

CPC Jurisdictional Scans Year at a Glance

Year: 2019

Total # of Scans:	13
Themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Annual Revenue Forecasting ● Alcohol Practices ● Application of Fees for Indigenous Park Users ● Caravan/Large Group Reservation Management ● Drafting of Legal Land Descriptions ● Licensing Fees Concessionaires ● Management Planning Programs ● Off Road Vehicle Information Request ● Parks Agencies with an App ● Parks Maintenance Budgets ● Parks Recreational and Disposition Fees ** ● Photo Contests ● Provincial Advisory Board or Committee ● Special Event Policy
Overall Response Rate:	31%
Scan with Highest Response Rate:	Provincial Advisory Board or Committee / Annual Revenue Forecasting
Responded Most Often:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Saskatchewan Parks at 54% Response Rate ● Ontario Parks at 50% Response Rate ● Newfoundland and Labrador Parks at 45% Response Rate
Responded Least Often:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Government of the Northwest Territories at 0% Response Rate ● Parks New Brunswick at 8% Response Rate ● Yukon Parks at 15% Response Rate
Key Insights:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Responding jurisdictions, other than Sepaq, do not generally allow alcohol in their day use areas. ● Most jurisdictions simply abide by the larger provincial mandates on alcohol usage in public spaces ● Some jurisdictions prohibit the use of alcohol on busy weekends even in campsites to avoid conflict. ● Responding jurisdictions did not charge use fees for anyone. Camping fees apply to everyone.

- The responding jurisdictions have limited availability for group camping, accommodating on average groups of about 10-20. These reservations generally need to be made by calling the park in question.
- Too few responses to give general insights
- Newfoundland and Labrador Parks are mostly mapped in house
- Alberta:
 - 4 maintenance/funding strategies to deal with the varied categories/types of assets within the Parks:
 - Routine Maintenance (RM): 10-30% of operational budget
 - Time-based Maintenance (TbM) , also known as Life Cycle Maintenance (LCM): 25-30% of capital budget
 - Condition-based Maintenance (CbM): From capital budget. Each year all 5 regions submit a list of projects and the CMR committee scores/ranks them. Based on the capital budget a list of approved projects are set. We have a rolling 5 year project list that we establish at least 2-3 years in advance and make adjustments if required 3 months prior to fiscal start.
 - Capital Replacement Investments: Large scale investments, submit a separate capital investment ask.
 - Budget is made up of two types of funding:
 - Operational Funding
 - Capital Budget: Set by Alberta Treasury Board
 - Working on Restrategizing
- Saskatchewan: No particular tools or strategies
- Ontario: “Our plant is not in good enough condition to successfully use a predictive/formulaic allocation model; we are compelled to make prioritization decisions in conjunction with parks”
 - Hierarchy of Needs type model: Starting with immediate threats to human health and safety, flowing downwards towards new

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ equipment acquisitions○ Provides further breakdown in the comment section● Newfoundland and Labrador<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Zero Based Budgeting approach○ No formal asset management tool○ Projects are given funding based on submissions and public/staff feedback● Nova Scotia<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Prioritized based on impact to visitor experience, critical infrastructure, etc. Prioritize list and address as funds are available● Parks Canada<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Annual reinvestment rate model: Annual Maintenance and Repair (M&R) reinvestment rate = 1 divided by the useful life of an asset. For an asset with 50 year useful life, $1/50 = 2\%$, so 2% of that assets total value should be budgeted each year for M&R. 2% is an average rate, lower for newer assets, higher as they age● It would seem that provincial Park systems do not generally have the budget to be able to realize standard budgeting tools, as their ability to allocate funds must be highly flexible and based on a prioritization need.● Park systems that tend to bring in higher capital are in a better place to create budgeting models as they have a more reliable funding model to be able to allocate.● Although most jurisdictions do not have a permanent, official board that gives regular and general advice to the Minister and senior management, most jurisdictions have a number of committees or panels on specific issues that provide advice and feedback.● Alberta is interested in the creation of an advisory board● In Newfoundland & Labrador there is an ecological council that provides advice to the Minister, but it is not related to parks.● Sépaq has a permanent board appointed by gov't and meets every 6-8 week and the CEO of Sépaq
--	---

	<p>sits on the board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None of the responding provincial agencies had an App. Alberta’s website is mobile friendly. ● Parks Canada is the only responding jurisdiction with an App. ● Responding jurisdictions did have in depth legislation for the management of Off Road Vehicles such as side by sides. ● Responding jurisdictions noted that permittance of Off Road Vehicles varied for different conservation areas, i.e vehicles may be permitted in less sensitive areas but not permitted in more sensitive areas. ● Jurisdictions are across the board on their approach to concessionaires agreements, ranging from having guiding policies, to negotiating per agreement, to basing each agreement on gross revenue. ● It is most common to forecast a budget based on either the previous years revenues or on the average of the past three years revenues. Each was reported with equal frequency. Saskatchewan parks normally rely on the past year model, incorporating the three year model when the past year included items that were specific to that year. ● It is uncommon to use tools such as weather forecasting and economic trends in budget forecasting, however there is an interest in these more sophisticated models. ● Sepaq also uses anticipated growth of infrastructure and services to help budget their forecast. ● Weather and other influencers can be used to understand past years revenues to better forecast future budgets
<p>Questions to Consider:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Has the alcohol ban in campsites on major weekends been effective in mitigating conflict?

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What can be done to increase and promote visitation and participation by Indigenous visitors in parks?• Revisit the question of ability to accommodate large group camping in the future to capture more responses• What other methods do other jurisdictions use to map park boundaries?• How do parks categorize their hierarchy of needs allocation models?• Across the jurisdictions, what characteristics are looked at to determine need for maintenance funds?• Is it more effective to have advisory panels for individual parks or topics than to have one larger board for the entire jurisdiction? Would there be value in having both?• What has Sépaq accomplished through their board? How efficient do they find their structure? Is this a structure that could be modelled in other jurisdictions looking to create advisory panels?• For provincial jurisdictions who may face larger obstacles to funding, would a website that is mobile friendly be a sufficient tool or would an App still be ideal?• Can Off Road Vehicle users play an important role in conservation of certain areas?• Does your jurisdiction have a partnership/relationship with local Off Road Vehicles user groups? What does this relationship look like/has it benefited your park(s)?• Are there policies that exist that could be applied across jurisdictions to provide consistency and support for agreement making, but also provide the flexibility that each jurisdiction needs?• Some jurisdictions seem to have better access to/more thoroughly developed tools for forecasting their budgets. Can these be shared with other jurisdictions to use at their discretion? What tools are most efficient in which jurisdictions? |
|--|---|

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there a forecasting tool that would be most effective for all jurisdictions? What is the experience of each jurisdiction with their current budget forecasting procedure?
--	--

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