

## CPC Jurisdictional Scans Year at a Glance

**Year:2015**

<b>Total # of Scans:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Themes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Aboriginal Entry Fee Policies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Bridge Directive or Policies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Campground Host Scan</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Campsite Limitations</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Disabled Persons and Discounts</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Dogs in Parks Survey</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Learn to Camp Programs</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Legislative Review - Alberta</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Minimum Operating Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">PPAs Designed for Lichens</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Safety Hazard Vehicle Policies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Visitor Services Director</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Volunteers in Parks</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Wildlife Viewing</a></li> </ul>
<b>Overall Response Rate:</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>Scan with Highest Response Rate:</b>	<b><a href="#">Disabled Persons and Discounts</a></b>
<b>Responded Most Often:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yukon Parks at <b>69%</b> Response Rate</li> <li>• Parcs New Brunswick at <b>67%</b> Response Rate</li> <li>• Ontario Parks at <b>64%</b> Response Rate</li> </ul>
<b>Responded Least Often:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nunavut Parks at <b>21%</b> Response Rate</li> <li>• Northwest Territories Parks at <b>27%</b> Response Rate</li> <li>• Parks Canada/Sépaq/Nova Scotia Parks at <b>38%</b> Response Rate</li> </ul>
<b>Key Insights:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many jurisdictions have policies in place for free vehicle entry for Indigenous Peoples</li> <li>• Indigenous Peoples policies are most often associated with traditional land use</li> <li>• Many jurisdictions do not have their own guiding manuals for bridge directives</li> <li>• It is possible to partner with another ministry that has experience for bridge type projects</li> <li>• Campground Host programs that do exist have generally been in place for decades and have a wealth of data to inform their existence and success.</li> </ul>

- Alberta in particular seems to have a thriving Campground Host Program.
- There is the possibility of running into issues with unionized employees if they feel work is being taken away from them.
- Participation in a Campground Host Program is often at the discretion of individual park supervisors; having a program in place does not mean that the program is offered everywhere.
- Most reported accommodation unit limitation: **1 + 1** non-accommodation equipment unit (i.e. dining tent)
- Most reported number of people limitation: **6 or 1 family unit** defined as parent(s) with their children.
- Most reported number of vehicles allowed: **1 vehicle**, additional visitor parking is normally provided
- Exceptions can be made by the Campground Manager under certain circumstances.
- Jurisdictions often use Provincial/National/Other Ministry definitions, if anything, of Disability/Disabled Person. Parks specific definitions are rare.
- Focus is placed on accessible services/facilities as the barrier to engagement. Finances not normally identified as the primary barrier to engagement for persons with disabilities.
- That being said, where finances are identified as a barrier, as with AISH (see Alberta comment section), it is recommended that fee reductions be introduced
- Waving of user fee for persons accompanying a person with a disability identified as a good service practice.
- Self Identification or Placards most reportedly used
- B.C, which offers one of the largest discounts, (free frontcountry camping), requires most significant identification (see B.C comment section)
- The concept of reduced fees for persons with disabilities seems to be often based on the concept of the limited accessibility of the experience to those persons. Rather than accept this reality and try to “make up for it” with a discount, jurisdictions seem to be trying to remedy the issue of access with universal design and inclusive services so that persons with disabilities are not missing any components of the parks experience.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many of the responding jurisdictions had either done planning for, executed, or continues to execute Learn to Camp Programs</li> <li>● Respondents mostly did not comment on their willingness to collaborate with Parks Canada on a national network of Learn to Camp programs</li> <li>● Based on a relatively low response rate, Minimum Operating Standards and how they are documented seem to vary wildly across jurisdictions, from no MOPs to multiple documents outlining various sector MOPs.</li> <li>● While rare, Protected Areas that were designated due to the rare lichen that occurs there do exist in some jurisdictions</li> <li>● Many jurisdictions have extensive manuals and documents outlining protocols and policies that relate to job hazard analysis, vehicle and equipment operation and maintenance, and training requirements for specific tasks</li> <li>● Most jurisdictions that responded did not have a Director of Visitor Services/Experience or a position they deemed similar</li> <li>● Although volunteer programs are common, responding jurisdictions did not tend to have formal contracts with Unions to allow volunteerism</li> <li>● Responding jurisdictions did not have Wildlife Viewing Policies specifically for parks</li> <li>● Sepaq is meant to have compiled the results from the Dogs in Parks survey into a formal summary. Please contact Sepaq for final insights</li> </ul>
<p><b>Questions to Consider:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Should Indigenous Peoples have free access to all Parks and Protected Areas? How would that be coordinated across jurisdictions? What would this kind of policy look like?</li> <li>● How do jurisdictions currently take on these types of bridge projects? Do they outsource or rely on other ministries for these projects?</li> <li>● How often should a Campground Host Program be revisited, evaluated, and updated?</li> </ul>

- What have been some of the challenges in maintaining a successful Campground Host Program?
- Are the above limits serving the purpose for which they were intended? I.e. If the number of occupants per site was limited in order to reduce noise and footprint, has this limitation decreased the noise and footprint of sites?
- Although finances may not be the primary barrier to access for people with disabilities, could a financial incentive encourage those who have been previously excluded from a setting to engage with the experience?
- Many jurisdictions do not yet seem to have any policies regarding persons with disabilities. Those that do seem to have extensive Inclusivity Policies and Guidelines. Is it possible to encourage jurisdictions without policies to adopt and adapt existing policies into their procedures? What resources would they need to accomplish this?
- Would your jurisdiction be open to collaborating with Parks Canada on a national network of Learn to Camp Programs?
- What resources would you need to successfully operate a Learn to Camp Program?
- Should all jurisdictions have Minimum Operating Standards on certain services/operations?
- Is it possible to standardize Minimum Operating Standards for certain services/operations across jurisdictions?
- Would providing a standardized set of Minimum Operating Standards for certain services/operations have any benefits to jurisdictions?
- What other natural areas could seek designation to protect rare lichen?
- Would a large, collective database for resources like this be useful? A sort of library of manuals across jurisdictions, where jurisdictions could simply deposit copies of manuals into the database.
- Would a Director of Visitor Services/Experience be a valuable addition to your jurisdictions team?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Have jurisdictions with Directors of Visitor Services/Experience noticed a significant benefit to their results?</li><li>• What steps would need to be taken to create such a position within a jurisdiction? What kind of resources would be required?</li><li>• What value is there in having a formal agreement with Unions to provide for volunteerism in parks?</li><li>• Do any of the jurisdictions that did not respond have this type of agreement? Have they found it beneficial to their operations?</li><li>• Should parks have their own Wildlife Viewing Policies? Would it be possible to have a standard set of policies to apply to all jurisdictions?</li></ul>
--	---

\*Jurisdictional Response Rate Score is calculated based on # of times responded/(total # of scan requests - # inquiries from that jurisdiction).