

ANALYSIS REPORT
MISSISSIPPI LAKE PLAN SURVEY

References: A. MLA Survey (12 questions) promulgated in 2012
B. Survey data report (17 pages, in pie chart format), completed Dec 2013

INTRODUCTION

This is a brief analysis of the data provided by the 367 respondents who completed the survey at ref A. The analysis is based solely upon the data provided at ref B, and therefore limited in detail. The author is not a professional analyst of such surveys, but has some experience in this field.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

By far the majority of responses have come from owners (full and part-time) of lakefront property. A total of 325 returns came from lakefront owners (90% of 359).

Mississippi Lake is estimated at approx 1,200, the rate of return for lakefront property owners is only approx 27% (325 out of a total of an estimated 1200 properties). This also assumes only one return per household, which is likely not the case. A more thorough review of each response would be required to determine how many properties submitted multiple entries (eg: each spouse responding separately).

This rate of return on a survey (27%) is considered normal/typical, therefore the data is able to provide meaningful feedback on the information requested. However, considering the importance of the topic to (especially) owners of lakefront property, the rate of return is lower than expected.

A subsequent, more-focused survey should be devised to seek input from the non-respondents in this particularly important group of stakeholders.

Caution should be exercised when using the term "seasonal", as the survey indicates almost equal use by season.

Boating, in all forms, is a big part of lake enjoyment

The data indicates that if a powerboat exists, it is a big one. Approximately 75% of motors are at least 50 hp, with approx 25% greater than 75 hp. This is an interesting contrast with the "Regulate Boats" action, which is one of the top actions recommended

"limit commercial development" is cited as the #1 or #2 Action, yet 44.8% of returns stated "nil" impact

IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS

The first six questions requested general use, and identification information.

SUMMARY OF SOURCE OF RESPONSES

AREA	DESCRIPTION	#	%
A	(Drummond Conc. (A or Westshore Dr.) - Grasshopper Point, McCreary's Shore, McCullough's Landing	13	3.54
B	(Drummond Conc. 7) - Flintoff Bay, Malloch Shore, Robertson Shore, Red Rock/Beck Shore	33	8.99
C	(Tennyson Rd.) - Black Bass Bay, Hunter Bay, Craig Shore	43	11.72
D	(9th Line Beckwith): Coleman Shore, High Bank, Petrie Shore, Petrie Point	59	16.08
E	(Lake Park Rd.): Gardiner Shore, Hay's Shore, Lake Park, Duff's Woods Subdivision	63	17.1
F	(Hwy 7 at Carleton Place, Townline Rd or Ramsay 5A): McDiarmid Shore, Birch Point, Montgomery Park	22	5.99
G	(McCann Rd.): Dowdalls Shore, Rathwell Shore	15	4.09
H	(Scotch Corners Rd.): Ab's Road, Squaw Point	48	13.08
I	(Ebb's Bay Rd.): Pretty's Island, Ebbs Bay/Ebb's Shore, Cookes Shore)	56	15.26
J	Innisville	5	1.36
K	Upstream of Innisville	0	0.00
L	Carleton Place and downstream	6	1.63
M	Other Location (ex. Mississippi Lake Island)	4	1.09
	Total	367	100

Of 367 respondents:

343 (94%) were owners of property. The remainder (24) were visitors and/or part time renters in the area. There were NIL respondents representing commercial or municipal interests.

359 respondents (98%) owned or used property on the waterfront, or within 200 meters of the waterfront:

327 (89%) owned or used waterfront property

32 (9%) owned or used property within 200 meters of the water front

MISSISSIPPI LAKE SURVEY REPORT –29 MAY 2014

228 (62%) inhabited homes; 119 (33%) inhabited cottages; 20 (5%) did not specify

The average time lived in the lake area (owned property or have been using the lake) is 42 years.

MLA membership: 175 indicated they were members
 101 indicated they were not members
91 did not respond
 367 responses

Municipality Distribution:

Beckwith	208	57 %
Carleton Place	9	2.5 %
Drummond/North Emsley	136	37 %
Mississippi Mills	13	3.5 %
Other	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>
	367	100 %

Usage Periods:

Spring	337	92%	(of 367)
Summer	366	99%	"
Autumn	337	92%	"
Winter	225	61%	"

Due to a portion of the waterfront properties being cottages, there is a dip in lake usage in the winter. However, there is a high proportion of usage throughout the year, and it would be misleading to refer to "seasonal" usage.

Population Density:

359 of the 367 respondents indicated that their household had:

1-2 occupants	227	63%
3-4	102	28%
5-6	24	7%
more than 6	<u>6</u>	<u>2%</u>
	359	100%

ACTIVITIES

Question # 7 provided 19 choices of activities, plus space to insert “other” activities. A total of 364 respondents provided data on 20 activities (canoeing and kayaking were broken out separately, or perhaps double counted as the paper surveys had these two activities combined). The totals, in order of popularity are as follow:

1	Swimming	302	83%
2	Boating	281	77%
3	Reading	274	75%
4	Socializing	268	74%
5	Walking/Hiking	240	66%
6	Nature Appreciation	236	65%
7	Canoeing	199	55%
8	Fishing	194	53%
9	Kayaking	176	48%
10	Water Skiing	118	32%
11	Ice Skating	106	29%
12	Sailing	70	19%
13	Ice Fishing	63	17%
14	Winter Skiing	53	15%
15	ATVing	45	12%
16	Snowmobiling	42	11%
17	Jet Skiing (PWC)	40	11%
18	Lodging	31	8%
19	Hunting	24	7%
20	Camping	<u>8</u>	2%
		2,770	

2,770 counts of activity for 364 respondents yield an average of 7.6 activities per respondent.

Swimming and Boating were by far the most popular activities, although a great variety of activities are undertaken on or around the lake.

BOAT DATA

Question # 8 provided up to six slots to list types of boats

<u>Boat type</u>	Aluminum motor	103
	Pontoon	47
	Other motor	199
	Sail	37
	Canoe	103
	Kayak	91
	Row	5
	Paddle	30
	Jet Ski (PWC)	35
	Other	<u>20</u>
	Total	670

This was provided by 319 responses, so the average response listed two boats
 52% of the boats (349) were motor boats (except PWCs)
 Of the remaining 48%, 29% consisted of canoes and kayaks

<u>Boat Size</u>	0-12 ft	172	31.4%
	12-15 ft	136	24.8%
	15-25 ft	208	37.8%
	>25 ft	<u>33</u>	6%
		549 responses	

<u>Motor Size</u>	<10 hp	70	20%
	10-15 hp	21	6%
	15-25 hp	20	6%
	25-50 hp	40	11%
	50-75 hp	46	13%
	>75 hp	<u>155</u>	44%
		352 responses	

<u>Usage rate</u>	Daily	27	4.5%
	Few/wk	200	33%
	Once/wk	102	17%
	Once/2 wks	101	17%
	Once/mo	92	9%
	Infreq	<u>80</u>	13%
		602 responses	

MISSISSIPPI LAKE SURVEY REPORT –29 MAY 2014

<u>Launched from:</u>	Own property	170	48%
	Public ramps	102	29%
	Marinas	41	11.5%
	Other	<u>42</u>	11.5%
		355 responses	

<u>Docked at:</u>	Own property	307	94%
	Various other places	<u>20</u>	6%
		327 responses	

VALUES

Mississippi Lake Survey - Values - Question #9

Sorted by decreasing order of importance to respondents

#	VALUES	2-1-0 WEIGHTED CHOICES			
		Very Imp	Important	Not Imp	TOTAL
		(x2)	(x1)	0	
1	Clean water	346	20	1	712
7	Peace and tranquility	278	79	9	635
9	Home/cottage safety/security	274	79	7	627
3	Recreational enjoyment	262	86	10	610
6	Appreciation of birds and wildlife	255	97	10	607
8	Night skies	225	105	27	555
4	Landscapes	183	144	25	510
5	Flora and fauna	194	121	37	509
2	Natural shorelines	180	142	35	502
10	Sense of community	168	139	41	475

The survey listed 10 specific values to comment upon (# indicates the survey listing)
 The actual number of responses is tabulated for each Value
 The "TOTAL" column reflects the weighted sum of all the responses for a given Value
 NIL points are allocated for the "Not Important" column

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

The survey question listed 19 specific issues and concerns to comment upon.
 # refers to the order of concern as listed in the survey questionnaire
 The actual number of responses is tabulated for each Value
 The "TOTAL" column reflects the weighted sum of all the responses for a given Value
 NIL points are allocated for the "Not Important" column
 the issue of most concern to respondents received the least number of "no impact" hits
 the issue of least concern to respondents received the most number of "no impact" hits

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (Question # 10)

Sorted by decreasing order of concern to respondents

#	ISSUES AND CONCERNS	3-2-1 WEIGHTED CHOICES				TOTAL
		Significant	Moderate	Light	Nil	
		(x3)	(x2)	(x1)	0	
2	Weeds/Algae in water	159	120	65	15	782
3	Water levels	124	123	76	29	694
5	Boat speed	95	102	104	55	593
1	Water quality	87	119	89	53	588
4	Boat traffic	79	122	107	47	588
6	PWC's	87	89	113	62	552
10	Shoreline erosion	75	87	105	88	504
17	Fishing tournaments	79	70	111	92	488
16	Fish depletion	71	78	88	118	457
7	Residential development	60	85	99	107	449
11	Daytime noise	50	66	117	119	399
9	Septic system issues	54	71	81	146	385
8	Commercial development	75	39	75	155	378
12	Nighttime noise	39	60	123	132	360
15	Public access to lake	48	58	83	160	343
14	Tree and vegetation removal	36	57	97	160	319
13	Outdoor light pollution	24	52	108	168	284
19	ATV's	26	46	107	173	277
18	Snowmobiles	19	48	99	181	252

TOP THREE ACTIONS

“What to do?” (questions #11 and #12) received a great variety of recommendations (32 separate "actions" listed). Some patterns did emerge, although a great many Actions did not receive strong support. The wide variety of choices for Action has caused a smearing of interests. Also, many Actions were similar or overlapping

To better correlate the "Actions to be taken" responses (from question #11), a weighting of 3 points was ascribed to any Action listed by a respondent as a “#1” action to be taken. Similarly, a 2-point weighting was ascribed to any “#2” action listed, and a single point was ascribed to any “#3” action listed.

In this way, the top five individual Actions (3-2-1 weighting scale), were:

1	limit commercial development	224 pts
2	regulate boats	195 pts
3	reduce weeds and algae	189 pts
4	protect the shoreline	183 pts
5	better water quality	172 pts

However, addressing these as individual Actions does not accurately reflect the level of interest generated by the respondents for the wide spectrum of other Actions proposed. For example, although "limit commercial development" is the single largest individual Action, its impact would have been even greater had "limit development" (117 pts) been included. However, three other Actions propose increasing development, thereby counteracting the views of the former group.

To better capture all interests expressed by the respondents, a broader approach was necessary. A more accurate approach to determining the level of interest for any particular Action was to group similar Actions into larger Categories. Within each category there could exist Actions that are in fact contradictory (eg: "limit development", and "promote development"). However, the Categories now reflect the overall proportion of interest generated by respondents, regardless of the specific stance (for or against an action). Further consultation will be required to determine how to proceed for each Category.

The six main categories are as follow:

1. Environment	7 of 32 Actions, totaling 573 points for 30% interest
2. Development	6 of 32 Actions, totaling 431 points for 22%
3. Boating	3 of 32 Actions, totaling 280 points for 14%
4. Governance	11 of 32 Actions, totaling 267 points, for 14%
5. Fishing	4 of 32 Actions, totaling 196 points, for 10%
6. Weeds	1 of 32 Actions, totaling 192 points, for 10%

The following table lists the 32 Actions (as identified by respondents), in alphabetical order. The table also indicates how many times (“hits”) each Action was identified by respondents, and what importance that Action meant to a respondent (1st, 2nd, or 3rd choice). The TOTAL column indicates the total weighted score for that Action, as follows:

TOTAL = 3 points for a 1st choice + 2 points for a 2nd choice + 1 point for a third choice

The table also indicates how the 32 choices were grouped into six larger categories.

MISSISSIPPI LAKE SURVEY REPORT –29 MAY 2014

**Mississippi Lake Survey - Question #11 - top three actions to improve Lake
listed in ALPHABETICAL order as identified by respondents**

#	ACTION DESCRIBED BY RESPONDENTS	WEIGHTED CHOICES				CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY	
		1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL		
1	Better enforcement	0	0	20	20	D	governance
2	Better water levels	22	18	11	113	D	
3	Better water quality	35	26	17	174	A	environment
4	Build, Install, Construct new structures	1	8	1	20	B	development
5	Control invasive species	5	3	13	34	A	
6	Educate	2	7	11	31	D	
7	General stewardship	10	5	3	43	D	
8	Improve owner engagement	1	3	4	13	D	
9	Install commercial	4	1	2	16	B	
10	Less governance	4	3	2	20	D	
11	Limit commercial development	48	34	12	224	B	
12	Limit development	18	21	24	120	B	
13	Limit non-residence docking	4	14	5	45	B	
14	Navigation aids	1	4	0	11	D	
15	Noise control general	0	1	5	7	D	
16	Promote development	1	1	1	6	B	
17	Protect serenity	1	4	1	12	A	
18	Protect shoreline	39	22	23	184	A	
19	Protect wetland/habitat	3	2	4	17	A	
20	Protect wildlife	4	8	14	42	A	
21	Reduce weeds and algae	43	24	15	192	E	weeds
22	Regulate boat noise	3	14	3	40	C	boats
23	Regulate boats	30	40	25	195	C	
24	Regulate fishing	12	20	4	80	F	fish
25	Regulate ice fishing	14	12	4	70	F	
26	Regulate light pollution	1	1	4	9	D	
27	Regulate PWC's	7	9	6	45	C	
28	Regulate septic	22	18	8	110	A	
29	Regulate snowmobiles	1	1	0	5	D	
30	Research fish loss	1	0	0	3	F	
31	Safety in general	0	3	5	11	D	
32	Stock fish	6	7	11	43	F	
					1955		

The six Categories, into which 32 individual Actions were grouped, are:

Environment	30% of all Actions	Development	22%
Boating	14%	Governance	14%
Fishing	10%	Weeds	10%

MISSISSIPPI LAKE SURVEY REPORT –29 MAY 2014

Mississippi Lake Survey - top three actions to improve Lake

RANKED by 3-2-1 WEIGHTING

#	ACTIONS DESCRIBED BY RESPONDENTS	3-2-1 WEIGHTED CHOICES			
		1st (x3)	2nd (x2)	3rd (x1)	TOTAL
11	Limit commercial development	48	34	12	224
23	regulate boats	30	40	25	195
21	reduce weeds and algae	43	23	14	189
18	protect shoreline	39	22	22	183
3	better water Quality	35	25	17	172
12	limit development	17	21	24	117
2	better water levels	21	18	10	109
28	regulate septic	19	18	8	101
24	regulate fishing	12	18	4	76
25	regulate ice fishing	14	11	4	68
13	limit non-residence docking	4	14	5	45
27	regulate PWC's	7	9	5	44
9	General Stewardship	10	5	3	43
20	protect wildlife	4	8	14	42
22	regulate boat noise	3	14	3	40
32	stock fish	5	7	10	39
8	Control invasive species	5	3	12	33
5	Educate	2	7	11	31
4	Build, Install, Construct new structures	1	8	1	20
10	Less governance	4	3	2	20
1	Better enforcement	0	0	19	19
19	protect wetland/habitat	3	2	4	17
7	Install commercial	3	1	2	13
6	Improve owner Engagement	1	3	4	13
17	protect serenity	1	4	1	12
14	Navigation aids	1	4	0	11
26	regulate light pollution	1	1	4	9
31	safety in general	0	2	5	9
15	Noise control general	0	1	5	7
29	regulate snowmobiles	1	1	0	5
16	Promote development	1	0	1	4
30	research fish loss	1	0	0	3
		336	327	251	1913

367 returns x 6 points per return total 2,202 possible points

1913 points represent 87% of total possible (ie: not all returns listed three Actions)

The top five choices represent 963 of 1913 points, for a 50.3% share

The next 13 choices represent 788 points, for a 41.2% share

The bottom 15 choices represent 164 points, for 8.6% share

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Question # 12 requested respondents to provide any additional comments or concerns not already addressed in the preceding 11 questions. All such feedback was captured and inputted into Survey Monkey, and should be further analyzed to extract relevant/pertinent information. This step was not part of this report, but should be undertaken prior to public consultations, to ensure that all views and concerns are understood and can be addressed at those meetings.

CONTACT INFORMATION

<u>Response History:</u>	Apr 12	49 responses received
	Jul 12	27 “
	Oct 12	43 “
	Jan 13	7 “
	Apr 13	138 “
	Jul 13	79 “
	Oct 13	18 “
	Jan 14	<u>6</u> “
		367 “

Participation: 11% indicated willingness to help
 25% indicated willingness to volunteer
 72% indicated inability to help or participate

Contact Info: from 367 responses:

188	gave a name	51%
179	gave an address	49%
175	gave an email address	48%
170	gave a telephone number	46%

Meetings: from 367 responses:

144	39%	would attend meetings
61	16%	would not attend meetings
111	30%	only wished to be provided info
51	15%	did not provide an answer

Time of year: from 150 responses:

Spring	33	preferred for a meeting
Summer	25	“
Autumn	18	“
Winter	8	“
Any time	66	“

Time of Week: from 214 responses (some provided multiple options):

MISSISSIPPI LAKE SURVEY REPORT –29 MAY 2014

	Forenoon	Afternoon	Evening
Saturday	65	30	23
Sunday	27	30	19
Weekday	21	28	54

Best periods are: Saturday forenoon of Weekday evening

CONCLUSIONS

A great majority of the respondents were owners of lakeshore property. However, there was a relatively low return from residents (approx 73% did not complete the survey).

The rate of returns (367/1200) is nevertheless sufficient to draw relevant conclusions from the survey.

There was good correlation between the highest rated values/concerns, and proposed Actions.

The six Categories provide a better focus and reflection of the interests of the respondents.

Further consultations will be required to ascertain the specific Action to be pursued for each Category. The specific Actions should then be captured in the Lake Plan.