8	67.0	67.9	59.2	64.2										
Total	1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

25. Have you recreated on the water or on the shore of any rivers in the Campbell River system during this trip?

Recreate at River

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	N	1233	721	390	475	367	62.1	69.9	70.4	72.6	83.8	77.5	81.1	73.9	73.9	85.0	77.5	81.1	73.9	73.9	85.0
	Y	358	168	138	168	65	18.0	16.3	24.9	25.7	14.8	22.5	18.9	26.1	26.1	15.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	1591	889	528	643	432	80.1	86.2	95.3	98.3	98.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		396	142	26	11		19.9	13.8	4.7	1.7											
	System					6					1.4										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

26. Which river did you recreate at most recently on this trip?

$Q26RiverLocation Frequencies

		Responses										Percent of Cases				
		N					Percent									
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Q26 River Location[a]	Quinsam River	224	133	88	73	27	58.8%	72.3%	63.8%	44.0%	42.2%	62.6%	76.0%	63.8%	44.0%	42.2%
	Campbell River	137	42	47	85	20	36.0%	22.8%	34.1%	51.2%	31.3%	38.3%	24.0%	34.1%	51.2%	31.3%
	Salmon River	5	3		1		1.3%	1.6%		0.6%		1.4%	1.7%		0.6%	
	Other	15	6	3	7	17	3.9%	3.3%	2.2%	4.2%	26.6%	4.2%	3.4%	2.2%	4.2%	26.6%
Total		381	184	138	166	64	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	106.4%	105.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

a. Group

Other rivers (cumulative across all study years):

Other river name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		4620	99.1	99.1	99.1
	Cervus Creek	1	.0	.0	99.1
	Dolphin pool	1	.0	.0	99.1
	Elk River	9	.2	.2	99.3
	Myra Creek	2	.0	.0	99.4
	Oyster River	3	.1	.1	99.5
	Ralph River	22	.5	.5	100.0
	Shepherds Creek	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Wolf River	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

27. When was your most recent visit to this river?

When Visited River

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Today	244	134	111	126	32	12.3	13.0	20.0	19.3	7.3	70.3	80.2	81.6	78.3	51.6	76.9	86.8	87.5	78.3	62.9
	Yesterday	52	13	16	29	13	2.6	1.3	2.9	4.4	3.0	15.0	7.8	11.8	18.0	21.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Two days ago	28	9	1	6	10	1.4	.9	.2	.9	2.3	8.1	5.4	.7	3.7	16.1	85.0	92.2	88.2	82.0	79.0
	Other	23	11	8		7	1.2	1.1	1.4		1.6	6.6	6.6	5.9		11.3	6.6	6.6	5.9		11.3
	Total	347	167	136	161	62	17.5	16.2	24.5	24.6	14.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1640	864	418	493	376	82.5	83.8	75.5	75.4	85.8										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

28. During your most recent visit to this river, what activities did you participate in?

$Q28RiverActivities Frequencies

		Responses										Percent of Cases				
		N					Percent									
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Q28 River Activities[a]	Camping	121	103	35	41	8	16.7%	24.3%	13.2%	10.4%	7.8%	33.8%	58.5%	26.9%	26.1%	13.1%
	Fishing	89	67	53	46	19	12.3%	15.8%	19.9%	11.6%	18.4%	24.9%	38.1%	40.8%	29.3%	31.1%
	Swimming	24	17	5	7	5	3.3%	4.0%	1.9%	1.8%	4.9%	6.7%	9.7%	3.8%	4.5%	8.2%
	Beach activities	26	18	3	5	6	3.6%	4.2%	1.1%	1.3%	5.8%	7.3%	10.2%	2.3%	3.2%	9.8%
	Boating	5	2	1			0.7%	0.5%	0.4%			1.4%	1.1%	0.8%		
	Hiking/Walking	155	76	68	126	31	21.4%	17.9%	25.6%	31.9%	30.1%	43.3%	43.2%	52.3%	80.3%	50.8%
	Picnicking	31	22	12	21	1	4.3%	5.2%	4.5%	5.3%	1.0%	8.7%	12.5%	9.2%	13.4%	1.6%
	Dog walking	90	47	35	28	7	12.4%	11.1%	13.2%	7.1%	6.8%	25.1%	26.7%	26.9%	17.8%	11.5%
	Canoeing	6	1	1	1	1	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	1.6%
	Kayaking	5	6	2	4	2	0.7%	1.4%	0.8%	1.0%	1.9%	1.4%	3.4%	1.5%	2.5%	3.3%
	Wildlife Viewing	73	22	16	46	7	10.1%	5.2%	6.0%	11.6%	6.8%	20.4%	12.5%	12.3%	29.3%	11.5%
	Sightseeing	86	41	33	66	15	11.9%	9.7%	12.4%	16.7%	14.6%	24.0%	23.3%	25.4%	42.0%	24.6%
	Other	13	2	2	4	1	1.8%	0.5%	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	3.6%	1.1%	1.5%	2.5%	1.6%
Total		724	424	266	395	103	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	202.2%	240.9%	204.6%	251.6%	168.9%

a. Group

Other activities respondents reported participating in (cumulative across all study years):

Q28RiverOtherName

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		4644	99.6	99.6	99.6
	Biking	4	.1	.1	99.7
	Exploring	1	.0	.0	99.7
	Geocaching	1	.0	.0	99.7
	Goldpanning	1	.0	.0	99.7
	Photography	4	.1	.1	99.8
	Play in water	1	.0	.0	99.8
	Play with kids	3	.1	.1	99.9
	Running	1	.0	.0	99.9
	Snorkelling	1	.0	.0	99.9
	Tubing	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Work	2	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

29. Thinking of the river that you recreated at most recently, were there any water-based activities that you were going to participate in that you were unable to do specifically because of the river-flow conditions?

River Activities Unable to Do

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	No	354	164	126	147	53	17.8	15.9	22.7	22.5	12.1	93.9	98.2	96.9	95.5	89.8	93.9	98.2	96.9	95.5	89.8
	Yes	23	3	4	7	6	1.2	.3	.7	1.1	1.4	6.1	1.8	3.1	4.5	10.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	377	167	130	154	59	19.0	16.2	23.5	23.5	13.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					

Missing	1610	864	424	500	379	81.0	83.8	76.5	76.5	86.5										
Total	1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

Activities identified that respondents were unable to do because of the river flow conditions (cumulative across all study years):

Q29RiverActUnableList

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		4628	99.2	99.2	99.2
	Boating	1	.0	.0	99.2
	Camping	1	.0	.0	99.3
	Canoeing	2	.0	.0	99.3
	Cliff jumping	1	.0	.0	99.4
	Fishing	11	.2	.2	99.6
	Handicap access	1	.0	.0	99.6
	Hiking/Walking	3	.1	.1	99.7
	Low water	2	.0	.0	99.7
	Rapids	1	.0	.0	99.7
	Swimming	6	.1	.1	99.9
	Tubing	6	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

30. Based on your most recent activities at the river, how did water flows influence your recreation experience?

River Flow Influence

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Positive	90	66	66	30	11	4.5	6.4	11.9	4.6	2.5	25.7	36.9	51.2	20.0	19.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Positive	91	68	28	19	15	4.6	6.6	5.1	2.9	3.4	26.0	38.0	21.7	12.7	25.9	74.3	63.1	48.8	80.0	81.0
	No influence	143	39	32	98	29	7.2	3.8	5.8	15.0	6.6	40.9	21.8	24.8	65.3	50.0	48.3	25.1	27.1	67.3	55.2
	Somewhat Negative	21	6	3	3	2	1.1	.6	.5	.5	.5	6.0	3.4	2.3	2.0	3.4	7.4	3.4	2.3	2.0	5.2
	Very Negative	5				1	.3				.2	1.4				1.7	1.4				1.7
	Total	350	179	129	150	58	17.6	17.4	23.3	22.9	13.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1637	852	425	504	380	82.4	82.6	76.7	77.1	86.8										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

31. Based on your most recent activities at the river, how satisfied were you with the shoreline conditions while engaged in water-based recreation?

River Shoreline Condition

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Satisfied	134	84	65	60	21	6.7	8.1	11.7	9.2	4.8	38.6	46.9	51.2	39.7	36.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Satisfied	110	60	25	43	19	5.5	5.8	4.5	6.6	4.3	31.7	33.5	19.7	28.5	33.3	61.4	53.1	48.8	60.3	63.2
	Neither	79	28	32	45	12	4.0	2.7	5.8	6.9	2.7	22.8	15.6	25.2	29.8	21.1	29.7	19.6	29.1	31.8	29.8
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	20	7	5	2	4	1.0	.7	.9	.3	.9	5.8	3.9	3.9	1.3	7.0	6.9	3.9	3.9	2.0	8.8
	Very Dissatisfied	4			1	1	.2			.2	.2	1.2			.7	1.8	1.2			.7	1.8
	Total	347	179	127	151	57	17.5	17.4	22.9	23.1	13.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1640	852	427	503	381	82.5	82.6	77.1	76.9	87.0										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

32. Based on your most recent activities at the river, how safe did you feel engaging in water-based recreation given the current water flow?

River Safety

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Very Safe	186	88	72	100	24	9.4	8.5	13.0	15.3	5.5	53.9	49.7	56.3	68.5	42.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Somewhat Safe	90	47	33	27	19	4.5	4.6	6.0	4.1	4.3	26.1	26.6	25.8	18.5	33.3	46.1	50.3	43.8	31.5	57.9
	Neither Safe nor Unsafe	50	37	19	18	11	2.5	3.6	3.4	2.8	2.5	14.5	20.9	14.8	12.3	19.3	20.0	23.7	18.0	13.0	24.6
	Somewhat Unsafe	13	4	4	1	3	.7	.4	.7	.2	.7	3.8	2.3	3.1	.7	5.3	5.5	2.8	3.1	.7	5.3
	Very Unsafe	6	1				.3	.1				1.7	.6				1.7	.6			
	Total	345	177	128	146	57	17.4	17.2	23.1	22.3	13.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					

Missing	1642	854	426	508	381	82.6	82.8	76.9	77.7	87.0										
Total	1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

33. What conditions, if any, did you encounter during your time recreating on the river that posed a safety concern to you?

$Q33RiverSafety Frequencies

		Responses														
		N					Percent					Percent of Cases				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Q33 River Safety[a]	High flows	73	6	9		5	19.6%	3.4%	6.9%		8.5%	22.7%	3.5%	7.0%		8.9%
	Floating debris	28	10	2	2	3	7.5%	5.7%	1.5%	1.4%	5.1%	8.7%	5.8%	1.6%	1.4%	5.4%
	Poor access conditions	53	4	5	6	5	14.2%	2.3%	3.8%	4.1%	8.5%	16.5%	2.3%	3.9%	4.2%	8.9%
	Exposed hazards	16	8	2		2	4.3%	4.6%	1.5%		3.4%	5.0%	4.6%	1.6%		3.6%
	Other	22	5		3	3	5.9%	2.9%		2.1%	5.1%	6.8%	2.9%		2.1%	5.4%
	None	181	142	113	134	41	48.5%	81.1%	86.3%	92.4%	69.5%	56.2%	82.1%	88.3%	93.7%	73.2%
Total		373	175	131	145	59	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	115.8%	101.2%	102.3%	101.4%	105.4%

a. Group

Other safety concerns mentioned for rivers (cumulative across all study years):

Other Safety Concerns

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid			4631	99.3	99.3	99.3
	Bears	Bear scat	1	.0	.0	99.3
		Bears	2	.0	.0	99.4
	Boat launch		1	.0	.0	99.4
	Dam obstructing historic flows		1	.0	.0	99.4

	Danger trees near the trails	1	.0	.0	99.4
	Erosion of trails and banks	5	.1	.1	99.5
	High flows	1	.0	.0	99.5
	Lack of pedestrian bridge	1	.0	.0	99.6
	Low flows	4	.1	.1	99.7
	Massive waterfall	1	.0	.0	99.7
	Muddy shore/bank	6	.1	.1	99.8
	Slippery rocks	1	.0	.0	99.8
	Swimming	1	.0	.0	99.8
	Traffic	1	.0	.0	99.9
	Poor trail accessibility	1	.0	.0	99.9
	Turbid water	1	.0	.0	99.9
	Woody debris	4	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

34. Is this your first visit to the Campbell River system?

First Time Visiting

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	No	1130	522	369	397	290	56.9	50.6	66.6	60.7	66.2	69.0	57.8	69.1	61.7	67.4	69.0	57.8	69.1	61.7	67.4
	Yes	508	381	165	246	140	25.6	37.0	29.8	37.6	32.0	31.0	42.2	30.9	38.3	32.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	1638	903	534	643	430	82.4	87.6	96.4	98.3	98.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		349	128	20			17.6	12.4	3.6												
	System				11	8				1.7	1.8										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

35. On average, how many days per season do you typically visit the Campbell River system?

a) Spring

Spring Visitation

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Never	151	59	33	36	39	7.6	5.7	6.0	5.5	8.9	14.3	13.4	9.2	9.4	14.9	89.8	86.8	89.1	94.2	82.4
	Less than once	37	12	4	2	11	1.9	1.2	.7	.3	2.5	3.5	2.7	1.1	.5	4.2	75.5	73.4	79.9	84.8	67.4
	Once	108	58	39	22	46	5.4	5.6	7.0	3.4	10.5	10.2	13.2	10.9	5.8	17.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	2-3 days	196	74	80	79	81	9.9	7.2	14.4	12.1	18.5	18.5	16.8	22.3	20.7	31.0	18.5	16.8	22.3	20.7	31.0
	4 days plus	567	237	202	242	84	28.5	23.0	36.5	37.0	19.2	53.5	53.9	56.4	63.5	32.2	72.0	70.7	78.8	84.3	63.2
	Total	1059	440	358	381	261	53.3	42.7	64.6	58.3	59.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		71					3.6														
	System	857	591	196	273	177	43.1	57.3	35.4	41.7	40.4										
	Total	928					46.7														
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

b) Summer

Summer Visitation

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Never	33	9	6	11	4	1.7	.9	1.1	1.7	.9	3.1	1.9	1.7	2.8	1.4	91.7	93.2	96.7	96.9	92.5
	Less than once	35	3	6	5	4	1.8	.3	1.1	.8	.9	3.3	.6	1.7	1.3	1.4	88.6	91.4	95.0	94.1	91.1
	Once	88	33	12	12	21	4.4	3.2	2.2	1.8	4.8	8.3	6.8	3.3	3.1	7.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2-3 days	128	68	46	50	92	6.4	6.6	8.3	7.6	21.0	12.0	14.0	12.7	12.9	32.9	12.0	14.0	12.7	12.9	32.9
	4 days plus	779	373	291	309	159	39.2	36.2	52.5	47.2	36.3	73.3	76.7	80.6	79.8	56.8	85.3	90.7	93.4	92.8	89.6
	Total	1063	486	361	387	280	53.5	47.1	65.2	59.2	63.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		67					3.4														
	System	857	545	193	267	158	43.1	52.9	34.8	40.8	36.1										
	Total	924					46.5														
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

c) Winter

Winter Visitation

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Never	317	181	189	130	103	16.0	17.6	34.1	19.9	23.5	31.0	44.9	53.4	39.4	45.2	88.2	88.3	89.5	88.5	87.3
	Less than once	74	25	22	31	16	3.7	2.4	4.0	4.7	3.7	7.2	6.2	6.2	9.4	7.0	57.2	43.4	36.2	49.1	42.1
	Once	121	47	37	38	29	6.1	4.6	6.7	5.8	6.6	11.8	11.7	10.5	11.5	12.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	2-3 days	135	27	41	43	31	6.8	2.6	7.4	6.6	7.1	13.2	6.7	11.6	13.0	13.6	13.2	6.7	11.6	13.0	13.6
	4 days plus	377	123	65	88	49	19.0	11.9	11.7	13.5	11.2	36.8	30.5	18.4	26.7	21.5	50.0	37.2	29.9	39.7	35.1
	Total	1024	403	354	330	228	51.5	39.1	63.9	50.5	52.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		106					5.3														
	System	857	628	200	324	210	43.1	60.9	36.1	49.5	47.9										
	Total	963					48.5														
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

d) Fall

Fall Visitation

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Never	204	134	137	66	53	10.3	13.0	24.7	10.1	12.1	19.7	31.9	38.8	19.3	22.3	89.1	87.4	90.1	86.3	81.9
	Less than once	64	14	11	18	18	3.2	1.4	2.0	2.8	4.1	6.2	3.3	3.1	5.3	7.6	69.4	55.5	51.3	67.0	59.7
	Once	113	53	35	47	43	5.7	5.1	6.3	7.2	9.8	10.9	12.6	9.9	13.7	18.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	2-3 days	197	57	60	66	63	9.9	5.5	10.8	10.1	14.4	19.0	13.6	17.0	19.3	26.5	19.0	13.6	17.0	19.3	26.5
	4 days plus	458	162	110	145	61	23.0	15.7	19.9	22.2	13.9	44.2	38.6	31.2	42.4	25.6	63.2	52.1	48.2	61.7	52.1
	Total	1036	420	353	342	238	52.1	40.7	63.7	52.3	54.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		94					4.7														
	System	857	611	201	312	200	43.1	59.3	36.3	47.7	45.7										
	Total	951					47.9														
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

36. What is your gender?

Gender

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Female	358	416	314	321	217	18.0	40.3	56.7	49.1	49.5	42.6	45.9	60.9	50.5	50.9	42.6	45.9	60.9	50.5	50.9
	Male	483	490	202	315	209	24.3	47.5	36.5	48.2	47.7	57.4	54.1	39.1	49.5	49.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	841	906	516	636	426	42.3	87.9	93.1	97.2	97.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		1146	125	38			57.7	12.1	6.9												
	System				18	12				2.8	2.7										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

37. What is your current age?

Age

		Frequency					Percent					Valid Percent					Cumulative Percent				
		True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year					True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Valid	Under 25	189	91	41	22	8	9.5	8.8	7.4	3.4	1.8	11.0	10.1	7.9	3.4	1.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	25-34	233	107	91	97	77	11.7	10.4	16.4	14.8	17.6	13.5	11.9	17.6	15.2	17.9	13.5	11.9	17.6	15.2	17.9
	35-44	374	194	139	190	109	18.8	18.8	25.1	29.1	24.9	21.7	21.5	26.9	29.7	25.4	35.2	33.4	44.6	44.8	43.4
	45-54	318	164	95	137	106	16.0	15.9	17.1	20.9	24.2	18.5	18.2	18.4	21.4	24.7	53.7	51.6	63.0	66.3	68.1
	55-64	321	183	78	120	63	16.2	17.7	14.1	18.3	14.4	18.6	20.3	15.1	18.8	14.7	72.3	71.8	78.1	85.0	82.8
	64 plus	288	163	72	74	66	14.5	15.8	13.0	11.3	15.1	16.7	18.1	14.0	11.6	15.4	89.0	89.9	92.1	96.6	98.1
	Total	1723	902	516	640	429	86.7	87.5	93.1	97.9	97.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0					
Missing		264	129	38			13.3	12.5	6.9												
	System				14	9				2.1	2.1										
Total		1987	1031	554	654	438	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0										

38. How many people are in your party today?

Descriptive Statistics

		True Study Year				
		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Party Size	N	1688	849	505	628	412
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	38	48	24	60	14
	Mean	3.42	3.79	3.39	3.47	2.92
	Std. Deviation	2.911	3.224	2.462	4.055	1.800
	Variance	8.474	10.397	6.064	16.444	3.239
Valid N (listwise)	N	1688	849	505	628	412

39. Where do you currently reside (i.e., where you have lived for more than 6 months out of the past year) (cumulative across study years)?

a) City

b) Province/State

c) Country

a) City (cumulative across study years):

City (edited responses)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		676	14.5	14.5	14.5
	100 Mile House	3	.1	.1	14.6
	Aachen	1	.0	.0	14.6
	Aarau	1	.0	.0	14.6
	Abbotsford	5	.1	.1	14.7
	Adebude	1	.0	.0	14.7
	Adelaide	2	.0	.0	14.8
	Aerdenhout	1	.0	.0	14.8
	Agassiz	2	.0	.0	14.8
	Airdrie	2	.0	.0	14.9
	Aix-en Provence	1	.0	.0	14.9
	Alabama	1	.0	.0	14.9
	Aldergrove	1	.0	.0	14.9
	Alert Bay	6	.1	.1	15.1
	Amstelveen	1	.0	.0	15.1
	Amsterdam	1	.0	.0	15.1
	Andrew	1	.0	.0	15.1
	Arbury	1	.0	.0	15.2
	Arkansas	1	.0	.0	15.2
	Arnhem	2	.0	.0	15.2
	Ashcroft	1	.0	.0	15.2
	Asheville	1	.0	.0	15.3
	Atlanta	1	.0	.0	15.3
	Augsburg	1	.0	.0	15.3
	Austin	1	.0	.0	15.3
	Baden-bad	1	.0	.0	15.4
	Bahamas	1	.0	.0	15.4
	Balmertown	1	.0	.0	15.4
	Banff	3	.1	.1	15.5
	Barcelona	1	.0	.0	15.5
	Barendrecht	1	.0	.0	15.5
	Barry	1	.0	.0	15.5
	Basel	1	.0	.0	15.5
	Bavaria	1	.0	.0	15.6
	Beaver Dam	2	.0	.0	15.6
	Bedford	1	.0	.0	15.6
	Bella Bella	1	.0	.0	15.7
	Bellevue	2	.0	.0	15.7
	Bellingham	3	.1	.1	15.8
	Berkeley	2	.0	.0	15.8
	Berlin	1	.0	.0	15.8
	Bern	1	.0	.0	15.8
	Biddinghuizen	1	.0	.0	15.9
	Billercay	1	.0	.0	15.9
	Black creek	1	.0	.0	15.9
	Black Creek	29	.6	.6	16.5
	Blaine	2	.0	.0	16.6
	Bowser	6	.1	.1	16.7
	Brampton	1	.0	.0	16.7

	Brandon	1	.0	.0	16.7
	Breda	1	.0	.0	16.8
	Brentwood Bay	1	.0	.0	16.8
	Brier	1	.0	.0	16.8
	Brugge	1	.0	.0	16.8
	Bruno	1	.0	.0	16.9
	Brush Prairie	1	.0	.0	16.9
	Burnaby	13	.3	.3	17.2
	Burns Lake	2	.0	.0	17.2
	Bury st edmunds	1	.0	.0	17.2
	Byron Bay	1	.0	.0	17.2
	Cairing	1	.0	.0	17.3
	Calgary	54	1.2	1.2	18.4
	California	2	.0	.0	18.5
	Cambridge	1	.0	.0	18.5
	Campbell River	1704	36.5	36.5	55.0
	Canmore	5	.1	.1	55.1
	Cardiff	1	.0	.0	55.1
	Chemainus	2	.0	.0	55.2
	Cheticamp	1	.0	.0	55.2
	Chicago	1	.0	.0	55.2
	Chilliwack	8	.2	.2	55.4
	Claresholm	1	.0	.0	55.4
	Cobble Hill	3	.1	.1	55.5
	Cobourg	1	.0	.0	55.5
	Cochrane	2	.0	.0	55.6
	Coeur d alene	1	.0	.0	55.6
	Cold Lake	1	.0	.0	55.6
	Comic valley	1	.0	.0	55.6
	Comox	183	3.9	3.9	59.5
	Comox Valley	3	.1	.1	59.6
	Conception Bay	1	.0	.0	59.6
	Coombs	7	.2	.2	59.8
	Copenhagen	1	.0	.0	59.8
	Coquitlam	5	.1	.1	59.9
	Cortez	1	.0	.0	59.9
	Cortez Island	4	.1	.1	60.0
	Coupeville	2	.0	.0	60.1
	Courtenay	201	4.3	4.3	64.4
	Cowichan	2	.0	.0	64.4
	Cowichan Bay	1	.0	.0	64.4
	Cowichan Station	1	.0	.0	64.5
	Cowichan Valley	3	.1	.1	64.5
	Cranbrook	5	.1	.1	64.6
	Creston	1	.0	.0	64.6
	Crofton	2	.0	.0	64.7
	Cuddington	1	.0	.0	64.7
	Culemborg	1	.0	.0	64.7
	Cumberland	39	.8	.8	65.6
	Cupertino	1	.0	.0	65.6
	Dallas	2	.0	.0	65.6
	Damme	1	.0	.0	65.7
	Danville	1	.0	.0	65.7
	Dawson	1	.0	.0	65.7

	Delta	5	.1	.1	65.8
	Den Bosch	1	.0	.0	65.8
	Denman Island	2	.0	.0	65.9
	Denver	3	.1	.1	65.9
	Deverta	1	.0	.0	66.0
	Dewsbury	1	.0	.0	66.0
	Dresden	1	.0	.0	66.0
	Dronten	1	.0	.0	66.0
	Drumheller	1	.0	.0	66.0
	Duncan	53	1.1	1.1	67.2
	Ead	1	.0	.0	67.2
	Ede	1	.0	.0	67.2
	Edihborn	1	.0	.0	67.2
	Edmonton	43	.9	.9	68.2
	Eindhaven	1	.0	.0	68.2
	El Selvado	1	.0	.0	68.2
	Ely	1	.0	.0	68.2
	Enter	1	.0	.0	68.2
	Erfurt	1	.0	.0	68.3
	Errington	2	.0	.0	68.3
	Eugene	1	.0	.0	68.3
	Eymet	1	.0	.0	68.4
	Fanny Bay	2	.0	.0	68.4
	Fernie	1	.0	.0	68.4
	Fort Collins	1	.0	.0	68.4
	Fort Langley	1	.0	.0	68.5
	Fort MacMurray	4	.1	.1	68.5
	Fort Worth	2	.0	.0	68.6
	Franaker	1	.0	.0	68.6
	Frankfurt	5	.1	.1	68.7
	Fraser Valley	1	.0	.0	68.7
	French Creek	1	.0	.0	68.8
	Freusburg	1	.0	.0	68.8
	Gabriola Island	4	.1	.1	68.9
	Gibsons	3	.1	.1	68.9
	Gold river	1	.0	.0	69.0
	Gold River	33	.7	.7	69.7
	Goodlands	1	.0	.0	69.7
	Gouda	1	.0	.0	69.7
	Grande Cache	1	.0	.0	69.7
	Grande Prairie	4	.1	.1	69.8
	Green Bay	1	.0	.0	69.8
	Gremolle	1	.0	.0	69.9
	Guelph	2	.0	.0	69.9
	Hagen	1	.0	.0	69.9
	Hamilton	2	.0	.0	70.0
	Hanley	1	.0	.0	70.0
	Harrison Mills	2	.0	.0	70.0
	Hayling Island	1	.0	.0	70.0
	Heidelberg	1	.0	.0	70.1
	Herentals	1	.0	.0	70.1
	Hinton	1	.0	.0	70.1
	Holberg	1	.0	.0	70.1
	Hong Kong	1	.0	.0	70.2

	Hoorn	1	.0	.0	70.2
	Hope	1	.0	.0	70.2
	Hornby Island	2	.0	.0	70.2
	Houston	2	.0	.0	70.3
	Howe Island	1	.0	.0	70.3
	Hubbards	1	.0	.0	70.3
	Jasper	1	.0	.0	70.3
	Kamloops	25	.5	.5	70.9
	Kampen	1	.0	.0	70.9
	Kansas	2	.0	.0	70.9
	Kelowna	23	.5	.5	71.4
	Kiel	1	.0	.0	71.5
	Kingcome	1	.0	.0	71.5
	Kingston	2	.0	.0	71.5
	Kitimat	1	.0	.0	71.5
	Kolin	1	.0	.0	71.6
	Kyoto	1	.0	.0	71.6
	La-Crete	1	.0	.0	71.6
	Lacombe	1	.0	.0	71.6
	Ladner	2	.0	.0	71.7
	Ladysmith	15	.3	.3	72.0
	Lake Cowichan	4	.1	.1	72.1
	Lake Stevens	1	.0	.0	72.1
	Langford	1	.0	.0	72.1
	Langley	12	.3	.3	72.4
	Lantzville	12	.3	.3	72.6
	Leiden	1	.0	.0	72.7
	Lenexa	1	.0	.0	72.7
	Lethbridge	4	.1	.1	72.8
	Limage	1	.0	.0	72.8
	Lincoln	1	.0	.0	72.8
	Lisatore	1	.0	.0	72.8
	London	7	.2	.2	73.0
	Los Angeles	2	.0	.0	73.0
	Loveland	1	.0	.0	73.0
	Lucerne	1	.0	.0	73.1
	Luebeck	1	.0	.0	73.1
	Mackay	1	.0	.0	73.1
	Mainland	1	.0	.0	73.1
	Makawao	1	.0	.0	73.2
	Malahat	1	.0	.0	73.2
	Maniwaki	1	.0	.0	73.2
	Maple Ridge	9	.2	.2	73.4
	Massena	1	.0	.0	73.4
	Medicine Hat	3	.1	.1	73.5
	Medstead	1	.0	.0	73.5
	Melbourne	1	.0	.0	73.5
	Merville	4	.1	.1	73.6
	Mexico City	1	.0	.0	73.6
	Michigan	1	.0	.0	73.6
	Midway	1	.0	.0	73.7
	Milano	1	.0	.0	73.7
	Mill Bay	6	.1	.1	73.8
	Mission	1	.0	.0	73.8

	Mississippi	1	.0	.0	73.9
	Monterey	1	.0	.0	73.9
	Montpellier	1	.0	.0	73.9
	Montreal	2	.0	.0	73.9
	Moscow	1	.0	.0	74.0
	Mt. Curry	1	.0	.0	74.0
	Mt. Vernon	1	.0	.0	74.0
	Munich	3	.1	.1	74.1
	N.Augusta	1	.0	.0	74.1
	Nanaimo	186	4.0	4.0	78.1
	nanoose Bay	1	.0	.0	78.1
	Nanoose Bay	12	.3	.3	78.4
	Nashville	1	.0	.0	78.4
	Neuburg	1	.0	.0	78.4
	New Westminster	4	.1	.1	78.5
	New York	2	.0	.0	78.5
	Newcastle	1	.0	.0	78.6
	Nice	1	.0	.0	78.6
	nieuwebreg	1	.0	.0	78.6
	Nivenille	1	.0	.0	78.6
	North saanich	1	.0	.0	78.6
	North Saanich	4	.1	.1	78.7
	North Vancouver	12	.3	.3	79.0
	Norwich	1	.0	.0	79.0
	Nymengen	1	.0	.0	79.0
	Nyrerdal	1	.0	.0	79.1
	Oakbay	1	.0	.0	79.1
	Okanogan	1	.0	.0	79.1
	Oliver	1	.0	.0	79.1
	Olympia	1	.0	.0	79.1
	Oregon	1	.0	.0	79.2
	Othmarsingen	1	.0	.0	79.2
	Ottawa	7	.2	.2	79.3
	Oyster River	2	.0	.0	79.4
	Palmerston North	1	.0	.0	79.4
	Paris	5	.1	.1	79.5
	Park City	1	.0	.0	79.5
	Parksville	72	1.5	1.5	81.1
	Peace River	2	.0	.0	81.1
	Pemberton	1	.0	.0	81.1
	Penatang	1	.0	.0	81.2
	Penticton	2	.0	.0	81.2
	Perth	4	.1	.1	81.3
	Phoenix	3	.1	.1	81.3
	Pianwa	1	.0	.0	81.4
	Pine Lake	1	.0	.0	81.4
	Planet earth	1	.0	.0	81.4
	Plano	1	.0	.0	81.4
	Port Alberni	39	.8	.8	82.3
	Port Alice	3	.1	.1	82.3
	Port Angeles	1	.0	.0	82.4
	Port Coquitlam	4	.1	.1	82.4
	Port Hardy	19	.4	.4	82.8
	Port McNeil	6	.1	.1	83.0

Portland	10	.2	.2	83.2
Potters bar	1	.0	.0	83.2
Pouch River	1	.0	.0	83.2
Powell River	9	.2	.2	83.4
Poznan	1	.0	.0	83.4
Prince Albert	1	.0	.0	83.5
Prince George	5	.1	.1	83.6
Prince Rupert	1	.0	.0	83.6
Pt. Edward	1	.0	.0	83.6
Pt. Roberts	1	.0	.0	83.6
Quadra	3	.1	.1	83.7
Quadra island	1	.0	.0	83.7
Quadra Island	8	.2	.2	83.9
Qualicum	6	.1	.1	84.0
Qualicum Beach	19	.4	.4	84.4
Quardra Island	1	.0	.0	84.5
Queens	2	.0	.0	84.5
Quesnel	2	.0	.0	84.5
Red Deer	3	.1	.1	84.6
Regina	8	.2	.2	84.8
Reno	1	.0	.0	84.8
Renton	1	.0	.0	84.8
Revelstoke	1	.0	.0	84.8
Richmond	14	.3	.3	85.1
Rio Vista	1	.0	.0	85.2
Rocky Mountain House	4	.1	.1	85.2
Romo	1	.0	.0	85.3
Rosenheim	1	.0	.0	85.3
Rotorua	1	.0	.0	85.3
Rotterdam	2	.0	.0	85.4
Royston	2	.0	.0	85.4
Russia	1	.0	.0	85.4
S graven,oer	1	.0	.0	85.4
Saanich	5	.1	.1	85.5
Saanicton	1	.0	.0	85.6
Sacramento	4	.1	.1	85.7
Saffron	1	.0	.0	85.7
Salmon Arm	1	.0	.0	85.7
Salt Spring Island	6	.1	.1	85.8
San Diego	1	.0	.0	85.8
San Francisco	1	.0	.0	85.9
San Jose	1	.0	.0	85.9
San Juan Islands	1	.0	.0	85.9
SanRafael	1	.0	.0	85.9
Santa Cruz	1	.0	.0	86.0
Santa Fay	1	.0	.0	86.0
Sardis	1	.0	.0	86.0
Saskatoon	6	.1	.1	86.1
Sayward	7	.2	.2	86.3
Seaton	1	.0	.0	86.3
Seattle	29	.6	.6	86.9
Senneterre	1	.0	.0	86.9
Seoul	1	.0	.0	87.0

	Seshelt	1	.0	.0	87.0
	Shawnigan Lake	10	.2	.2	87.2
	Sheabogenbosch	1	.0	.0	87.2
	Sherwood Park	1	.0	.0	87.2
	Sidney	12	.3	.3	87.5
	Singapore	1	.0	.0	87.5
	Slave Lake	1	.0	.0	87.5
	Sooke	18	.4	.4	87.9
	Squamish	4	.1	.1	88.0
	St. Albert	2	.0	.0	88.1
	St. John's	1	.0	.0	88.1
	St.Helens	1	.0	.0	88.1
	Stevenage	1	.0	.0	88.1
	Stoney Plain	1	.0	.0	88.1
	Strasbourg	1	.0	.0	88.2
	Stratford	2	.0	.0	88.2
	Sturgeon County	1	.0	.0	88.2
	Stutgart	1	.0	.0	88.3
	Sudbury	1	.0	.0	88.3
	Sunshine Coast	1	.0	.0	88.3
	Surrey	21	.5	.5	88.7
	Sussex	1	.0	.0	88.8
	Sydney	1	.0	.0	88.8
	Tacoma	5	.1	.1	88.9
	Tahsis	2	.0	.0	88.9
	Tangstedt	1	.0	.0	89.0
	Terrace	1	.0	.0	89.0
	Tewksbury	1	.0	.0	89.0
	Tianjin	1	.0	.0	89.0
	Tilburg	2	.0	.0	89.1
	Tofino	9	.2	.2	89.3
	Toronto	20	.4	.4	89.7
	Toulouse	1	.0	.0	89.7
	Traralgch	1	.0	.0	89.7
	Traverse City	1	.0	.0	89.8
	Troy	1	.0	.0	89.8
	Truro	1	.0	.0	89.8
	Tulalip	2	.0	.0	89.8
	Tustin	1	.0	.0	89.9
	Ucluelet	2	.0	.0	89.9
	University Place	1	.0	.0	89.9
	Utrecht	4	.1	.1	90.0
	Valkenswaard	1	.0	.0	90.0
	Vancouver	90	1.9	1.9	92.0
	Vancouver WA	1	.0	.0	92.0
	Vanderhoof	1	.0	.0	92.0
	Vernon	14	.3	.3	92.3
	Victoria	305	6.5	6.5	98.8
	Victpria	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Villingen	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Vojens	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Voorburg	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Vulcan	1	.0	.0	98.9
	Wagga Wagga	1	.0	.0	99.0

Wailuku	1	.0	.0	99.0
Warburg	1	.0	.0	99.0
Washington DC	1	.0	.0	99.0
Waterloo	1	.0	.0	99.1
Wellington	3	.1	.1	99.1
West Vancouver	1	.0	.0	99.1
Wetaskiwin	2	.0	.0	99.2
Whistler	2	.0	.0	99.2
White Rock	6	.1	.1	99.4
Whitehorse	1	.0	.0	99.4
Wigton	1	.0	.0	99.4
Williams Lake	1	.0	.0	99.4
Wiltshire	1	.0	.0	99.4
Winchester	1	.0	.0	99.5
Windsor	2	.0	.0	99.5
Winnipeg	6	.1	.1	99.6
Wolverhampton	1	.0	.0	99.7
Woods Hole	1	.0	.0	99.7
Worchester	1	.0	.0	99.7
Worthing	1	.0	.0	99.7
Woss	2	.0	.0	99.8
Yakima	1	.0	.0	99.8
Yarmouth	1	.0	.0	99.8
Yellowknife	1	.0	.0	99.8
Youbou	1	.0	.0	99.8
Zeballos	5	.1	.1	100.0
Zumbudwae	1	.0	.0	100.0
Zurich	1	.0	.0	100.0
Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

b) Province/State (cumulative across study years):

Province/State

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		779	16.7	16.7	16.7
	AB	156	3.3	3.3	20.0
	AK	1	.0	.0	20.1
	AL	1	.0	.0	20.1
	AR	1	.0	.0	20.1
	AZ	4	.1	.1	20.2
	Bav	1	.0	.0	20.2
	BC	3470	74.4	74.4	94.6
	CA	24	.5	.5	95.1
	Cam	1	.0	.0	95.2
	Che	1	.0	.0	95.2
	CO	5	.1	.1	95.3
	DC	1	.0	.0	95.3
	FL	2	.0	.0	95.3
	Fle	1	.0	.0	95.4
	Gel	1	.0	.0	95.4
	Her	1	.0	.0	95.4
	HI	2	.0	.0	95.5
	IL	2	.0	.0	95.5
	KA	2	.0	.0	95.5
	KS	1	.0	.0	95.6
	MA	3	.1	.1	95.6
	MB	10	.2	.2	95.8
	ME	1	.0	.0	95.9
	MI	2	.0	.0	95.9
	MS	1	.0	.0	95.9
	NB	1	.0	.0	95.9
	NC	2	.0	.0	96.0
	NL	2	.0	.0	96.0
	NM	1	.0	.0	96.1
	NRW	1	.0	.0	96.1
	NS	5	.1	.1	96.2
	NV	1	.0	.0	96.2
	NWT	1	.0	.0	96.2
	NY	3	.1	.1	96.3
	ON	59	1.3	1.3	97.6
	OR	11	.2	.2	97.8
	QC	5	.1	.1	97.9
	SA	2	.0	.0	97.9
	SC	1	.0	.0	98.0
	SK	19	.4	.4	98.4
	Suf	1	.0	.0	98.4
	TN	1	.0	.0	98.4
	TX	6	.1	.1	98.5
	UT	1	.0	.0	98.6
	Val	1	.0	.0	98.6
	WA	60	1.3	1.3	99.9
	Wel	1	.0	.0	99.9
	WI	2	.0	.0	99.9
	Wis	1	.0	.0	100.0

	YK	1	.0	.0	100.0
	YT	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

c) Country (cumulative across study years):

Country (edited responses)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		589	12.6	12.6	12.6
	Australia	18	.4	.4	13.0
	Austria	1	.0	.0	13.0
	Belgium	2	.0	.0	13.1
	Brussels	1	.0	.0	13.1
	Canada	3741	80.2	80.2	93.3
	China	4	.1	.1	93.4
	Denmark	5	.1	.1	93.5
	England	14	.3	.3	93.8
	France	13	.3	.3	94.1
	Germany	35	.8	.8	94.8
	Holland	8	.2	.2	95.0
	Italy	3	.1	.1	95.1
	Japan	4	.1	.1	95.2
	Mexico	2	.0	.0	95.2
	Netherlands	33	.7	.7	95.9
	New Zealand	5	.1	.1	96.0
	Poland	1	.0	.0	96.0
	Russia	3	.1	.1	96.1
	Singapore	1	.0	.0	96.1
	South Korea	1	.0	.0	96.1
	Spain	1	.0	.0	96.2
	Sweden	1	.0	.0	96.2
	Switzerland	10	.2	.2	96.4
	Texas	1	.0	.0	96.4
	The Netherlands	1	.0	.0	96.4
	UK	14	.3	.3	96.7
	USA	151	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Wales	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	4664	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX C. SCATTERPLOTS DEPICTING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS AND WEATHER



Appendix C Figure 1. Effect of weather on relationship between influence of water level on recreation experience and daily average water elevation



Appendix C Figure 2. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction with shoreline condition and daily average water elevation



Appendix C Figure 3. Effect of weather on relationship between perception of safety and daily average water elevation



Appendix C Figure 4. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction with access to beach and daily average water elevation



Appendix C Figure 5. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction with access to water via boat launch and daily average water elevation



Appendix C Figure 6. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction with access to water via shoreline and daily average water elevation



Appendix C Figure 7. Effect of weather on relationship between influence of water flows on riverine recreation experience and daily average flow rate



Appendix C Figure 8. Effect of weather on relationship between influence of water flows on riverine recreation experience and daily average flow rate with 2016 high flows removed



Appendix C Figure 9. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction with riverine shoreline conditions and daily average flow rate



Appendix C Figure 10. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction with riverine shoreline conditions and daily average flow rate with 2016 high flows removed



Appendix C Figure 11. Effect of weather on relationship between perception of safety at river and daily average flow rate



Appendix C Figure 12. Effect of weather on relationship between perception of safety at river and daily average flow rate with 2016 high flows removed



Mixed linear model p-value in lower right of plot

Appendix C Figure 13. Effect of weather on relationship between impressiveness of falls and daily average flow rate



Mixed model p-value in lower right of plot

Appendix C Figure 14. Effect of weather on relationship between satisfaction of viewing experience at falls and daily average flow rate

APPENDIX D. CAMPBELL RIVER DECISION CHOICE EXPERIMENT KNOWN AND 4-CLASS MODEL RESULTS

CAMPBELL RIVER DCE – KNOWN CLASS AND 4-CLASS LATENT MODEL RESULTS

KNOWN-CLASS MULTINOMIAL LOGIT MODELS

Known class models were used to manually investigate the preferences of specific "chosen" user groups. Appendix Table 1 presents a comparison of multiple 'known class' models based on respondent identification as: Beach Recreation; Kayakers; Swimmers; Campbell River residents; Non-Campbell River residents; Campers only; People planning on sightseeing at the falls; and Boaters.

As with previous reservoir samples, there are differences between these known classes and the general river DCE 1-class model are noted in **bold** – representing a change in the most preferred option – and outlined – representing a change in preference direction. Only significant values are shown. In general, the preferences of beach recreation respondents in the river DCE differed the most compared to the general 1-class model results as they strongly preferred only 1 river flow level. In contrast, several groups had no significant differences from the 1-class model (e.g. non-Campbell River residents and Campbell residents). The known class comparisons for the river DCE shows that respondents continue to be homogenous in their negative perception of extremely high (i.e. 'High high') water conditions. River substrate and wood debris features only factor in few groups decision making.

Appendix Table 1. Results of the "known class" multinomial logit model testing effects of river features

Attribute and Attribute Level	BEACH RECREATION	KAYAKING	SWIMMERS ONLY	CAMPBELL RIVER RESIDENTS	NON CAMPBELL RIVER RESIDENTS	CAMPERS ONLY	SIGHTSEEING FALLS	BOATERS ONLY
Water Level								
(1)LOW LOW	**0.8202**	-0.4089	-0.3474	0.1891	0.2651	0.2027	**0.7957**	**0.4297**
(2)Low	0.2582	0.0744	0.3020	0.3183	0.3426	0.4065	0.3990	-0.3700
(3)Average	-0.6272	**0.3342**	0.2177	0.0405	0.0086	-0.0077	-0.4264	0.4249
(4)High	-0.6685	0.2962	**1.1754**	-0.2366	-0.2094	-0.2831	-0.1941	-0.6579
(5)HIGH HIGH	0.2172	-0.2958	-1.3477	-0.3113	-0.4070	-0.3184	-0.5741	0.1733
River Flow		0.0000						
(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	-0.4412	0.1241	0.1562	0.2844	0.0794	0.1596	0.3489	-0.4747
(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	-0.8891	-0.0968	**1.2742**	0.1585	0.0342	0.1291	**0.5180**	-0.1678
(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	0.2622	**0.3677**	-0.6751	0.0668	**0.1317**	0.1119	0.0033	**0.2724**
(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	**0.5528**	0.1260	-0.5489	-0.1224	-0.1680	-0.1925	-0.2339	0.4804
(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	0.5153	-0.5210	-0.2065	-0.3874	-0.0773	-0.2080	-0.6363	-0.1103
River Substrate								
(1)Natural substrate	0.3215						-0.1818	
(2)High boulder cover	-0.3215						0.1818	

Shoreline Features						
(1)Exposed substrate	0.1541	0.0801	0.1343	0.1659		0.2264
(2)Vegetated	-0.1541	-0.0801	-0.1343	-0.1659		-0.2264
Wood Debris						
(1)Present		-0.0674		-0.0825	-0.0769	
(2)Not Present		0.0674		0.0825	0.0769	

FOUR-CLASS MULTINOMIAL LOGIT MODEL

Appendix Table 2 highlights the results of a 4-class latent model in which all but river substrate features are highly significant (p <.01 or p <.05) and some differences between classes exist. However, unlike reservoir features, river recreation respondents were more homogenous in their preferences. Differences between these latent classes and the general 1-class model are noted in **bold** – representing a change in the most preferred option – and outlined – representing a change in preference direction. Class 3 respondents preferred higher river flows over other respondents. All latent classes expressed differences in their preferred water level but generally preferred lower water levels, with the exception of class 3 which preferred higher water flows.

Appendix Table 2. Results of the 4-class latent model testing effects of river features (n=428)

Attribute and Attribute Level	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	p-value
Proportion of recreationists	54.17%	24.37%	15.74%	5.72%	
	Part-worth utility estimates				
Water Level					
(1)LOW LOW	0.1853	**2.9158**	-1.3189	**0.3202**	0.0017
(2)Low	0.2158	2.4407	0.0519	0.1757	
(3)Average	-0.0925	0.4633	0.5476	0.1506	
(4)High	-0.0787	-1.7677	0.1199	0.2375	
(5)HIGH HIGH	-0.2299	-4.0520	**0.5996**	-0.8841	
River Flow					
(1)Low Low (<40 m3/s)	0.1805	0.8386	-0.3203	**0.3366**	0.0019
(2)Low (41-60 m3/s)	**0.2265**	**0.8986**	-0.4587	-0.0603	
(3)Average (61-100 m3/s)	0.1671	0.2515	0.1016	-0.3883	
(4)High (101-128 m3/s)	-0.2633	-0.2837	**0.6475**	-0.3101	
(5)High High (>129 m3/s)	-0.3109	-1.7049	0.0299	0.4221	
River Substrate					
(1)Natural substrate	-0.0294	-0.1094	0.0929	-0.1531	0.72
(2)High boulder cover	0.0294	0.1094	-0.0929	0.1531	
Shore Line Features					
(1)Exposed substrate	0.0812	1.0845	0.0120	0.3645	0.00069
(2)Vegetated	-0.0812	-1.0845	-0.0120	-0.3645	
Wood Debris					
(1)Present	**0.0434**	-0.2106	-0.2634	**0.0320**	0.04
(2)Not Present	-0.0434	0.2106	-0.0120	-0.0320	

APPENDIX E. CAMPBELL RESERVOIRS PUBLIC USE AND PERCEPTIONS SURVEY



Campbell Reservoirs Public Use and Perceptions Study

On behalf of BC Hydro and Power Authority Act, the Laich-Kwil-Tach Environmental Assessment Ltd. Partnership (LKT) is conducting a study about public use and perceptions on recreation in the Campbell Reservoirs. We would appreciate if you could complete this survey. The results will provide insights into public use and preferences for water management.

Participation in the survey is voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time. You may skip any questions if you are not comfortable answering, although we encourage you to complete the survey as thoroughly as possible.

All information that you provide are confidential and anonymous; results will only be presented in tabulated form and not individually. Please do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

If you have any questions about why BC Hydro is conducting this research, please contact Phil Bradshaw – Project Manager, BC Hydro at 604-528-1693.

Thanks for your time and enjoy your stay!

v1



Map of Campbell River Reservoir System

The Campbell River system is outlined in red below and is comprised of a number of lakes/reservoirs and rivers that are used by outdoor recreationists.



To Be Completed By Surveyor

Date & Time*
2019-02-11 04:01:04 PM

Location*

Weather*

Survey completed this year?*

DCE Photo Book #*



SECTION A: Current Visit to the Campbell River Reservoir System

Show map of Campbell River Reservoir System?

No Yes

1.a. Are you currently engaged in a day trip or an overnight trip in the Campbell River Reservoir System?

Day Trip [✓ Overnight Trip]

1.b. If staying overnight, how many days are you spending in the Campbell River Reservoir System on this trip?

0

2. If staying overnight in the Campbell River system area, what type of accommodation are you using on this trip?
(Check all that apply)

3. What one activity was the most important for you in your decision to visit the Campbell River Reservoir system for this trip?

4. Which areas in the Campbell River system have you visited or anticipate visiting for recreational activities on this trip?



Campbell Reservoirs Survey

5 / 10

SECTION B: Visit to a Lake/Reservoir

This next section of the survey asks about your most recent visit to a lake/reservoir within the Campbell River Reservoir System.

Show map of Campbell River Reservoir System?

No | Yes

5. Have you recreated on the water or on the shore of any lakes/reservoirs in the Campbell River system during this trip?

No [✓ Yes]

6. Which one lake/reservoir did you recreate at most recently on this trip?

Buttle Lake | Lower Campbell Reservoir | McIvor Lake | Upper Campbell Reservoir | Other

7. When was your most recent visit to this lake/reservoir?

Today | Yesterday | Two days ago | Other

8. During your most recent visit to this lake/reservoir, what activities did you participate in?
(Check all that apply)

9. Based on your most recent activities at the lake/reservoir, how did water levels influence your recreation experience?

10. Thinking of the lake/reservoir that you recreated at most recently, were there any water-based or shore-based activities that you were going to participate in that you were unable to do specifically because of the water level?

No | Yes

11. Based on your most recent activities at the lake/reservoir, how satisfied were you with the shoreline conditions while engaged in water-based recreation?

Shoreline conditions refer to the type of substrate, presence of woody debris, presence of vegetation, etc.

12. Based on your most recent activities at the lake/reservoir, how safe did you feel engaging in water-based recreation given water levels at that time?

13. What conditions, if any, did you encounter during your time recreating at the lake/reservoir that posed a safety concern to you?
(Check all that apply)

14. Given the water levels at the time, how satisfied were you during your most recent activities at the reservoir with access to the...
(Check only one for each)

a. beach?

b. water via a boat launch?

c. water via the shoreline?

Prev | Cancel | Next



SECTION C: Future Lake/Reservoir Visits

You will now refer to the photo book you received, where you will be presented with six pairs of photos representing different hypothetical lake/reservoir conditions.

The conditions of Site A and Site B will differ in each of the following photo pairs. While some of the photos may not seem ideal, each one of them could occur under certain circumstances.

For each set of pictures please select whether you would choose to recreate in the area represented in Site A or Site B, or neither of them.

There is no right or wrong answers to these special types of research questions but it is important to regard them as real-world situations, in which the selected conditions are available to you. You will be asked to complete a total of six evaluations.

15. For photo pair 1, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A
Site B
Neither site

16. For photo pair 2, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A
Site B
Neither site

17. For photo pair 3, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A
Site B
Neither site

18. For photo pair 4, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A
Site B
Neither site

19. For photo pair 5, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A
Site B
Neither site

20. For photo pair 6, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A
Site B
Neither site



Campbell Reservoirs Survey

7 / 10

SECTION D: Visit to Elk Falls

Show map of Campbell River Reservoir System?

No Yes

21. Have you visited Elk Falls during this trip?

No [✓ Yes]

22. When was your most recent visit to Elk Falls?

Today Yesterday Two days ago Other

23. Just based on the water flows you observed at the falls on your most recent visit, how impressive would you rate Elk Falls?

24. How satisfied were you with your viewing experience of Elk Falls?



Future River Visits

You will now refer to the photo book you received, where you will be presented with six pairs of photos representing different hypothetical river conditions for Campbell River.

The conditions of Site A and Site B will differ in each of the following photo pairs. While some of the photos may not seem ideal or likely to occur, each should be considered as a realistic option. In the photos, current river flow conditions are presented within the range of the past 50 years of hydrological conditions.

For each set of pictures please review all provided information and select whether you would choose to recreate in the area represented in Site A or Site B, or neither of them.

There is no right or wrong answers to these special types of research questions but it is important to regard them as real-world situations, in which the selected conditions are available to you. You will be asked to complete a total of six evaluations.

15. For photo pair 1, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A | Site B | Neither site

16. For photo pair 2, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A | Site B | Neither site

17. For photo pair 3, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A | Site B | Neither site

18. For photo pair 4, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A | Site B | Neither site

19. For photo pair 5, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A | Site B | Neither site

20. For photo pair 6, I would choose to recreate at:

Site A | Site B | Neither site



Campbell Reservoirs Survey

9 / 10

SECTION F: Past Visits to Campbell River Reservoir System

Show map of Campbell River Reservoir System?

No Yes

34. Is this your first visit to the Campbell River system?

[✓ No] Yes

35. On average, how many days per season do you typically visit the Campbell River system?

Winter

0 <1 1 2-3 4+

Spring

0 <1 1 2-3 4+

Summer

0 <1 1 2-3 4+

Fall

0 <1 1 2-3 4+



SECTION G: About You

36. What is your gender?

37. What is your current age?

38. How many people are in your party today?

0

39. Where do you currently reside (i.e., where you have lived for more than 6 months out of the past year)?
(Check all that apply)

City/Town

Province

Country

40. Do you have any additional comments about recreation on the water in the Campbell River system?

(In consideration of privacy, do not identify yourself or other specific individuals in your written comments. Any comments including self-identification or identification of third parties will be discarded.)

Thank you again for your participation