CHAPTER V: SUPPLY ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Through reading Chapter 1, it is possible to see that Knetsch, in presenting a design for the Canadian Outdoor Recreation Demand Study and in developing a further proposal for data analysis, saw the "analysis of supply" as very important. So it will not be surprising to find out that (contrary to what its number may suggest) TN 16, "Considerations in Defining a Methodology for Calculating the Supply of Outdoor Recreation", was completed early in the CORD Study. However, it may be surprising to find out that this study was not really prompted by Knetsch's design for the CORD Study but rather reflects Ontario's work on the TORPS, Tourism and Outdoor Recreation Planning Study. Incidentally, this note does not reflect the current status of "research" on measuring supply. Provincial committees on supply measurement continued to meet (to 1976). In 1974 one full-time research officer was appointed to be responsible for Ontario's supply measurement project.

CORD Study Volume III (as is commented on in TN 5) makes it clear that lack of compatibility in CORD Facility Inventory data between the Provinces was a factor that forced a particular direction on "national scale" supply analyses. As the reader has seen in Chapter 1, Knetsch proposed that Canada follow the "Rutgers' methodology" in developing models. This involves introducing measures of the level of supply into "origin" models (e.g., TN 12). But in 1971, alter expert advice from several persons including a member of the Rutger's research group (Cicchetti), it was concluded that because of (1) variation in types of facilities on which information was collected and (2) variation in the years to which data were relevant (from 1968 to 1971), using the Rutger's methodology to develop a Canadian model was of questionable value.

By 1971 Cheung's development of a day-use model had raised questions about how the availability of "alternative supply" around a given city or park affects the use of a given unit of supply, e.g. use of a given park. The need to consider alternative factors prompted the preparation of TN 3. Strangely enough, work on this note started in early 1972, but only in 1974 did the interrelationships between numbers of issues become clear enough that the authors felt free to complete the note in its present form.

It may only be when the reader of this volume has read Chapter X that it will be clear how the CORD Study researchers who prepared TN 29 benefited from detailed study of the Cesario model. They saw a unity between origin and destination models. Work on TN 5 followed by work on TN 11 and 33 made clear that there was a need for a work like TN 29. However there is no need to pursue details. It has long been recognized (e.g. see Veal's comments in Chapter 13 of Burton 1971) that people do not react linearly to the "amount of supply" for participating in an activity available to them. Cheung's use of an alternative factor involves the recognition that geographic configuration of supply and the "attractivity" of different units of supply affect behaviour. To cite but two examples, TN 30 and 37 introduce analysis and literature on the effect that the availability of alternative activities in which to participate has on participation in a given activity. So there was good reason to try to get information from an "origin perspective" about how people responded to the complex supply situation in which they live out their daily lives. The search for such information was undertaken in the way described in TN 29.