METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
Suite 300, Metro Square Building, St. Paul, MN 55101

DATA SUMMARY REPORT

METROPOLITAN RECREATION DEMAND STUDY

1977-78 ON-SITE SURVEYS

(Winter Phase)

Report No. 1.01
August 15, 1978

INTRODUCTION

During the winter of 1977-78, the first comprehensive attempt at assessing the demand for Regional Recreation Open Space in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area was begun by the Metropolitan Council. This effort, the Metropolitan Recreation Demand Study (MRDS) has two major components:

1 - A telephone/mail recreation participation and opinion survey of the general population in the seven-county Metropolitan Area. This component has been contracted to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to be done in conjunction with its surveys for the 1979 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Their effort has winter and summer phases with a clean tape of all responses being provided the Council for its independent use and analysis.

2 - An on-site survey of park and recreation facility users at regional parks and other facilities that appear to serve a regional audience. This component is being done by Council staff, and also consists of winter and summer phases.

This Data Summary Report concerns the results of the winter phase of Component 2--the on-site surveys conducted at a total of 50 areas in five general classes:

1 - Downhill Ski Areas

2 - Ski Touring Trails/Areas

3 - Other Park Use (skating, sliding, walking, etc.)

4 - Snowmobile Trails

5 - Nature Centers

This report summarizes the data for the first three of these classes. The Snowmobile and Nature Center surveys yielded very small total sample sizes (130 and 98 responses, respectively) and, therefore, await further tabulation by manual methods.

This report has three major objectives:

1 - to provide general summary data from each of the three surveys analyzed to date. This is done by means of "Total Sample" summary tables, which include responses to similar information types from all three surveys.

2 - to provide the reader and potential user with an idea of the data contained in the winter phase information bank and the possible cross-tabulations and analyses available using this data bank. This is done by means of an individual site breakdown for responses obtained in the Ski Touring survey. The reader should note that the same types of breakdowns are available for the Downhill Skiing and Other Park Use Surveys.

3 - to provide a brief, one or two sentence summary of the data in each information type. This will serve to highlight differences between the surveys and provoke thought as to reasons for the various results. No attempt at exhaustive analysis or listing of implications will be attempted. This information will come out in later reports on specific topics, and in a technical appendix to the revised Regional Recreation Open Space Development Development Guide/Policy Plan.

An index of the Data Tables is provided immediately after this introduction. These Data Tables form the major portion of the report. Each of them is meant to stand on its own as to relevant statistics, qualifications and comments. The reader may wish to refer to the three questionnaires given at the end of the report when looking at the results in each Data Table. All the information in each questionnaire is reported in the Tables with the exception of the following:

Omitted Information	Reason for Omission
1 - Group Details	Too little response, wide range of responses. Data is available.
2 - Number of Downhill Runs, Most Used Slopes, Individual Ski Trail Use	Responses have yet to be adjusted for time spent at area up to the time of the interview. In addition, these data are best reported in map form, and the maps have yet to be drawn in final form.
3 - Closest Areas and Reasons for Comparisons Made	These areas have yet to be assigned Traffic Analysis Zones, thereby making analysis for awareness impossible.
4 - Main Activity, Number of Prior Visits - Other Park Use Survey	Data impractical to report without further breakdown by site. However, this information is available.

The final item in the report is a Tentative Schedule for Future Reports based on the winter and summer phases of the MRDS. Other data reports will be generated upon request from the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commisioners, Metropolitan Council Members, Implementing Agency staff, and other concerned parties, as time permits.

METHODOLOGY

As listed in the Tentative Schedule for Future Reports, an overall Methodology Report will be completed on or about June 15, 1979. However, since the data reported here result from a sample of the population of visitors at particular recreation sites, a few words on survey methodology are in order.

The study consisted of a personal interview of approximately ten minutes average length for the Downhill Skiing and Ski Touring surveys, and about four minutes for the Other Park Use survey. This interview took place on the particular site as the visitor was about to leave the site, or, in the case of multiple-entry areas or areas where everyone leaves at once, while the visitor was taking a break sometime during his or her recreation outing at the site. The sample was randomized as much as possible according to the following methods:

1 - Downhill Skiing: Respondents were selected as they passed a specific point in the ski area. To maximize the sample size, the next skier passing the point was chosen after the interviewer had fully completed the previous interview. Sample selection at the various areas was evenly divided between those leaving the area and those taking a break during their visit to the area.

2 - Ski Touring: Respondents were most often selected as they came off the end of a trail or prepared to leave the general area where they were skiing. The "next skier past the point" selection method was used here as well as in the few situations where a long trail corridor with multiple access points was being surveyed (e.g., the Luce Line, Minnehaha Parkway where the sampling was done at two points along the trails).

3 - Other Park Use: Selection methods varied the most in this survey, and depended a great deal on the particular area being surveyed. In all cases, the "next visitor past a point" method was used to select respondents. The variation occured in the location of the points (e.g., the Como Conservatory doorway, a particular point on a walking path, the boardwalk leading away from a skating rink).

In all cases, a concerted effort was made to assure that no large segment of the visitor population was procedurally excluded from the sample. In other words, in no case was there any reason to believe that a segment of the visitor population of skiers, skaters, etc., was not represented in that portion of the population going past the sample point.

The winter phase was conducted from Saturday, December 17, 1977, through Sunday, March 19, 1978. In general, each area was surveyed two weekend days and three weekdays. It should be noted that weather patterns during this period had different effects on different activities (e.g., great winter for downhill skiing, poor winter for snowmobiling), and different effects on different areas within each activity being surveyed (e.g., good ski touring in some of the outlying sheltered areas, poor ski touring at more urban, open areas). Weather information has, or will be, entered on each data file to allow control for this factor.

D A T A T A B L E S

METROPOLITAN RECREATION DEMAND STUDY

1977-78 On-Site Surveys (Winter Phase)

1. Downhill Skiing

2. Ski Touring

3. Other Park Uses

DATA TABLE INDEX

TABLE 1

BASIC SAMPLE PARAMETERS
(Downhill Skiing, Other Park Use)

A. Downhill Skiing

	SKI AREA/PARK	SYSTEM CLASSIFICATION[1]	ADMINISTRATION[2]	SAMPLE SIZE(n)
1.	TOTAL	-	-	1855
2.	AFTON ALPS	PSU	Private	385
3.	BATTLE CREEK	RP(SU)	Ramsey County	25
4.	BIRCH PARK	PSU	Private	205
5.	BUCK HILL	PSU	Private	168
6.	CEDAR HILLS	PSU	Private	50
7.	COMO PARK	RP(SU)	St.Paul	37
8.	HYLAND HILLS	RPR(SU)	HCPRD	177
9.	MARTHALER PARK	LSU	City of West St.Paul	11
10.	MOUNT FRONTENAC	PSU	Private	149
11.	POWDER RIDGE	PSU	Private	109
12.	SKI TONKA	PSU	Private	48
13.	SNOWCREST	PSU	Private	104
14.	THEODORE WIRTH	RP(SU)	Private	32
15.	TROLLHAUGEN	PSU	Private	200
16.	VILLA PARK	LSU	City of Roseville	13
17.	WILD MOUNTAIN	PSU	Private	142

B. Other Park Areas

1.	TOTAL	-	-	1477
2.	AFTON	SP	Minnesota DNR	1
3.	BATTLE CREEK-INDIAN MOUNDS	RP	Ramsey County-St.Paul	38
4.	BUNKER HILLS	RP	Anoka County	3
5.	COMO PARK	RP	City of St.Paul	431
6.	HARRIET ISLAND-CHEROKEE	RP	City of St.Paul	19
7.	HIDDEN FALLS-CROSBY FARMS	RP	City of St.Paul	38
8.	KELLER-PHALEN	RP	Ramsey County-St.Paul	64
9.	LUCE LINE TRAIL	ST	Minnesota DNR	1
10.	MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	RP	MPRB	593
11.	MINNEHAHA	RP	MPRB	131
12.	MINNEHAHA PARKWAY	TC	MPRB	20
13.	MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	ST	Minnesota DNR	5
14.	NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	RP	MPRB	80
15.	SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	RPR	Washington County	1
16.	THEODORE WIRTH	RP	MPRB	19
17.	WEST RIVER PARKWAY	RP	MPRB	13

[1] - SYSTEM CLASSES:

SP - State Park
RP - Regional Park
RPR - Regional Park Reserve
ST - State Trail
TC - Trail Corridor
SU - Special Use
PSU - Private Special Use
LSU - Local Special Use

[2] - ADMINISTRATIVE ABBREVIATIONS:

DNR - Department of Natural Resources
HCPRD - Hennepin County Park Reserve District
MPRB - Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

TABLE 2

BASIC SAMPLE PARAMETERS - SKI TOURING

SKI TOURING AREA	SYSTEM CLASS[1]	ADMINISTRATION[2]	SAMPLE SIZE(n)	PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS BY DAY OF WEEK	
				WEEKDAY	WEEKEND
1. TOTAL	-	-	904	33	67
2. AFTON	SP	Minnesota DNR	15	13	87
3. BATTLE CREEK	RP	Ramsey County	14	7	93
4. BAYLOR	RP	Carver County	17	0	100
5. BUNKER HILLS	RP	Anoka County	146	25	75
6. CARVER	RPR	HCPRD	62	53	47
7. CLEARY LAKE	RP	SHPAB	37	43	57
8. COMO	RP	City of St. Paul	10	30	70
9. ELM CREEK	RP	HCPRD	27	11	89
10. FORT SNELLING	SP	Minnesota DNR	38	3	97
11. HIDDEN FALLS-CROSBY	RP	City of St. Paul	8	88	12
12. HYLAND LAKE	RPR	HCPRD	80	34	66
13. KELLER-PHALEN	RP	Ramsey County-St.Paul	25	32	68
14. LAKE REBECCA	RPR	HCPRD	57	42	58
15. LEBANON HILLS	RP	Dakota County	30	47	53
16. LUCE LINE TRAIL	ST	Minnesota DNR	10	30	70
17. MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	RP	MPRB	36	42	58
18. MINNEHAHA	RP	MPRB	4	25	75
19. MINNEHAHA PARKWAY	TC	MPRB	7	100	0
20. MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	ST	Minnesota DNR	26	31	69
21. MORRIS BAKER	RPR	HCPRD	45	49	51
22. NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	RP	MPRB	26	27	73
23. SNOWCREST SKI AREA	PSU	Private	6	100	0
24. SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	RPR	Washington County	28	32	68
25. SPRING LAKE	RP	Dakota County	6	0	100
26. THEODORE WIRTH	RP	MPRB	92	27	73
27. WILLIAM O'BRIEN	SP	Minnesota DNR	26	0	100
28. WOOD LAKE NATURE CENTER	LSU	City of Richfield	26	65	35

1 - SYSTEM CLASSES:

SP - State Park
RP - Regional Park
RPR - Regional Park Reserve
ST - State Trail
TC - Trail Corridor
PSU - Private Special Use
LSU - Local Special Use

2 - ADMINISTRATIVE ABBREVIATIONS:

DNR - Department of Natural Resources
HCPRD - Hennepin County Park Reserve District
SHPAB - Scott-Hennepin Park Advisory Board
MPRB - Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

TABLE 3

ARRIVAL, DEPARTURE TIMES: TIME DISTRIBUTION OF USE (Percentages)

(Total Samples - Ski Touring, Downhill Skiing, Other Park Use)

ACTIVITY/STATUS	n	TIME PERIODS													
		8am-9	9-10	10-11	11-12	12-1pm	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-5	5-6	6-7	7-8	8-9	9-10pm
1. SKI TOURING	904														
Arriving[1]		2	9	14	11	14	18	18	9	3	1	0	1	0	0
Departing[2]		0	1	4	10	11	12	18	19	19	3	1	1	1	0
Remaining[3]		2	10	20	21	24	30	30	20	4	2	1	1	0	0
2. DOWNHILL SKIING	1855														
Arriving		7	19	17	13	10	8	6	4	6	5	4	1	0	0
Departing		0	0	0	0	2	5	10	13	16	13	10	12	7	12
Remaining		7	26	43	56	64	67	63	54	44	36	30	19	12	0
3. OTHER PARK USE	1477														
Arriving		1	3	4	9	15	16	16	14	11	6	4	1	0	0
Departing		0	1	3	3	11	15	14	18	16	10	5	3	1	0
Remaining		1	3	4	10	14	15	17	13	8	4	3	1	0	0

[1] - Percent Arriving in Time Period (totals to 100%)

[2] - Percent Departing in Time Period (totals to 100%)

[3] - Percent Remaining at End of Time Period (totals to more than 100%)

COMMENT: note that all three surveys peak at about the same time - between 1 and 3 in the afternoon. However, the peak use at downhill ski areas is approximately two-thirds of total use, while that at ski touring areas is less than a third, and that for other park uses is less than 20%. This results from a combination of long stays, a universally desirable time of day for all activities and probably the fact that money is charged for downhill ski areas. This type of information is of use mainly in determining turnover rates and real site capacities.

TABLE 4

TIME SPENT IN AREA

(Total Sample - All Three Surveys)

ACTIVITY	n	Mean Value (Min.)	Percent Staying: 1 hr or less	1 - 2 hrs	2 - 3 hrs	3 - 4 hrs	4 - 5 hrs	Over 5 hrs
Ski Touring	904	105	19	50	23	6	1	1
Downhill Skiing	1855	305	2	7	11	15	20	45
Other Park Uses	1477	60	69	26	4	1	0	0

COMMENT: the situation in Table 3 is magnified here - the length of stay for downhill skiing is three times that for ski touring and five times that for other park uses. The other park uses, being mostly in the urban area, appear to short term visits for skating, sliding,etc. The relatively low value for ski touring leads one to wonder about the necessity of long ski touring trails. However, a more fully-developed picture of trail use in the urban area will have to be done before this point can be considered further, i.e., the short stays at the urban areas may be dragging the average length of stay down disproportionately.

TABLE 5

TIME SPENT AT SKI TOURING AREA

(Total Sample, Selected Sites (n ≥ 25)

SKI TOURING	n	Mean Value(min.)	Percent[1] Staying:					
			1 hr. or less	1-2 hrs.	2-3 hrs.	3-4 hrs.	4-5 hrs.	>5 hrs
1. Total	904	105	19	50	23	6	1	1
2. Bunker Hills	146	120	10	53	23	10	3	1
3. Theodore Wirth	92	80	27	67	4	0	1	0
4. Hyland Lake	80	100	22	42	30	4	0	1
5. Carver	62	130	10	39	35	10	6	0
6. Lake Rebecca	57	110	9	58	28	4	0	2
7. Morris Baker	45	125	11	31	44	13	0	0
8. Fort Snelling	38	90	21	61	18	0	0	0
9. Cleary Lake	37	100	19	57	19	3	3	0
10. Mpls. Chain of Lakes	36	70	53	33	11	3	0	0
11. Lebanon Hills	30	90	23	57	20	0	0	0
12. South Washington County	28	90	21	68	7	0	4	0
13. Elm Creek	27	130	11	37	30	15	7	0
14. Minnesota Valley Trail	26	120	15	31	46	8	0	0
15. Nokomis-Hiawatha	26	95	35	42	8	12	4	0
16. William O'Brien	26	120	8	46	38	8	0	0
17. Wood Lake	26	80	31	58	12	0	0	0
18. Keller-Phalen	25	90	28	52	16	4	0	0

1 - Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

COMMENT: this Table shows the kind of variation alluded to in the comments on Table 3. Lengths of stay range between 70 minutes at the Minneapolis Chain-of-Lakes to 130 minutes at Elm Creek and Carver. In other words, skiing in the cities is a short outing, not unlike that of the other park uses, while the outer areas have different experiences involving a two-hour-plus stay. However, two hours is still a relatively shore outing compared to downhill skiing and some of the summer activities studied in previous years. It is also interesting to note that only 5 areas have more than 10 percent of their visitors staying more than three hours.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN GROUP

(Total Sample - All Three Surveys)

ACTIVITY	n	Percent of Visitors in Groups of:						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	>6
Ski Touring	904	30	39	13	9	4	3	2
Downhill Skiing	1855	16	30	15	13	6	5	15
Other Park Uses	1477	43	34	10	7	3	1	2

TABLE 7

MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION

(Total Sample - All Three Surveys)

ACTIVITY	n	Percent of Visitors Arriving By:					
		Car	Dropped Off	Public Transit	Charter Bus	Foot	Other
Ski Touring	904	93	1	0	0	3	3 (on skis)
Downhill Skiing	1855	80	10	0	8	1	1
Other Park Uses	1477	65	1	1	0	32	1

COMMENT: Table 6 - the differences in group size show ski touring in the regional parks to be a small group activity, probably influenced by the large number of young adults presently participating in the activity(see Table 33). The large percentage of groups over 6 in number at downhill ski areas shows the influence of bus trips from outside the Metropolitan Area to several of the ski areas, most notably Afton Alps. The other park use figures again show the predominance of short visits by one or two people to an area closeby.

Table 7 - nothing surprising here - people go ski touring almost exclusively by means of the private automobile, a third of the other park users travel to the parks by foot, and children being dropped off by their parents as well as charter busloads of people play a significant role in downhill skiing access. One pertinent question is: will ski touring follow the path of downhill skiing and begin to come by other means than car, or will it stay a low-group size activity requiring relatively more parking support?

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN GROUP - SKI TOURING

(Total Sample, Selected Sites (n ≥ 25))

SKI TOURING AREA	n	Percent[1] of skiers in groups of: 1	2	3	4	5	6	6
1. TOTAL	904	30	39	13	9	4	3	2
2. BUNKER HILLS	146	19	45	10	14	4	3	5
3. THEODORE WIRTH	92	32	46	12	4	5	0	1
4. HYLAND LAKE	80	30	41	15	8	1	4	1
5. CARVER	62	21	27	15	11	8	3	15
6. LAKE REBECCA	57	32	37	9	14	3	3	2
7. MORRIS BAKER	45	36	40	7	7	2	0	8
8. FORT SNELLING	38	32	34	24	8	2	0	0
9. CLEARY LAKE	37	38	35	16	5	0	5	1
10. MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	36	67	25	5	3	0	0	0
11. LEBANON HILLS	30	17	47	23	7	3	3	0
12. SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	28	36	46	7	7	0	0	4
13. ELM CREEK	27	30	30	18	11	7	0	4
14. MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	26	27	46	12	4	4	7	0
15. NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	26	35	35	19	8	3	0	0
16. WILLIAM O'BRIEN	26	31	41	8	12	4	4	0
17. WOOD LAKE	26	31	38	19	4	4	0	4
18. KELLER-PHALEN	25	40	24	16	16	4	0	0

[1] - Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

COMMENT: within the ski touring activity, there does not seem to be a pattern of group size according to park location. Perhaps there are two factors working here - a tendency for the more urban parks to have short visits, more often on foot, and more often by a solitary person because they are close and more spontaneous in nature; while some of the more rural parks have longer visits, generally by car, and, perhaps, more solitary because of a desire for solitude. It would seem that a balanced system would have to provide for both.

TABLE 9

SKILL LEVEL BY MEANS OF SELF-EVALUATION

(Total Sample - Ski Touring and Downhill Skiing)

ACTIVITY	n	Percent Rating Themselves As:[1]					
		Novice	N-I[2]	Intermediate	I-A[3]	Advanced	Don't Know
Ski Touring	904	28	5	40	7	16	4
Downhill Skiing	1855	20	4	46	7	22	1

[1]Those hesitant about the meaning of each level were given a cue such as;
Novice - I still have a good deal of work to do on stopping, turning, and really getting control of my skis.
Intermediate - I have most of the basic stopping and turning skills, but still have a ways to go in getting control over the more complex maneuvers.
Advanced - I know and can execute all the basic skills and really feel confortable with myself on most any hill.

[2]Between Novice and Intermediate.

[3]Between Intermediate and Advanced.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF YEARS INVOLVED IN ACTIVITY

(Total Sample - Ski Touring and Downhill Skiing)

ACTIVITY	n	Percent Involved in Activity For:								
		1 yr	2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs	6 yrs	7 yrs	8 yrs	>8 yrs
Ski Touring	904	26	18	22	13	8	5	2	2	4
Downhill Skiing	1855	20	16	13	12	8	4	4	4	19

COMMENT: Table 9 - a comparison can be made here between the two skiing activities. There appears to be a generally lower self-rating in ski touring, the newer of the two activities. There is also a larger proportion of those who don't know which class they belong in, probably due to the lesser emphasis on lessons and starting skills in ski touring. There is nevertheless a large proportion of intermediates in ski touring. Considering the relatively new status of the activity, this may be one of the reasons why there are some complaints about people backing up on hills and curves on the intermediate and advanced trails.

Table 10- the comparison is interesting here, also. Ski touring is newer and appears to be on a steadily increasing path. The dip in the progression at 2-years is probably due to the fact that the previous season(1976-1977) was generally bad for ski touring. It is interesting to note that while there are alot of "old timers" involved in downhill skiing, it seems to be winning new participants at a fairly steady rate.

TABLE 11

SKILL LEVEL BY MEANS OF SELF-EVALUATION - SKI TOURING BREAKDOWN

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (n≥25))

SKI TOURING AREA	n	Percent[1,4] Rating Themselves As:					
		Novice	N-I[2]	Intermediate	I-A[3]	Advanced	Don't Know
1. TOTAL	904	28	5	40	7	16	5
2. BUNKER HILLS	146	27	3	50	4	12	4
3. THEODORE WIRTH	92	29	3	43	9	12	4
4. HYLAND LAKE	80	21	8	38	5	25	4
5. CARVER	62	34	3	45	6	8	3
6. LAKE REBECCA	57	10	5	43	10	32	0
7. MORRIS BAKER	45	29	2	41	4	20	4
8. FORT SNELLING	38	39	8	37	8	8	0
9. CLEARY LAKE	37	27	8	38	11	16	0
10. MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	36	28	3	36	6	25	3
11. LEBANON HILLS	30	30	20	37	0	13	0
12. SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	28	25	4	46	7	14	4
13. ELM CREEK	27	18	4	23	11	22	22
14. MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	26	38	4	27	12	19	0
15. NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	26	50	4	27	4	15	0
16. WILLIAM O'BRIEN	26	19	4	35	12	27	3
17. WOOD LAKE	26	27	12	38	0	4	19
18. KELLER-PHALEN	25	44	0	48	0	0	8

[1] - Those hesitant about the meaning of each level were given a cue such as:

Novice - I still have a good deal of work to do on stopping, turning, and really getting control of my skis.
Intermediate - I have most of the basic stopping and turning skills, but still have a ways to go in getting control over the more complex maneuvers.
Advanced - I know and can execute all the basic skills and really feel comfortable with myself on most any hill.

[2] - Between Novice and Intermediate. [3] - Between Intermediate and Advanced. [4] -Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

COMMENT: there is a good deal of variation between the parks, ranging from relatively few novices and nearly a third advanced skiers at Lake Rebecca to half novices at Nokomis-Hiawatha and as low as 4% advanced skiers at Wood Lake. The presence of rental skis at several of the areas appears to have some effect - the generally higher proportion of advanced skiers is at places that don't rent. This again has system implications - some places are necessary for those who have their own equipment and don't want to be bothered by those learning the activity with rental equipment.

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF YEARS INVOLVED IN SKI TOURING
(Total Sample, Selected Areas (n ≥ 25))

SKI TOURING AREA	n	Percent[1] Involved in Ski Touring for:								
		1 year	2 yr.	3 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	6 yr.	7 yr.	8 yr.	≥8 years
1. TOTAL	904	26	18	22	13	8	5	2	2	4
2. BUNKER HILLS	146	30	16	28	11	6	1	0	3	5
3. THEODORE WIRTH	92	34	16	16	4	7	12	5	1	5
4. HYLAND LAKE	80	26	18	18	14	6	6	2	6	4
5. CARVER	62	26	23	23	16	5	2	3	3	0
6. LAKE REBECCA	57	16	12	32	16	10	4	4	0	6
7. MORRIS BAKER	45	38	7	20	10	16	0	0	2	7
8. FORT SNELLING	38	24	10	21	24	13	5	0	3	0
9. CLEARY LAKE	37	30	22	16	16	11	3	3	0	0
10. MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	36	31	19	17	19	8	3	0	0	3
11. LEBANON HILLS	30	27	17	23	23	3	3	0	3	1
12. SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	28	21	32	18	7	18	4	0	0	0
13. ELM CREEK	27	26	18	22	15	0	7	0	4	8
14. MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	26	35	19	12	15	8	4	0	0	7
15. NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	26	42	15	15	4	12	8	0	0	4
16. WILLIAM O'BRIEN	26	12	15	23	15	15	15	4	0	1
17. WOOD LAKE	26	42	15	31	8	0	0	4	0	0
18. KELLER-PHALEN	25	48	8	24	16	4	0	0	0	0

[1] - Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

COMMENT: again, there are few patterns between sites. However, larger proportions of first-year people show up at the close-in areas(e.g., Keller, Nokomis-Hiawatha, and Wood Lake each have over 40% of their users in the "1st year" class).

TABLE 13

DOWNHILL SKIING-FACTORS MAKING THE VISIT MORE AND LESS SATISFYING

(Total Sample - n=1855)

GENERAL FACTORS	Percent[1] Responding That Factor Made Visit More Satisfying	Percent[1] Responding That Factor Made Visit Less Satisfying
0. Nothing, Non-related Answers	35	55
1. Weather (good or bad)	18	7
2. Size of Area (# of runs, length of runs, etc.)	10	6
3. General Quality (good or bad)	25	4
4. Grooming, Snow Conditions	29	16
5. # People, Presence or Absence of Crowds	17	8
6. Chalet and Its Services	11	6
7. Lifts, Tows	11	8
8. Ski Rentals	1	2
9. Ski School, Instructions	4	1
10. Ticket Prices, Special Rates	3	2
11. Area Design, Layout	6	3

[1] Percentages Total to more than 100 due to multiple answers from each respondent.

COMMENT: once one gets past those who don't notice anything particularly good or bad about their visit(35% and 55% no answer, respectively), and those who like or dislike the particular weather conditions of the day, one finds that grooming, crowding, the chalet, the lift and tow system, and the general size of the area are the items that ski area quality appear to hinge upon. It was rather frustrating, at times, to elicit a better response from those who said the area was "generally nice"(25%). The type of information gathered here should prove especially useful in determining the probable success of any new or redeveloped ski area - the figures are there as to what skiers think is important.

Concerning the classes of factors listed in the left-hand column, each of these has ten subcategories, such that additional detail can be called out of the category, if necessary. For example, Category 11- Area Design/Layout- has ten specific comment categories within it that contain specific responses about area design and layout. By using this method and coding multiple specific answers for each respondent, little detail is lost in translating open-ended responses into frequencies and percentages. This will be true of all the open-ended responses included in MRDS questionnaires.

TABLE 14

OTHER PARK USE-FACTORS MAKING THE VISIT MORE AND LESS SATISFYING

(Total Sample - n=1477)

GENERAL FACTORS	Percent[1] Responding That Factor Made Vist More Satisfying	Percent[1] Responding That Factor Made Visit Less Satisfying
1. Nothing, Non-related Answers	16	63
2. Weather	24	3
3. Natural Amenities - General	13	1
4. Natural Amenities - Specific	9	0
5. Presence/Lack of Peace, Quiet, Solitude	8	4
6. Specific Items - Ice Rinks	10	5
7. Specific Items - Paths, Trails	20	12
8. Specific Items - Sliding Hills	2	0
9. Specific Items - Como Zoo	6	5
10. Specific Items - Como Conservatory	13	2
11. Other Specific Attractions	3	0
12. Support Facilities, Services	7	4
13. Maintenance	4	4
14. # of People - Absence or Presence of Crowds	6	2
15. Other People's Behavior	5	0
16. Other (General, non-specific answers, positive or negative)	14	4

[1]Percentages do not total to 100 due to multiple responses from each respondent.

COMMENT: concerning the other park uses, natural amenities and specific facility characteristics seem to dominate once the usual "nothing" and"weather" responses are out of the way. The high percentage of "nothing" answers to the negative factors (63%) is quite interesting: more breakdown by activity would probably aid here. It is also interesting to note that only one factor - paths/trails - elicited a negative response of more than 10 percent.

TABLE 15

FACTORS MAKING THE VISIT MORE SATISFYING - SKI TOURING BREAKDOWN

(Total Sample, Selected Sites (urban, urbanizing, rural)

GENERAL FACTORS	Total (n=904)	Percent[1] Responding with Factor at: Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
0 - Nothing, Non-related Answers	12	8	16	11
1 - Natural Amenities	30	33	39	21
2 - Weather/Snow Conditions	31	41	31	37
3 - Trail Layout/Length/Variety	26	54	34	21
4 - Specific Design Features (set track, one-way, no road crossings, etc.)	3	3	3	6
5 - Rules/Regulations/Procedures	3	2	2	2
6 - Support Facilities/Programs (parking, rentals, lessons, etc.)	18	5	18	32
7 - Trail Maintenance/Conditions	15	13	12	31
8 - Lack of Crowding	21	26	12	16
9 - Other (non-specific positive answers, low frequency responses, etc.)	38	38	45	32

1- Percentages do not total to 100 due to multiple answers from each respondent.

COMMENT: for some reason, it was easier to get answers out of ski tourers concerning the things that made their visits more enjoyable. Natural Amenities rated very high (30% overall), as did Trail Layout/Length/Variety (26%). Concerning the individual parks, its interesting to note the responses at Theodore Wirth under Natural Amenities(33%), Trail Layout(54%), and Lack of Crowding(26%). In this case, an urban park does quite well in comparison to its more rural and larger neighbors that might be expected to exhibit a higher proportion of these three responses. A further analysis of all the urban, urbanizing, and rural parks may provide some insight into the variety necessary to the regional park system.

TABLE 16

FACTORS MAKING THE VISIT LESS SATISFYING - SKI TOURING BREAKDOWN

(Total Sample, Selected Sites (urban, urbanizing, rural))

GENERAL FACTORS	Total (n=904)	Percent[1] Responding with Factor at: Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
0 - Nothing, Non-related Answers	49	62	62	44
1 - Natural Amenities	1	2	1	3
2 - Weather/Snow Conditions	15	5	8	15
3 - Trail Layout/Length/Variety	9	2	3	6
4 - Specific Design Features (no set track, two-way, road crossings, etc.)	5	3	5	6
5 - Rules/Regulations/Procedures	7	12	4	3
6 - Support Facilities/Programs (poor parking, rentals, etc.)	13	15	9	26
7 - Trail Maintenance/Conditions	16	16	17	16
8 - Crowding	2	2	3	0
9 - Other (low frequency responses)	1	3	0	2

1-Percentages do not total to 100 due to multiple answers from each respondent

---

COMMENT: again, it seems more difficult to get negative responses from people than positive ones. Only weather, support facilities, and trail maintenance seem to elicit displeasure from more than 10% of the skiers. This data will obviously have to be broken down by type of day, weather conditions, and user characteristics. It seems odd that Carver's highest factor for "more satisfying" (Support Facilities/Programs: 32%) is also its highest factor for "less satisfying"(26%). Overall, this Table serves to show what can make a skiing facility more attractive and, if aggregated in the correct way, could provide answers to some of the questions asked when a new trail is being proposed.

TABLE 17

FACTORS SEEN ACTING AS CONSTRAINTS ON DOWNHILL SKIING PARTICIPATION

(Total Sample - n=1855)

GENERAL FACTORS	Percent Responding With Factors
Ski as often as they would like?	
Yes	39
No, Not Sure	61
Factors seen as "most important" constraint[1]	
a. Lack of time	18
b. Lack of equipment	0
c. Lack of challenging areas	0
d. Hours at ski areas	0
e. Costs/Lack of money	13
f. Lack of transportation	9
g. Other interests/responsibilities	15
h. Support facilities at ski areas	0
i. Other reasons	6

1 - Percentages total to percentage answering "no" or "not sure" to whether they ski as often as they would like.

Comment - As always, when asked what keeps them from skiing more often, the most frequent initial response is "Lack of time". This, of course, is really the same as saying either "Other Interests and Responsibilities" or "Lack of Transportation" or some other such answer that is the real reason why a person doesn't participate more or at all. In the case of downhill skiing, "Other Interests", "Costs", and "Lack of Transportation" are the three main reasons. It is interesting to note that among skiers, "Lack of Challenge" at existing areas does not keep them from skiing more, nor do the facilities or hours at ski areas. The crux of the matter may be costs and transportation.

TABLE 18

FACTORS SEEN ACTING AS CONSTRAINTS ON SKI TOURING PARTICIPATION

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

	Total (n-904)	Percent Responding with Factor at: Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
Ski as often as they would like?				
Yes	42	28	32	32
No, Not Sure	58	72	68	68
Factor seen as "most important" constraint [1]				
a. Lack of time	24	40	35	20
b. Lack of equipment	1	0	2	0
c. Too Few Ski Areas	2	2	1	6
d. Hours at Ski Areas	1	0	1	3
e. Entry Fees	0	0	0	0
f. Lack of Transportation	1	2	1	0
g. Other Interest/Responsibilities	17	13	17	24
h. Other Reasons	10	13	11	15

1 - Percentages total to percentage answering "no" or "not sure" to whether they ski as often as they would like.

COMMENT: the only thing surprising about this table is the lack of constraints mentioned that are capable of being solved by planning and management! The ski touring population, being as car-oriented as it is, does not sense a transportation restraint. A lack of capacity does not seem to be a problem, either: only two percent overall said "Too Few Ski Areas" was an important constraint to them. It is interesting to note that the highest percentage response to a manageable constraint - "Too Few Ski Areas", was mentioned more often at Carver - the most rural of the three examples(6%). Perhaps an aggregation of the more rural ski facilities will show that this particular type of area draws a visitor that senses a capacity problem for the type of ski touring experience he or she wants.

TABLE 19

REASON FOR CHOOSING AREA VISITED OVER OTHER AREAS

A. DOWNHILL SKIING (n=1855)

MOST IMPORTANT REASON	Percent Answering With This Reason
1. Always come here	15
2. Close/Convenient	36
3. Other's choice/Recommendations	21
4. Chalet services	0
5. Rentals	0
6. Ski School/Instructions	3
7. Ticket prices/special rates	9
8. Lack of crowds/short lines	2
9. Curiosity	4
10. No particular reason	4
11. Other reasons	6

B. OTHER PARK USE (n=1477)

1. Always come here	4
2. Close/Convenient	57
3. Others choice/Recommendations	4
4. Scenery/Natural Environment	9
5. Ice rink facilities	10
6. Zoo/Conservatory	1
7. Winter carnival events	4
8. Sliding hill characteristics	0
9. Path/trail characteristics	2
10. Peace, solitude/Lack of crowds	3
11. Maintenance/Operations/Patrol	0
12. Miscellaneous specific answers	2
13. Miscellaneous general answers	4

Comment - Habit, convenience, and other's recommendations play a large part in deciding where to go skiing on a given day. Ticket prices or special rate days have their desired effect, also. It will be interesting to cross-tabulate those answering "Close" with the measures of time and distance incorporated with each interview. We should be able to see what "Close" means after this is done. One nagging qualification here - the initial factors that made the person get into the habit of going to an area or made he or she consider an area "Close" for the type of skiing they were after, will remain somewhat masked by this question.

TABLE 20

REASON FOR CHOOSING AREA VISITED OVER OTHER AREAS - SKI TOURING

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

MOST IMPORTANT REASON	Total (n=904)	Percent[1] Responding with Reason(s) at: Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
a. Always Come Here	5	5	8	5
b. Close/Convenient	52	61	49	37
c. Others' Choice/Recommendation	10	5	10	13
d. Natural Amenities	3	0	5	2
e. Trail Layout	7	9	8	6
f. Specific Trail Features	1	4	1	2
g. Maintenance	0	0	0	0
h. Rules and Regulations	1	0	0	3
i. Support Facilities/Services	2	2	4	5
j. Lack of Crowding	1	1	1	0
k. Other Specific Reasons	16	12	12	26
l. No Reason	2	0	1	2

[1] - Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

COMMENT: the same predominance of habit and convenience occur in ski touring. However, it is interesting to note that as the areas get further out, the "close" percentage drops off in favor of other more activity or site-oriented factors. Perhaps the correct aggregation of areas here will prove enlightening as to what causes people to choose a particular ski touring area.

TABLE

A. SOURCES OF INFORMATION AR[illegible] NEW SKI TOURING AREAS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas [Urban, Urbanizing, Rural])

GENERAL INFORMATION SOURCE	TOTAL (n=904)	Percent [1] Citing Each Source at:		
		THEODORE WIRTH (n=92)	BUNKER HILLS (n=146)	CARVER (n=62)
1. None, Don't Know	7	7	8	8
2. Other People/Skiers	41	49	51	40
3. Radio/Television Advertising	1	1	1	3
4. Newspaper Advertising	21	20	20	23
5. Specific Brochures/Publications	19	18	12	23
6. Other Media (Yellow Pages, Ski Shows, ads in general, etc.)	5	3	7	5
7. Ski Shops	3	1	1	0
8. Ski Clubs/Organizations	5	5	5	2
9. Other Sources	5	2	2	6

B. SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT NEW DOWNHILL SKI AREAS

(Total Sample - n=1855)

GENERAL INFORMATION SOURCE	Percent [1] Responding with Each Source
1. None, Don't Know	7
2. Other People/Skiers	50
3. Radio Advertising	10
4. Television Advertising	5
5. Newspaper Advertising	11
6. Ski Magazines (general or specific)	4
7. Area Brochures/Pamphlets/Maps	8
8. Other Media	5
9. Ski Shops	4
10. Ski Clubs/Organizations/Teams	3
11. Other Sources	3

[1]Percentages may not total to 100 due to multiple answers from each respondent.

COMMENT: As always, other people and skiers seem to be the most important source of information about new places to recreate. A continuing problem involves where the "other person" finds these things out! It's interesting to note the importance of radio and newspaper ads with downhill skiing, and the heavy importance of newspaper advertising and site specific brochures with ski touring. The latter is especially true at Carver, where brochures on the Park Reserve and the overall ski touring program are available.

TABLE 21

A. RATING OF SPECIFIC SKI TOURING FACILITIES/SERVICES

(Total Sample Only - n=904)

FACILITY/SERVICE	Number Giving A Rating	Percent Rating the Facility/Service as: More Than Adequate	Adequate	Less Than Adequate
Rental Equipment	98	33	57	10
Rest Rooms	169	19	75	7
Food-Beverage Service	61	20	77	3
Chalet	254	40	57	3
Rest Stops	228	28	65	7
Trail Markings	699	26	57	17
Maintenance	746	23	64	13
Lessons	12	42	58	0
Parking	788	23	75	2

B. RATING OF SPECIFIC DOWNHILL SKIING FACILITIES/SERVICES

Slopes/Hills	1824	21	74	5
Lift/Tow System	1834	26	62	12
Rental Equipment	555	28	60	12
Ski School/Instruction	243	58	39	3
Food-Beverage Service	1326	19	71	10
Warming/Relaxing Areas	1683	26	66	8
Restrooms	1377	10	74	16
Parking	1554	15	75	10

Comment: When asked about specific items at the ski area, generally aroudn ten percent gave "less than adequate" as a response. The facilities causing the most displeasure among those who responded at downhill areas were restrooms, the lifts and the rental equipment. Parking and the food and beverage service also caused complaints. In general, the best received facility/program is the ski school. Standardized training and certification probably have a lot to do with this. Other "more than adequate" ratings hovered around 25%. Specific crosstabulations will help pinpoint problems here.

When one considers "less than adequate" ratings for ski touring, trailmarkings, maintenance and rental equipment provided the most frequent responses. Ski lessons and the chalet seemed to effect the most positive responses (42 and 40 percent, respectively). However, the former suffers from small sample size and the latter may prove to be very specific to certain areas (e.g., Bunker Hills and The Seasons Restaurant).

TABLE 23

A. REACTION TO ENTRY/PARKING FEE

(Total Sample, Areas Charging Fees)

SKI TOURING AREA	n	Percent[1] Considering Parking/Entry Fee to be:					
		Very Low	Somewhat Low	About Right	Somewhat High	Very High	No Opinion
Total	387	1	5	52	17	0	29
Lake Rebecca	57	0	5	39	7	0	49
Morris T. Baker	45	0	2	38	9	0	51
Hyland Lake	80	0	6	44	12	0	38
Carver	62	0	6	48	21	0	24
Elm Creek	27	0	7	70	11	0	11
Cleary Lake	37	3	3	57	5	3	30
Fort Snelling	38	3	0	16	5	0	76
William O'Brien	26	8	8	62	8	0	15
Afton	15	0	7	60	7	0	26

1 - Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

B. REACTION TO TICKET PRICES-DOWNHILL SKIING
(Total Sample - n=1855)

Scale Items - "Do you consider the ticket prices to be:	Percent Responding With Each Scale Item:
Very Low	2
Somewhat Low	6
About Right	55
Somewhat High	22
Very High	2
No Opinion/Can't Say	13

Comment: The reaction to fees is somewhat predictable with around a quarter of the downhill prices rated as high and 20% or less of the skiing entry fees seen as too high. There do seem to be a lot of "No Opinion" given to the ski touring question. No explanation is offered as of yet. In the downhill areas, especially, there was much qualification of each answer with a statement to the effect "compared with other places, the prices are __." There was no great problem with the ticket prices, but responses to other questions, e.g., constraints to more participation (Table 17), indicate a bit of a problem with the cost of skiing.

TABLE 24

SKI ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP - SKI TOURING

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

ORGANIZATION TYPE	Percent Belonging to Various Organization Types at:			
	Total (n=904)	Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
1. Local Clubs (school, town, employee, etc.)	5	3	8	0
2. General Ski Touring or Outing Club (North Star, Blizzard, Minntour, etc.)	6	8	2	5
3. Ski Team	2	0	3	0
4. Environmental Organization (Sierra Club, Audobon, etc.)	2	0	1	5
5. Other Specific Organizations	1	3	0	2

B. SKI ORGANIZATION MEMEBERSHIP-DOWNHILL SKIING

(Total Sample: n=1855)

ORGANIZATION TYPE	Percent Belonging to Each Organization Type
1. Local Clubs (school, town, employee, etc.)	9
2. General Skiing or Outing Club (Blizzard, National Ski Patrol, U.S. Ski Patrol, U.S. Ski Ass'n., etc.)	8
3. Ski Team	4
4. Environmental Organizations	0
5. Specific Ski School	1
6. Other Organizations	0

COMMENT: somewhat less than 20% of downhill skiers belong to some type of ski club or organization(multiple responses make the figures non-additive). Fewer ski tourers appear to belong to an organization. Both activities have a high proportion of their organization members in local clubs or teams. Less than 10% to general purpose, broad-based skiing organizations in either activity. However, this percentage may be somewhat surprising to some who feel the organizations represent a negligible proportion of the skiing population.

TABLE 25

OTHER WINTER ACTIVITIES
(By Interview Type)

Interview Type	n	% of Respondents Participating in Activity						
		Downhill Skiing	Ski Touring	Snow-Mobiling	Ice Fishing	Ice Skating	Snow-Shoeing	Ski Jumping
DOWNHILL SKIING	1855	100	41	36	28	60	11	2
SKI TOURING	904	39	100	11	23	59	19	1
OTHER PARK USE	1477	34	40	13	23	56	12	-

COMMENT: participation in other winter activities seems to be relatively stable except for ski touring where generally more participants are also snowshoers(19%) and downhill skiing where relatively more people are also snowmobilers(36%). In any case, it is apparent that there are few people who are "one-activity oriented" in the winter. Incidentally, it looks like there is not a particularly large ski jumping population out there - many of the positive responses appeared to be given somewhat tongue-in-cheek!

TABLE 26

RESIDENCE CHARACTERISTICS

(Total Sample - All Three Surveys)

CHARACTERISTICS	Percent Responding With Each Class in the Following Surveys: Ski Touring (n=904)	Downhill Skiing (n=1855)	Other Park Use (n=1477)
A. Housing Type			
1. Single Family House	71	75	64
2. Duplex-Fourplex	9	5	13
3. Condominium - Townhouse	2	3	2
4. Apartment	14	12	18
5. Mobile Home	1	1	1
6. Other	3	4	2
B. Years at Present Address			
1. Less than 1	21	23	26
2. 1 to 3	28	20	22
3. 4 to 6	14	15	12
4. 7 to 10	11	12	10
5. Over 10	26	30	30
C. Years in Metro Area			
1. Less than 1	4	3	6
2. 1 to 3	11	5	9
3. 4 to 6	10	7	9
4. 7 to 10	10	9	9
5. Over 10	62	52	62
6. Do Not Live in Metro Area	3	24	5

Comments: There seems to be little difference between the three surveys on housing characteristics, although other park users seem to come from a slightly wider variety of housing types. All three activities have a rather mobile population, with nearly half of the population having lived in their present home for less than three years. A strong 60% of the population in each survey has lived in the Metropolitan Area over ten years. It will be interesting to check these figures against those used to measure awareness of other areas. The downhill skiing population is somewhat skewed by the large number of non-metropolitan residents.

TABLE 27

TYPES OF HOUSING - SKI TOURERS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

HOUSING TYPE	Percent of Skiers Residing in Each Housing Type at:			
	Total (n-904)	Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
Single Family House	71	57	82	71
Duplex - Fourplex	9	21	5	8
Condominium - Townhouse	2	2	3	0
Apartment	14	14	6	16
Mobile Home	1	0	3	0
Other	3	6	1	5

COMMENT: within the ski touring population, it is interesting to note the relatively low single-family house percentage at Theodore Wirth. Duplexes and fourplexes seem to be the major housing type taking percentage points away from the single family houses. This is not surprising for the city, but the 16% apartment rate at Carver is somewhat surprising. Carver origin statistics will have to be checked to see where this reservoir of apartment dwellers is. Overall, it will be interesting to aggregate the population on a urban-urbanizing-rural park basis for analysis.

TABLE 28

A. YEARS LIVED AT PRESENT ADDRESS - SKI TOURERS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (Urban, Urbanizing, Rural))

YEARS AT PRESENT ADDRESS	Percent[1] in Various Year Classes at: TOTAL (n=904)	THEODORE WIRTH (n=92)	BUNKER HILLS (n=146)	CARVER (n=62)
Less than 1	21	28	12	23
1 to 3	28	36	28	35
4 to 6	14	9	14	15
7 to 10	11	9	16	8
Over 10	26	18	29	19

B. YEARS LIVED IN METROPOLITAN AREA - SKI TOURERS

YEARS IN METRO AREA				
Less than 1	4	4	0	2
1 to 3	11	16	8	15
4 to 6	10	12	10	18
7 to 10	10	14	13	6
Over 10	61	52	69	55
Do not live in Metro Area	3	1	1	5

1 - Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

COMMENT: again, the figures are self-explanatory and not too surprising. The ski touring population at Bunker Hills seems to be a good deal more established in the area than those at the other two parks. Further analysis will have to be done on all parks surveyed to see if there is a steady urban-urbanizing-rural pattern to residency patterns and their resulting effect on awareness and recreation participation.

TABLE 29

OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

(Total Samples - All Three Surveys)

CHARACTERISTICS	Percent Responding With Each Class in the Following Surveys: Ski Touring (n=904)	Downhill Skiing (n=1855)	Other Park Use (n=1477)
A. Compensation Type			
1. Self-Employed	7	9	9
2. Salaried	47	25	34
3. Hourly Wages	21	26	21
4. Commission	2	3	3
5. Retired	2	1	9
6. No Paying Job	19	31	22
7. Other	2	5	2
B. Primary Occupational Category			
1. Clerical	6	4	7
2. Technical	9	5	8
3. Professional	48	24	34
4. Skilled Labor	8	6	13
5. Unskilled Labor	4	2	6
6. Student	11	47	21
7. Homemaker	9	5	7
8. Other	5	7	4
C. Work Time Class			
1. Weekdays Only	40	23	35
2. Some Evenings/Weekends	34	25	26
3. Mostly Evenings/Weekends	8	14	9
4. Not Presently Employed	10	28	22
5. Other Categories	8	10	8
D. Annual Gross Household Income(s)			
1. Less than 5000	4	2	6
2. 5000 - 10000	8	7	12
3. 10000 - 15000	15	10	18
4. 15000 - 20000	17	12	17
5. 20000 - 25000	19	13	12
6. 25000 - 30000	9	10	8
7. Over 30000	19	22	12
8. Didn't Know	6	17	9
9. Refused	2	2	5

TABLE 30

TYPE OF COMPENSATION - SKI TOURERS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

COMPENSATION TYPE	Percent in Compensation Class By:			
	Total (n=904)	Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n-62)
Self-Employed	7	5	5	8
Salaried	47	45	47	44
Hourly Wages	21	26	21	19
Commission	2	2	3	0
Retired	2	0	2	0
No Paying Job	19	21	18	24
Other	2	1	4	5

COMMENT: Table 29(previous page) - there are a few patterns emerging from the occupational characteristics of those interviewed in the three surveys. There seems to be a relatively high proportion of salaried professionals involved in ski touring and other park uses while those with no paying job(mostly students) are the predominant class at downhill ski areas. The low proportion of "weekday only" workers (40% or under in all cases) is also influenced by the number of students involved. However, it is interesting to note that odd job hours can have a beneficial effect on recreation capacity. A move toward this situation would aid recreation facility utilization in many ways. The last category - Income - shows a slightly higher average for downhill skiing. Otherwise, the income distribution is spread pretty well for each activity. Of course, the lower income classes are generally underrepresented. Analysis of specific sites should show up some differences here.

Table 30 - within the ski touring activity, there is little variation between the three parks concerning compensation type. Each park distribution holds closely to the ski touring survey average.

TABLE 31

A. OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY - SKI TOURERS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

PRIMARY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY	Percent[1] in Each Occupation Category at:			
	Total (n=904)	Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
Clerical	6	8	8	6
Technical	9	9	4	6
Professional	48	49	57	50
Skilled Labor	8	11	8	10
Unskilled Labor	4	2	1	5
Student	11	14	11	10
Homemaker	9	5	10	10
Other	5	2	1	3

B. GENERAL TIME WORKED

WORK TIME CLASSES				
Weekdays Only	40	43	41	35
Some Evenings/Weekends	34	29	36	37
Mostly Evenings/Weekends	8	8	5	6
Not Presently Employed	10	13	11	13
Other Categories	8	7	7	9

[1] - Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding .

COMMENT: again, little variation except for the relatively high proportion of professionals skiing at Bunker Hills. There is also a smaller proportion of "weekday only" workers at Carver. In general, these factors are relatively constant over the three parks. Further will again be aimed at discovering a pattern between parks with different characteristics and locations.

TABLE 32

HOUSEHOLD INCOME - SKI TOURERS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

ANNUAL GROSS HOUSEHOLD INCOME(S)	Percent[1] in Each Income Class at:			
	Total (n=904)	Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
Less than 5000	4	8	2	3
5000 - 10000	8	18	3	3
10000 - 15000	15	18	10	13
15000 - 20000	17	11	19	15
20000 - 25000	19	16	21	18
25000 - 30000	9	11	17	8
Over 30000	19	15	19	27
Didn't Know	6	2	5	11
Refused	2	0	3	2

1- Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding

COMMENT: there is some significant variation here. Theodore Wirth seems to have a somewhat lower distribution of incomes than the ski touring average, while Bunker Hills seems somewhat higher than the average and Carver a good deal higher. It will be particularly interesting if this pattern persists in the urban-urbanizing-rural analysis that will be systematically done on all the data from these surveys. Income has been discovered as a good proxy for many socio-economic characteristic in predicting recreation behavior. Perhaps there will be some patterns developing between the regional parks in terms of income levels. Take particular note of the relatively large percentage of incomes less than $10000 at Theodore Wirth.

TABLE 33

SEX, AGE, RACE OF RESPONDENTS

(Total Sample - All Three Surveys)

	PERCENT RESPONDING WITH EACH CLASS IN THE FOLLOWING SURVEYS:		
	SKI TOURING (n=904)	DOWNHILL SKIING (n=1855)	OTHER PARK USE (n=1477)
A. SEX			
1. Male	60	61	63
2. Female	40	39	37
B. AGE CLASS			
1. Pre-teen (13 or under)	3	2	12
2. Teenager (14 to 19)	38	24	23
3. Young Adult (20 to 34)	49	36	51
4. Middle-Aged Adult (35 to 59)	9	34	10
5. Senior Citizen (60 or over)	1	6	4
C. RACE			
1. White	98	98	98
2. Black	1	1	1
3. Other	1	1	1

COMMENT: There seems to be about a 60 - 40 split in favor of the males in the survey. This may, in part, be due to the sampling method, i.e. the next one off the trail, past a gate, etc. If there is a group, the male will, more than likely be the first one of the group to go past the selection point. Consequently, they show up more often in the sample. However, the proportions are not different enough to cause worry over a good representation of the female point of view.

The age classes show ski touring to be a teenager/young adult activity, downhill skiing an activity evenly distributed across the three middle-age classes, and other park use predominantly done by young adults, with significant participation by three other classes. Senior citizens reach the highest proportion in downhill skiing. One would tend to think the location of the other park use areas would make middle-aged, senior citizen use higher there. Perhaps further analysis will show this true for some parks.

The race composition is not a surprise: Ninety-eight percent white seems to be the norm for all three winter activities.

TABLE 34

SEX, AGE, AND RACE - SKI TOURERS

(Total Sample, Selected Areas (urban, urbanizing, rural))

	Percent[1] of Each Sex, Age Class, and Race at:			
	Total (n=904)	Theodore Wirth (n=92)	Bunker Hills (n=146)	Carver (n=62)
A. Sex				
Male	60	57	53	53
Female	40	43	47	47
B. Age Class				
Pre-Teen	3	4	2	2
Teenager	38	26	46	47
Young Adult	49	64	43	34
Middle-Age Adult	9	5	8	18
Senior Citizen	1	0	1	0
C. Race				
White	98		100	98
Black	1	2	0	0
Other	1	0	0	2

1- Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding

COMMENT: no great surprise in any of these tables. The teenage-young adult predominance comes in here, especially as concerns the former category. Sex and race are as previously discussed in Table 33.

TABLE 35

VISITOR SAMPLE ORIGINS
(Total Samples - Ski Touring, Downhill Skiing, Other Park Use)

ORIGIN CLASSES	PERCENT[1] CONTACTED IN EACH SURVEY BY ORIGIN CLASS						POPULATION 4/1/78 est.
	SKI TOURING		DOWNHILL SKIING		OTHER PARK USES		
	n_2(904)	n_2(868)	n_1(1855)	n_2(1336)	n_1(1477)	n_2(1397)	
ANOKA COUNTY	9	9	4	6	1	1	10
CARVER COUNTY	3	3	1	1	0	0	2
DAKOTA COUNTY	6	6	6	8	2	2	10
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS	23	24	8	11	45	48	19
OTHER HENNEPIN COUNTY	33	34	28	39	14	15	29
CITY OF ST. PAUL	8	8	7	10	24	25	14
OTHER RAMSEY COUNTY	8	8	9	13	7	7	10
SCOTT COUNTY	3	3	1	1	0	0	2
WASHINGTON COUNTY	5	5	7	10	1	2	6
NON-METROPOLITAN AREA	4	-	28	-	5	-	-
TOTAL	102	100	99	99	99	100	102

n_1 - sample with non-metro residents included

n_2 - sample with non-metro residents excluded

[1] - Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

COMMENT: a general origin table for comparison with relative metro population figures. Individual site variation makes it hard to generalize in this form, but the n_2 sample can be used for comparison to population figures.

TABLE 36

A. MILES FROM RESIDENCE TO AREA

(Total Samples - All Three Surveys)

Activity	n	Mean (miles)	PERCENT IN EACH 5-MILE DISTANCE CLASS						
			5 or less	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31 or
Ski Touring	883	10	40	24	16	9	5	3	3
Downhill Skiing	1469	17(19)[1]	25	12	10	10	12	13	18
Other Park Use	1404	4	76	14	6	2	1	1	0

B. MINUTES FROM RESIDENCE TO AREA

(Total Samples - All Three Surveys)

Activity	n	Mean (minutes)	PERCENT IN EACH 5-MILE TIME CLASS								
			5 or less	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41 or more
Ski Touring	883	17	12	24	19	15	11	7	5	3	4
Downhill Skiing	1469	26(28)[1]	17	8	8	10	10	8	9	9	21
Other Park Use	1404	11	25	38	14	11	5	4	2	0	1

[1] First Figure refers to full sample for which time and distance were measured, i.e., includes those from the 10 counties which are adjacent to the Metropolitan Area. The figure in parentheses uses only those visitors residing in the 7-county Metropolitan Area. The Downhill Skiing survey is the only one where this makes a difference, because of the large number of skiers and ski areas in the 10 adjacent counties.

COMMENT: The means and percentages are rather self-explanatory here, particularly when one considers the distribution of the downhill skiing areas. It appears that downhill skiers are used to traveling relatively long distances to get to the areas they prefer. When the data is broken down by individual areas, it will probably show a good picture of regionality as concerns downhill skiing. All in all, the figures in this Table will have to be cross-tabulated and mapped by site to provide their full value in determining the regionality of the various sites.

TABLE 37

MILES FROM RESIDENCE TO SKI TOURING AREA
(Total Sample, Selected Areas (n 25))

SKI TOURING AREA	n	Mean (miles)	PERCENT IN EACH 5-MILE DISTANCE CLASS						
			5 or less	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31 or more
1. TOTAL	883	10	40	24	16	9	5	3	3
2. BUNKER HILLS	146	10	25	28	32	10	5	1	0
3. THEODORE WIRTH	92	5	54	39	5	0	0	1	0
4. HYLAND LAKE	80	9	38	32	16	10	1	1	1
5. CARVER	62	17	11	19	16	19	10	11	13
6. LAKE REBECCA	57	22	5	9	4	26	21	21	14
7. MORRIS BAKER	45	13	2	36	38	16	9	0	0
8. FORT SNELLING	38	10	16	55	21	5	0	0	3
9. CLEARY LAKE	37	13	22	22	22	14	11	8	3
10. MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	36	3	94	6	0	0	0	0	0
11. LEBANON HILLS	30	10	37	20	30	7	3	3	0
12. SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	28	9	29	46	11	11	4	0	0
13. ELM CREEK	27	9	30	30	30	11	0	0	0
14. MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	26	12	35	15	12	8	19	0	12
15. NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	26	4	81	15	4	0	0	0	0
16. WILLIAM O'BRIEN	26	20	12	8	12	23	15	12	19
17. WOOD LAKE	26	5	81	12	4	4	0	0	0
18. KELLER-PHALEN	25	7	48	40	0	4	4	4	0

1 - Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

COMMENT: again, the variation is apparent. The mean mileage figure ranges from 3 miles for visitors to the Minneapolis Chain of Lakes to 22 miles for Lake Rebecca. However, before this information can be used for assessing the relative regionality of any particular site, population figures within a given distance from the facility must be included in the analysis. This will be done as part of preparing the Policy Plan revision. It seems that a regional park should draw its use in proportion to the population at various distances from it. By using distance measures and the Council's transportation files, a good picture of the relative regionality of Regional System units can be obtained.

TABLE 38

MINUTES FROM RESIDENCE TO SKI TOURING AREA
(Total Sample, Selected Areas (n 25))

SKI TOURING AREA	n	Mean (min.)	PERCENT[1] IN EACH 5-MINUTE TIME CLASS								
			5 or less	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41 or more
1. TOTAL	883	17	12	24	19	15	11	7	5	3	4
2. BUNKER HILLS	146	15	20	14	18	21	16	4	3	3	1
3. THEODORE WIRTH	92	13	5	24	42	21	5	1	0	0	1
4. HYLAND LAKE	80	16	19	18	16	22	8	10	4	1	2
5. CARVER	62	25	5	13	10	16	15	10	6	8	18
6. LAKE REBECCA	57	35	5	5	4	4	11	23	14	16	20
7. MORRIS BAKER	45	19	0	24	13	18	22	13	7	2	0
8. FORT SNELLING	38	17	5	16	24	24	21	5	3	0	3
9. CLEARY LAKE	37	21	8	14	19	14	16	5	5	8	10
10. MPLS. CHAIN OF LAKES	36	7	33	53	11	0	3	0	0	0	0
11. LEBANON HILLS	30	16	0	47	7	20	10	3	7	7	0
12. SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	28	12	4	64	7	11	7	4	4	0	0
13. ELM CREEK	27	14	7	30	19	30	7	4	4	0	0
14. MINNESOTA VALLEY TRAIL	26	20	4	42	12	0	8	12	4	8	12
15. NOKOMIS-HIAWATHA	26	8	35	42	12	8	0	4	0	0	0
16. WILLIAM O'BRIEN	26	28	12	0	8	12	15	12	8	12	21
17. WOOD LAKE	26	7	54	23	12	8	4	0	0	0	0
18. KELLER-PHALEN	25	13	20	40	12	12	4	0	4	4	4

[1] - Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

COMMENT: same comments as for Table 37. As this Table indicates, virtually every ski tourer in the study travelled 30 minutes or less to go skiing. With the proper population figures and mapping techniques, we should be able to build an accurate mosaic of the service areas of the various parks in the Regional System and the facilities withing them.

TABLE 39

FUTURE REPORT SCHEDULE

REPORT NUMBER	TITLE	AVAILABILITY DATE
1.01	Data Summary Report - Downhill Skiing, Ski Touring, Other Park Use(Winter Phase)	8/15/78
.02	Data Summary Report - Snowmobiling, Nature Center Use(Winter Phase)	9/15/78
.03	Data Summary Report - General Park Use (Summer Phase)	1/15/79
.04	Data Summary Report - Water Access Points	1/15/79
.05	Data Summary Report - Trail Corridors	1/15/79
.06	Data Summary Report - Campgrounds	2/01/79
.07	Data Summary Report - Nature Center Use (Summer Phase)	2/01/79
2.01	Winter Facility Use Summary(by facility, day of week, time of day, recreational activity)	9/30/78
.02	Summer Facility Use Summary(same breakdown as for winter use)	2/15/78
3.	SPECIAL TOPIC REPORTS	beginning approximately
.01	Group Size and Composition	3/15/79
.02	Time Distribution of Use	
.03	Reasons for Choosing Certain Facilities	
.04	Overall Facility Satisfaction	
.05	Constraints on Visits to Preferred Facilities	
.06	Awareness of Alternative Facilities	
.07	Activity Clusters at Selected Facilities	
.08+	Other topics as necessary	
4.00	METHODOLOGICAL REPORT(survey instruments, instructions, sample selection, coding conventions, analysis methods, etc.)	6/15/79

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
Suite 300 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

METROPOLITAN RECREATION DEMAND STUDY
Downhill Skiing--Winter 1977-78

1. Approximately what time did you arrive at _____? _____

2. a. How many people came with you today? _____

   b. Were they: _____ Family _____ Other (specify)

   _____ Friends

   _____ Organized group (specify)

3. What means of transportation did you use to get to _____ today?

4. About how many downhill runs did you make today?

   _____ 5 or less _____ 6 to 10 _____ 11 to 25 _____ 26 to 50 _____ over 50 _____ don't know

5. Here is a map of the slopes at _____, with each run indicated by a letter, A through _____. Would you give me the letter of the slope you used most often today? _____

6. We are interested in the skill level and experience of skiers who use _____. Would you personally rate yourself as a:

   _____ novice, _____, _____ intermediate _____, or _____ advanced skier?

   _____ first time (to 8), _____ don't know

7. How many years would you say you have participated in downhill skiing?

   _____ 1st year _____ 2 to 5 _____ 6 to 10 _____ 11 or more _____ don't know

8. Concerning your visit to _____ today:

   a. Was there anything that made it particularly satisfying to you?

   b. Was there anything that made it less satisfying for you?

9. a. Would you say you presently ski about as often as you would like?

_____ No _____ Not sure _____ Yes

b. What do you feel is the main reason you are not able to ski more often? _____ Time

_____

c. There may be several other reasons why one may not be able to ski as often as one would like. I'm going to list a few, and would you tell me if any of them keep you from skiing more?

_____ lift ticket costs

_____ other associated costs

_____ lack of transportation to existing ski areas

_____ lack of challenge at existing ski areas

_____ your other interests or responsibilities

_____ hours at existing areas

_____ support facilities at existing ski areas

_____ any other reasons? (specify)

10. a. What was the single most important reason you chose _____ over other areas for today's ski outing?

_____

b. Are there any other reasons?

11. I'm going to read a short list of facilities available at _____. If you did not use a facility, please say so. If you did, please tell me whether you found it more than adequate, adequate, or less than adequate?

		MA	A	LA	No Opinion
1. ski slopes	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. lift/tow system	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. rental equipment	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. ski school	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. food/beverage service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. warming/relaxing areas	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. restrooms	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. parking area	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. What would you say is your biggest source of information about new or different places to ski?

_____

13. a. Using your residence as a starting point, what are the three closest places you know of where you can participate in any type of downhill skiing?

b. Have you visited _____, _____, _____?

c. In the last 5 years?

d. Compared to _____, would you say that, overall, _____ is a better place to ski, about the same, or a worse place to ski?

e. Briefly, what makes it better/worse?

Area	Visited Yes	5 yr.	B	S	W	Reason
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	

14. Considering the facilities provided, would you say the lift ticket prices here are:

_____ very low _____ somewhat low _____ about right _____ somewhat high _____ very high _____ no opinion

15. Do you presently belong to any organizations or clubs that promote downhill skiing?

_____ No _____ Yes ⟶ Which ones (any others)?

16. Do you participate in any of the following winter recreation activities:

_____ ice fishing

_____ ice skating

_____ snowshoeing

_____ snowmobiling

_____ cross-country skiing

_____ ski jumping (like to) _____

_____ any other winter outdoor recreation activities (specify)

17. The other side of the card contains a set of seven statements concerning where you live and what type of job you have. For each statement, please read it to yourself and then give me the letter of the phrase that completes the statement best as concerns you:

1. A B C D E F G ____________________
2. A B C D E
3. A B C D E F
4. A B C D E F G ____________________
5. A B C D E F G H ____________________
6. A B C D ____________________
7. A B C D E F G H ____________________

18. One of the most important things we need to know is the pattern of skier travel in the metropolitan area. The only way we can determine this is to know where you go to ski, such as here at __________, and where you come from, that is, your home address. May I have your home address?

May ~~I have the community you live~~ in and your zip code?

19. That's all the questions I have. Thank you for your cooperation.

- -

<u>CONTROL INFORMATION</u>

1. Date __________ Time __________ Facility ______________ Interviewer __________
2. Respondent Type: M F / SC MA YA TN PT / B W S A O
3. Reaction to Survey: Hostile Uncoop Neut Coop Very Coop
4. Peculiar Circumstances:

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
Suite 300 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

METROPOLITAN RECREATION DEMAND STUDY
Ski Touring--Winter 1977-78

1. Approximately what time did you arrive at _____? _____

2. a. How many people came with you today? _____

   b. Were they: _____ Family _____ Other (specify)

   _____ Friends

   _____ Organized group (specify)

3. What means of transportation did you use to get to _____ today?

4. Here is a map of the ski touring trail/area at _____. We have marked each trail/area segment with a letter, A through _____. I need two pieces of information from you concerning these segments: the letters of the segments you used today, and the number of times you used each of those segments.

   _____ A _____ C _____ E _____ G _____ I

   _____ B _____ D _____ F _____ H _____ J

5. We are interested in the skill level and experience of skiers who use the trails(s) at _____. Would you personally rate yourself as a:

   _____ novice, _____, _____ intermediate _____, _____ or advanced skier?

   _____ first time (to 7) _____ don't know

6. How many years would you say you have participated in ski touring?

   _____ 1st year _____ 2 to 5 _____ 6 to 10 _____ 11 or more _____ don't know

7. Concerning your visit to _____ today:

   a. Was there anything that made it particularly satisfying to you?

   b. Was there anything that made it less satisfying than it might have been?

8. Do you participate in any of the following winter recreation activities:

_____ ice fishing
_____ ice skating
_____ snowshoeing
_____ snowmobiling
_____ downhill skiing
_____ ski jumping (like to) _____
_____ any other winter outdoor recreation activities ?(specify)

9. a. Would you say you presently go ski touring about as often as you would like:

_____ No _____ Not sure _____ Yes

b. What do you feel is the main reason you are not able to ski more often? _____ Time

_____

c. There may be several other reasons why one may not be able to ski as often as one would like. I'm going to list a few, and, would you tell me if any of them keep you from skiing more often?

_____ lack of equipment
_____ too few ski touring areas
_____ hours at existing facilities
_____ entry fees
_____ lack of transportation to existing areas
_____ other interests or responsibilities
_____ any other reasons?

10. a. What was the single most important reason you chose _____ over other areas for today's outing?

_____

b. I have a short list of items that might serve as reasons for visiting a particular ski touring area. Tell me if any of the following reasons were important in your decision to ski at _____ today:

_____ equipment rentals _____
_____ chalet/warming house _____
_____ length of trails
_____ challange of the trails
_____ area the trails go through
_____ number of people at other areas
_____ snow conditions
_____ way the trails are maintained
_____ closeness to home
_____ the nature center facility/ program
_____ any other reasons?

11. I'm going to read a short list of facilities available at _____. If you did not use a facility today, please say so. If you did, please tell me whether you found it to be more than adequate, adequate, or less than adequate?

	DU	MA	A	LA	No Opinion
1. rental equipment					
2. restrooms					
3. food/beverage service					
4. chalet/warming house					
5. rest stops on trail					
6. trail markings					
7. trail maintenance					
8. ski lessons					
9. parking					

12. What would you say is your biggest source of information concerning new and different places to go ski touring?

_____

13. a. Using your residence as a starting point, what are the three closest places you know of that have any kind of ski touring trails?

b. Have you visited _____, _____, _____?

c. In the last 5 years?

d. Compared to _____, would you say that, overall, it is a better place to ski, about the same, or a worse place to ski:

e. Briefly, what makes it better/worse?

Area	Visited yes	Visited 5 yr.	B	S	W	Reason
_____						
_____						
_____						

14. Considering the facilities provided, would you say that the entry/parking fee at _____ is:

_____ very low _____ somewhat low _____ about right _____ somewhat high _____ very high _____ no opinion

15. Do you presently belong to any organizations or clubs that promote ski touring?

_____ No _____ Yes ⟶ Which ones (any others)?

16. This card contains a set of seven statements concerning where you live and what type of job you have. For each statement, please read it to yourself and then give me the letter of the phrase that completes the statement best as concerns you:

1. A B C D E F G _____
2. A B C D E
3. A B C D E F
4. A B C D E F G _____
5. A B C D E F G H _____
6. A B C D _____
7. A B C D E F G H _____

17. One of the most important things we need to know is the pattern of skier travel in the metropolitan area. The only way we can determine this is to know where you go to ski, such as here at _____, and where you come from, that is, your home address. May I have your home address?

May I have the community you live in and your zip code?

18. That's all the questions I have. Thank you for your cooperation.

- -

CONTROL INFORMATION

1. Date _____ Time _____ Facility _____ Interviewer _____
2. Respondent Type: M F / SC MA YA TN PT / B W S A O
3. Reaction to Survey: Hostile Uncoop Neut Coop Very Coop
4. Peculiar Circumstances:

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
Suite 300 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

METROPOLITAN RECREATION DEMAND STUDY
Miscellaneous Use--Winter, 1977-78

1. a. About what time did you arrive at _____ today? _____

   b. About what time do you plan to leave? _____

2. a. How many people came with you today? _____

   b. Were they: _____ family _____ other (specify)
   _____ friends
   _____ organized group (specify)

3. What means of transportation did you use to get to _____ today?

4. a. What was the main recreation activity you participated in at _____ today? (Put an "X" below)

   b. What other recreation activities did you participate in? (Put a check mark below)

   c. Do you participate in any of the following outdoor recreation activities:

____	*ice fishing	____	____	*snowshoeing	____
____	*ice skating	____	____	nature study	____
____	*x-country skiing	____	____	walking/hiking	____
____	*downhill skiing	____	____	jogging	____
____	*snowmobiling	____	____	* any other winter outdoor recreation activities (specify)	____

5. Have you been here before?

_____ No _____ Not Sure _____ Yes How many times in the past two weeks? _____

6. a. Is there anything about your visit to _____ today that made it really enjoyable?

   b. Is there anything about it that was disappointing to you?

7. You said that _____ was your main recreation activity today. Why did you choose _____ over other places you could _____?

_____

8. a. Using your residence as a starting point, would you give me the five closest places where you can _____.

   b. Have you _____(ed) at _____, _____, _____, _____, _____?

   c. Overall, would you rather _____ here or at _____

Area	Visited	Prefer Here	Prefer There
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

9. This card contains a set of seven statements concerning where you live and what type of job you have. For each statement, please read it to yourself and then give me the letter of the phrase that completes the statement best as concerns you:

   1. A B C D E F G _____
   2. A B C D E
   3. A B C D E F
   4. A B C D E F G _____
   5. A B C D E F G H _____
   6. A B C D _____
   7. A B C D E F G H _____

10. One of the most important things we need to know is the pattern of park visitor travel in the metropolitan area. The only way we can determine this is to know which parks you visit, such as _____, and where you come from, that is, your home address. May I have your home address?

May I have the community you live in and your zip code?

That's all the questions I have. Thank you for your cooperation.

- -

CONTROL INFORMATION

1. Date _____ Time _____ Facility _____ Interviewer _____
2. Respondent Type: M F / SC MA YA TN PT / B W S A O
3. Reaction to Survey: Hostile Uncoop Neut Coop Very Coop
4. Peculiar Circumstances: