

Collaborative Research Programme On River Basin Management Planning Economics

Public Preferences for WFD Outcomes

Appendices



Department of the
Environment
www.doeni.gov.uk



SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE



ENVIRONMENT AGENCY



DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS
ENTERPRISE & REGULATORY REFORM



SNIFFER
SCOTLAND & NORTHERN IRELAND
FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH



UKMPG
The United Kingdom Major Ports Group



Country Land &
Business Association
RURAL ECONOMY IS OUR BUSINESS

The Collaborative Research Programme, under which this report has been produced, is jointly sponsored by Defra, Welsh Assembly Government, Scottish Executive, Department of Environment Northern Ireland, Environment Agency, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Scotland and Northern Ireland Forum for Environmental Research, UK Water Industry Research, the Joint Environmental Programme, UK Major Ports Group, British Ports Association, CC Water, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, National Farmers' Union and Country Land and Business Association (the "Collaborative Partners"). The Collaborative Partners have made their best endeavours to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this report. However, the Collaborative Partners cannot assume responsibility for the content of this report or for any opinions or statements of fact expressed therein or for any actions taken as a result of consulting this report. The report does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of any individual organisation.

© 2006 Defra, Welsh Assembly Government, Scottish Executive, Department of Environment Northern Ireland, Environment Agency, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Scotland and Northern Ireland Forum for Environmental Research, UK Water Industry Research, the Joint Environmental Programme, UK Major Ports Group, British Ports Association, CC Water, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, National Farmers' Union and Country Land and Business Association. All rights reserved.

CRP Project 4d:
Public Preferences for WFD
Outcomes [Prioritisation]

Appendices to Final Report

April 2008

Prepared by:

Accent
Chiswick Gate
598-608 Chiswick High Road
London
W4 5RT

Prepared for:

Defra
Area 3D Ergon House
17 Smith Square
London
SW1P 3JR

In association with:
Paul Metcalfe

Contact: Jo East
E-mail: jo.east@accent-mr.com
Tel: 020 8742 2211
Fax: 020 8742 1991

Contact: Kevin Andrews

File name:

CONTENTS

Appendix A.	RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	3
Appendix B.	MAIN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	3
Appendix C.	SHOWCARDS	3
Appendix D.	VERBATIM RESPONSES	3
Appendix E.	SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS TABLES	3
E.1.	The Importance of Accessibility	3
E.2.	Decision-Making Process.....	3
E.3.	Comparison of CRP 4c Revisits with New Recruits.....	3
Appendix F.	REVIEW OF WIDER LITERATURE.....	3
F.1.	Review of University of Brighton (2001) Water-Based Sport and Recreation: The Facts	3
F.2.	Review of University of Brighton (2004) Improving Access for Canoeing on Inland Waters: A Study of the Feasibility of Access Agreements	3

APPENDIX A. RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Confirmation

I confirm that this interview was conducted under the terms of the MRS Code of Conduct and is completely confidential

Interviewer's signature:

THANK RESPONDENT FOR THEIR HELP IN THIS RESEARCH

APPENDIX B. MAIN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Interviewer no:

Interviewer name:

Date:

/

Time interview started:

:

Household Composition

In this survey, I will ask you to respond on behalf of your household.

- Q1. Firstly, how many people, including yourself and children, live in your household?
 Q2. How many of these are under 18? [IF NONE, GO TO Q4. OTHERWISE GO TO Q3]
 Q3. What are their ages?

Use of the Water Environment

I will now ask about how you and others in your household make use of lakes, rivers, canals or coastal waters.

- Q4. Please look at Card 1. This card lists a number of water body types. I would like to know how often you, or any members of your household, have visited any of these types of water body in England and Wales in the last twelve months as part of a leisure visit.

The types of trips and outings I'm interested in are:

- Any activities around the water, such as walking, running, cycling, or sitting nearby;
- Water contact activities, such as canoeing, rowing, rafting, surfing, windsurfing, diving, wading, paddling, or swimming;
- Fishing; or,
- Other boating, such as narrow boating or yachting.

Please don't include incidental visits that were not part of a leisure visit, for example passing alongside a river on the way to work. The following question asks about these types of visits.

I would like to know if you, or any members of your household, have visited any of these types of water body often – that is more than six times in the last twelve months, or sometimes – that is between three and six times in the last twelve months, or rarely – that is only once or twice in the last twelve months, or not at all.

[MARK ANSWERS FOR EACH WATER BODY (ROW) USING THE FOLLOWING CODE:]

- 1 = Often
- 2 = Sometimes
- 3 = Rarely
- 4 = None
- 8 = Don't know
- 9 = Refused

Question	Water Body	Frequency
a	Coastal water	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
b	Lake	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
c	Reservoir	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
d	Estuary	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
e	Large River (Navigable by boats)	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
f	Small River / Stream	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
g	Canal	[1-4]; [8]; [9]

IF Q4a=9 & Q4b=9 & Q4c=9 & Q4d=9 & Q4e=9 & Q4f=9 & Q4g=9 , GO TO Q6; OTHERWISE ASK Q5

Q5. Please now look at Card 2. This card lists a number of leisure activities, which make use of the water environment. I would like to know if you, or any members of your household, have used any water environments in England and Wales to participate in any of the following activities. Please tell me whether you have done any of these things often, sometimes, rarely, or not at all during the last 12 months.

[MARK ANSWERS FOR EACH ACTIVITY (ROW) USING THE FOLLOWING CODE:]

- 1 = Often
- 2 = Sometimes
- 3 = Rarely
- 4 = None
- 8 = Don't know
- 9 = Refused

Question	Activity	Frequency
a	Surfing	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
b	Scuba diving or snorkelling	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
c	Waterskiing or jet-skiing	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
d	Sailing or wind-surfing	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
e	Swimming (other than in swimming baths)	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
f	Canoeing	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
g	Rowing	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
h	Narrow-boating and other powered cruise boating	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
i	Paddling or wading	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
j	Fishing	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
k	Walking, running, cycling or sitting nearby	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
l	Bird / wildlife watching	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
m	Any other use (please specify) _____	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
n	Any other use (please specify) _____	[1-4]; [8]; [9]

Q6. Now, please look again at Card 1. I would now like to know how often you, or any members of your household, have visited any of these types of water body in England and Wales in the last 12 months incidentally, that is, not as a focal part of a leisure visit.

The types of visits I'm interested in now are:

- walking, cycling or driving alongside the water body on the way to work, or to another destination.
- taking a ferry or hovercraft as part of a longer journey

As before, "often" means more than six times in the last 12 months, sometimes means between three and six times in the last 12 months", "rarely" means only once or twice in the last 12 months, and "never" means not at all in the last 12 months.

[MARK ANSWERS FOR EACH WATER BODY (ROW) USING THE FOLLOWING CODE:]

- 1 = Often
- 2 = Sometimes
- 3 = Rarely
- 4 = None
- 8 = Don't know
- 9 = Refused

Question	Water Body	Frequency
a	Coastal water	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
b	Lake	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
c	Reservoir	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
d	Estuary	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
e	Large River (Navigable by boats)	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
f	Small River / Stream	[1-4]; [8]; [9]
g	Canal	[1-4]; [8]; [9]

Priorities for Types of Improvement

Over the past 10 years, significant improvements have been made to the quality of the water environment in England and Wales. Now a new law is in place, which has as its first goal to make sure that no place gets any worse from now on. It then aims to make substantial improvements within the next 8 to 20 years. The following questions ask you to decide how important different features of the water environment are to you, and how satisfied you are with the current situation with respect to these features. The amount of money available to make improvements is limited and not everything can be done. The answers you give to these questions will be used to help determine the priority that will be given to making different types of improvement to the water environment. Please feel free to say "I don't know" to any of the questions if you feel you don't have enough knowledge of the issue to offer a reasonably informed opinion.

Aesthetic Characteristics of the Water Environment

Firstly, I want you to consider the aesthetic characteristics of water bodies and their surrounding environments, that is, how they appear to you when you visit them. Please look at Card 3.

- Q7. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is "not at all important" and 10 is "extremely important", how important is it to your household (/ you) that the water environment in general, ie any rivers, lakes, coastal areas, and so on, are free of the following:

Question	Characteristic	Importance
a	General litter, such as plastic bags, paper, cans and bottles in and around the water	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
b	Foam or slime on the water surface	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
c	Algae or bindweed	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
d	Murkiness or discolouration	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
e	Bad smells	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
f	Erosion of banks and shores	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
g	Man-made features, such as dams and weirs	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
h	Crowds of people	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused

- Q8. Considering each characteristic on Card 3 in turn, is it equally important for all types of water body, or is it more important for some types of water body, and less important for others? Please consider all the types of water body on Card 1.

- a) First of all, is it equally important for all types of water body, that they are free of "General litter

such as plastic bags, paper, cans and bottles in and around the water”or is it more important for some types of water body, and less important for others?

[IF EQUALLY IMPORTANT FOR ALL, MARK RESPONSE AS “None” FOR Q8a](i) AND Q8a)(ii) AND GO TO b]; OTHERWISE ASK:

- (i) For which types of water body is it more important? [IF ”None” SKIP TO (iii)]
- (iii) For which types of water body is it less important? [IF ”None” SKIP TO b)]

b) Now consider “Foam or slime on the water surface” is it equally important for all types of water body, that they are free of this, or is it more important for some types of water body, and less important for others?

[IF EQUALLY IMPORTANT FOR ALL, MARK RESPONSE AS “None” FOR Q8b](i) AND Q8b)(ii) AND GO TO c]; OTHERWISE ASK:

- (i) For which types of water body is it more important? [IF ”None” SKIP TO (iii)]
- (iii)For which types of water body is it less important? [IF ”None” SKIP TO c)]

REPEAT ABOVE QUESTION WORDING FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- c) Algae or bindweed
- d) Murkiness or discolouration
- e) Bad smells
- f) Erosion of banks and shores
- g) Man-made features, such as dams and weirs
- h) Crowds of people

[MARK ANSWERS FOR EACH CHARACTERISTIC, AND EACH IMPORTANCE LEVEL USING THE FOLLOWING CODE:]

- 1 = Coastal water
- 2 = Lake
- 3 = Reservoir
- 4 = Estuary
- 5 = Large River (Navigable by boats)
- 6 = Small River / Stream
- 7 = Canal
- 8 = None
- 9 = Don’t know
- 10=Refused

[CODE ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED BY THE RESPONDENT.]

Question	Characteristic	(i) More Important	(ii) Less Important
a	General litter, such as plastic bags, paper, cans and bottles in and around the water		
b	Foam or slime on the water surface		
c	Algae or bindweed		
d	Murkiness or discolouration		
e	Bad smells		
f	Erosion of banks and shores		
g	Man-made features, such as dams and weirs		
h	Crowds of people		

Q9. Now, for these same characteristics, I want to know how satisfied your household is (/ you are) with the current state of the water environment. For these next questions, I want you to consider all instances over the past year where you have visited or passed by any water body for any purpose.

On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is “not at all satisfied” and 10 is “extremely satisfied”, how satisfied are you with the current state of the rivers, lakes, coastal areas, and so on, that you have visited in the past year, with respect to each of the following characteristics:

Question	Characteristic	Satisfaction
a	General litter, such as plastic bags, paper, cans and bottles in and around the water	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
b	Foam or slime on the water surface	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
c	Algae or bindweed	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
d	Murkiness or discolouration	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
e	Bad smells	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
f	Erosion of banks and shores	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
g	Man-made features, such as dams and weirs	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
h	Crowds of people	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused

Ecological Characteristics of the Water Environment

Now, I want you to consider some ecological characteristics of water bodies and their surrounding environments. Please look at Card 4.] The ecological quality of water bodies and their surrounding environments affects the abundance and mix of plants and animals and also affects the risk to humans from contracting water-borne illnesses when using the water for contact activities such as canoeing, rowing, rafting, surfing, windsurfing, diving, wading, paddling, or swimming.

Q10. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is “not at all important” and 10 is “extremely important”, how important is it to your household (/ you) that the water environment in general, ie any rivers, lakes, coastal areas, and so on, provides the following:

Question	Characteristic	Importance
a	Abundance of plants and greenery	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
b	Variety of plants and greenery	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
c	Abundance of fish, birds and other animals	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
d	Variety of fish, birds and other animals	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused

Q11. Considering each characteristic on Card 4 in turn, is it equally important for all types of water body, or is it more important for some types of water body, and less important for others? Please consider all the types of water body on Card 1.

a) First of all, is it equally important to you for all types of water body, that they provide an “Abundance of plants and greenery” or is it more important for some types of water body, and less important for others?

[IF EQUALLY IMPORTANT FOR ALL, MARK RESPONSE AS “None” FOR Q11a](i) AND Q11a](ii) AND GO TO b); OTHERWISE ASK:

(i) For which types of water body is it more important? [IF “None” SKIP TO (iii)]

(iii) For which types of water body is it less important? [IF “None” SKIP TO b)]

b) Now consider the “Variety of plants and greenery” is it equally important to you for all types of water body, that they provide this, or is it more important for some types of water body, and less important for others?

[IF EQUALLY IMPORTANT FOR ALL, MARK RESPONSE AS “None” FOR Q11b)(i) AND Q11b)(ii) AND GO TO c]; OTHERWISE ASK:

(i) For which types of water body is it more important? [IF “None” SKIP TO (iii)]

(iii) For which types of water body is it less important? [IF “None” SKIP TO c)]

REPEAT ABOVE QUESTION WORDING FOR THE FOLLOWING:

c) Abundance of fish, birds and other animals

d) Variety of fish, birds and other animals

[MARK ANSWERS FOR EACH CHARACTERISTIC, AND EACH IMPORTANCE LEVEL USING THE FOLLOWING CODE:]

1 = Coastal water

2 = Lake

3 = Reservoir

4 = Estuary

5 = Large River (Navigable by boats)

6 = Small River / Stream

7 = Canal

8 = None

9 = Don’t know

10=Refused

[CODE ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED BY THE RESPONDENT.]

Question	Characteristic	(i) More Important	(ii) Less Important
a	Abundance of plants and greenery		
b	Variety of plants and greenery		
c	Abundance of fish, birds and other animals		
d	Variety of fish, birds and other animals		

Q12. Now, for these same characteristics, I want to know how satisfied your household is (/ you are) with the current state of the water environment. For these next questions, I want you to consider all instances over the past year where you have visited or passed by any water body for any purpose.

On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is “not at all satisfied” and 10 is “extremely satisfied”, how satisfied are you with the current state of the rivers, lakes, coastal areas, and so on, that you have visited in the past year, with respect to each of the following characteristics:

Question	Characteristic	Satisfaction
a	Abundance of plants and greenery	[1-10] ; 11=Don’t Know; 12=Refused
b	Variety of plants and greenery	[1-10] ; 11=Don’t Know; 12=Refused
c	Abundance of fish, birds and other animals	[1-10] ; 11=Don’t Know; 12=Refused
d	Variety of fish, birds and other animals	[1-10] ; 11=Don’t Know; 12=Refused

Litter and Ecology

The new law is focused on improving the ecological quality of water bodies and their surrounding environments. It aims to improve the abundance and variety of plants, fish, birds and other animals. The presence of general litter, however, such as plastic bags and bottles, does not in general harm the ecology, and so may not necessarily be tackled unless there is strong public demand.

Q13. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is neither agree nor disagree, 4 is agree, and 5 is strongly agree, how far do you agree with the following statements:

Question	Statement	Agreement
a	Clearing the waters and surrounding environments of general litter should come first before tackling ecological concerns	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
b	Improving ecological quality should be the first priority, even where there is general litter present.	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused

Accessibility and Provision of Public Facilities

I now want you to consider the accessibility of, and the provision and maintenance of public facilities at, water bodies in your local area, and around England and Wales.

Q14. Please look at Card 2. For any of the activities on this card that you have done, or have considered doing in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is "not at all satisfied" and 10 is "extremely satisfied", with the current amount of access available to you?

Question	Activity	Satisfaction with Current Access
a	Surfing	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
b	Scuba diving or snorkelling	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
c	Waterskiing or jet-skiing	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
d	Sailing or wind-surfing	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
e	Swimming (other than in swimming baths)	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
f	Canoeing	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
g	Rowing	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
h	Narrow-boating and other powered cruise boating	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
i	Paddling or wading	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
j	Fishing	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
k	Walking, running, cycling or sitting nearby	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
l	Bird / wildlife watching	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
m	Any other use (please specify)	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused
n	Any other use (please specify)	[1-10] ; 11=Don't Know; 12=Refused

Priorities for Where to Make the Improvements

The following questions ask for your views on the importance of public accessibility in determining where improvements should be made. In some places, access to the water is restricted to clubs or private land owners. In other places, access is physically impossible, or very difficult. In other places still, whilst the waters are physically and legally accessible, they are rarely visited by the public due to their remoteness from populated areas.

Q15. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is neither agree nor disagree, 4 is agree, and 5 is strongly agree, how far do you agree with each of the following statements

Question	Statement	Agreement
a	Higher priority should be given to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners.	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q15a=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]
b	Higher priority should be given to places that are physically accessible than to places that are not.	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q15b=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]
c	Higher priority should be given to places where more visits are made by the general public.	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q15c=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]
d	Higher priority should be given to places with more serious problems, without taking into account accessibility and number of visits by the public	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q15d=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]

Decision Making Process

The questions I have asked you in this survey will be used to influence the priority given to different sorts of improvements to the water environment in England and Wales over the next 8 to 20 years.

Q16. Considering all of the issues covered in this survey, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is neither agree nor disagree, 4 is agree, and 5 is strongly agree, how far do you agree with each of the following statements:

Question	Statement	Agreement
a	Except where I've said "I don't know", I have enough knowledge of the issues covered in this survey to offer a reasonably informed opinion.	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q16a=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]
b	Other members of the public are more informed than me, and should have a greater influence in setting improvement priorities	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q16b=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]
c	Decisions on setting priorities for improvement should be left to experts within the government and its agencies.	[1-5] ; 6=Don't Know; 7=Refused
(i)	[IF Q16c=1 OR 5] Why do you say that?	[RECORD VERBATIM]

Demographic Information

In order to ensure that we survey people from all walks of life, I would now like to ask you some questions about you and your household. I would like to reassure you that all responses will be kept strictly confidential.

Q17. [HAND RESPONDENT EDUCATION CARD] What is the highest level of education you completed on this card? Do not include specialized schools like secretarial, art, or trade schools. [RECORD A-G]

A	Primary
B	O levels, GCSE or CSE (1 or more passes), NVQ Level 1 or Foundation Level GNVQ
C	5 or more O levels, CSE grade 1's or GCSE grades A-C; School Certificate; 1 or more A levels or AS levels; NVQ level 2 or Intermediate GNVQ.
D	2 or more A levels; 4 or more AS levels; Higher School Certificate; NVQ level 3; or Advanced GNVQ.
E	First Degree, Higher Degree, NVQ levels 4 and 5; HNC; HND; Qualified Teacher Status; Qualified Medical Doctor; Qualified Dentist; Qualified Nurse; Midwife; or Health Visitor.
F	DON'T KNOW
G	REFUSED

Q18. [HAND RESPONDENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS CARD] Which of the categories on this card describes your current employment status? [RECORD A-L]

A	Working full-time employee (31+ hours)
B	Working part-time employee (1-30 hours)
C	Working - self-employed
D	Working and full time student
E	Not working - seeking work
F	Not working - full time student
G	Not working - retired
H	Not working - looking after home/children
I	Not working - permanently sick / disabled
J	Not working - other
K	Don't know
L	Refused
M	NO PARTNER

Q19. [HAND RESPONDENT INCOME CARD] For classification purposes only, please tell me which category best describes the total income that you (and all other members of this household) earned during 2006 before taxes. Please be sure to include each member's wages and salaries, as well as net income from any business, pensions, benefits dividends, interest, tips, or other income. Just tell me the letter that best describes your household's income. [RECORD A-Q]

	Per Week	Per Year
A	Up to £86	Under £4,500
B	£87-£125	£4,500-£6,499
C	£126-£144	£6,500-£7,499
D	£145-£182	£7,500-£9,499
E	£183-£221	£9,500-£11,499
F	£222-£259	£11,500-£13,499
G	£260-£298	£13,500-£15,499
H	£299-£336	£15,500-£17,499
I	£337-£480	£17,500-£24,999
J	£481-£576	£25,000-£29,999
K	£577-£769	£30,000-£39,999
L	£770-£961	£40,000-£49,999
M	£962-£1,441	£50,000-£74,999
N	£1,442-£1,922	£75,000-£99,999
O	£1,923 or over	£100,000 or over
P	DON'T KNOW	
Q	REFUSED	

Thank you for your help in this research

This research was conducted under the terms of the MRS code of conduct and is completely confidential. If you would like to confirm my credentials or those of Accent please call the MRS free on 0500 396999.

Please can I take a note of your name and where we can contact you for quality control purposes?

Respondent name:

Telephone: home:..... work:.....

Thank you

I confirm that this interview was conducted under the terms of the MRS code of conduct and is completely confidential

Interviewer's signature:

Time Interview completed: :

APPENDIX C. SHOWCARDS

CARD 1 – Types of Water Body

Type of Water Body	Often (More than 6 times in the last 12 months)	Sometimes (Between 3 and 6 times in the last 12 months)	Rarely (Once or twice in the last 12 months)	None (Zero times in the past 12 months)
Coastal water	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Lake	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Reservoir	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Estuary	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Large River (Navigable by boats)	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Small River / Stream	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Canal	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None

CARD 2 – Activities

Activity	Often (More than 6 times in the last 12 months)	Sometimes (Between 3 and 6 times in the last 12 months)	Rarely (Once or twice in the last 12 months)	None
Surfing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Scuba diving or snorkelling	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Waterskiing or jet-skiing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Sailing or wind-surfing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Swimming (other than in swimming baths)	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Canoeing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Rowing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Narrow-boating and other powered cruise boating	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Paddling or Wading	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Fishing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Walking, running, cycling or sitting nearby	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Bird / wildlife watching	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Any other use (please specify) _____	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None
Any other use (please specify) _____	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	None

CARD 3 – Aesthetic Characteristics of the Water Environment

General litter, such as plastic bags, paper, cans and bottles in and around the water
Foam or slime on the water surface
Algae or bindweed
Murkiness or discolouration
Bad smells
Erosion of banks and shores
Man-made features, such as dams and weirs
Crowds of people

CARD 4 – Ecological Characteristics of the Water Environment

Abundance of plants and greenery

Variety of plants and greenery

Abundance of fish, birds and other animals

Variety of fish, birds and other animals

CARD 5 – Public Facilities

Access by road

Car parking

Public toilets

Paths, signs, and picnic tables

AGE

A	18-24
B	25-29
C	30-44
D	45-59
E	60-64
F	65-74
G	75+

EDUCATION

A	Primary
B	O levels, GCSE or CSE (1 or more passes), NVQ Level 1 or Foundation Level GNVQ
C	5 or more O levels, CSE grade 1's or GCSE grades A-C; School Certificate; 1 or more A levels or AS levels; NVQ level 2 or Intermediate GNVQ.
D	2 or more A levels; 4 or more AS levels; Higher School Certificate; NVQ level 3; or Advanced GNVQ.
E	First Degree, Higher Degree, NVQ levels 4 and 5; HNC; HND; Qualified Teacher Status; Qualified Medical Doctor; Qualified Dentist; Qualified Nurse; Midwife; or Health Visitor.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

A	Working full-time employee (31+ hours)
B	Working part-time employee (1-30 hours)
C	Working - self-employed
D	Working and full time student
E	Not working - seeking work
F	Not working - full time student
G	Not working - retired
H	Not working - looking after home/children
I	Not working - permanently sick / disabled
J	Not working - other

INCOME

	Per Week	Per Year
A	Up to £86	Under £4,500
B	£87-£125	£4,500-£6,499
C	£126-£144	£6,500 - £7,499
D	£145-£182	£7,500 - £9,499
E	£183-£221	£9,500-£11,499
F	£222-£259	£11,500-£13,499
G	£260-£298	£13,500-£15,499
H	£299-£336	£15,500 - £17,499
I	£337-£480	£17,500 - £24,999
J	£481-£576	£25,000 - £29,999
K	£577-£769	£30,000 - £39,999
L	£770-£961	£40,000 - £49,999
M	£962-£1,441	£50,000 - £74,999
N	£1,442-£1,922	£75,000 - £99,999
O	£1,923 or over	£100,000 +

APPENDIX D. VERBATIM RESPONSES

Q15A Higher priority should be given to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners

Strongly Disagree – 31 people

- Should have equal treatment for all places regardless the accessibility
- I don't think the numbers are the thing you do it for - you do it for the environment and the suffering animals, not the people
- Because it should all be sorted - it's the environment, not a picture show for tourists
- Equal priority should be given to all places
- People should always have access, public access should always be a priority
- Should all be accessible to the public so should get more priority
- Because more people use them, and tourists use them
- Because it's about equality and access for everybody
- Everyone should be able to enjoy these places - not just private users
- If its private then they should deal on with it on their own
- It's all very well to have a nice stretch of river and keep it private but that means you have a private duty to maintain it.
- Detrimental to environment if you leave out certain places from the focus
- I dont believe in these places having priority
- Because private ones are not used by many people
- Because its unfair not to
- Because it should all be equal across the board
- Because the busy areas get more people there - and hence more pollution from litter
- Places should be given equal priority regardless of whether visited or not
- They should all have equal importance for the animals/wildlife
- You have to put everyone first - not just private places
- The same level of care should be given everywhere
- I dont agree with people not being able to use areas in the environment. Shouldnt be limited to the privileged few.
- Because water should be the same everywhere and it doesn't matter who has access or not. If you're talking about the environmental issues it doesn't matter, obviously if the general public have access it takes more management, but that's why it needs more priority
- The general public are a scruffy lot and they wont be as careful with the environment as private land owners are, as they will treat it with a bit more respect.
- Should be ranked by importance of condition
- Wherever it needs doing
- It reduces the opportunity for other people when restricted to club owners, etc.
- Private areas should be maintained privately
- I think all water sites should be taken care of by the water supplier/regardless of people visiting or not
- Private land is private land
- All be kept clean

Strongly Agree

- The general public should get a higher priority
- Restricted access should mean greater responsibility

- Private places should do their own thing
- Private businesses look after themselves. Money should go to the public, so long as the public respect the areas and take it upon themselves to maintain what is done.
- In terms of taxation and water rates - it ought to be provided for the majority of bill payers who fund it
- I would like places with higher accessibility to be prioritised
- It's more important to the general public
- People in this country pay lots of tax, water accessibility should be given higher priority for all.
- No problem unless there is damage
- I think that if people want to enjoy the country then they should be allowed to do so
- Because people get to enjoy the nature and see what needs to be saved - then they will be more caring themselves once they have something good to protect
- Not enough areas for walking etc, too privatised
- It is more important to the general public to have access, then anyone can use it
- Private landowners and clubs should not get the priority, the general public comes first
- I think the general public should be able to enjoy the water bodies and whatever improvements are needed
- I only have public transport, so only go to local accessible areas, so more important, because I don't have access to others and want my daughter to experience these places safely.
- Public should have access to all places so that priority is equal in all circumstances
- Access should be made available for all
- To get the most out of it
- I oppose things belonging to individuals rather than the people
- There should be no problem of access if people enjoy these amenities
- Certain areas are not accessible, eg estuaries, and are therefore less important
- Places where everyone can go should have priority
- Private owners should be responsible for their own areas
- Environment should be equal for everybody
- Access to the general public is important, not everyone can afford club membership fees
- Like to think it's all accessible
- I think more places should be accessible to the public
- Prioritise the areas that will get the most use to increase enjoyment levels
- Because the people are more important and will want to look after it
- The general public should be given a higher priority as they make up the majority
- Thinks public access is important
- I think places with higher access should be prioritised
- Public interest is more important than private interest
- They should help the public to get to these places
- Because the busy areas get more people there - and hence more pollution from litter
- So that everybody can have a taste of the improvements rather than a small minority
- Should be for the benefit of everyone
- If it's private, the landowners would usually take care of it
- If it's private they need to look after it themselves
- More benefit to general public

- Access should be for everybody
- Private have their own land, but public need to have more access to areas.
- Better for people and locality in general if focus on accessible place by public
- More people will access the places
- There should be no restrictions
- The general public are to blame most of the time for the neglect of these areas
- It's every person's right to get to these places
- Everyone should have a right to access to the environment which is available to them
- The places should be available to all people, and those places should have more attention than other places which are only restricted for certain groups of people
- Most impact on ecological balance will be there. More people means more attention is needed as more potential for damage
- People are more likely to stay indoors and should be encouraged to go outside
- Just strongly agree with it
- Everybody should be able to have access to these improvements
- To make improved accessability
- Mainly for safety conditions of banks are very important to help people from falling in. Attention given to provide public access.
- Because i think its a shared planet and we should have shared amenities
- Because i think public money should be spent on public access areas.
- Private places should pay for their own upkeep
- They should have access- the public are paying for it.
- The public should all be able to go to these improved places. And they should be accessible.
- Privately owned land normally well maintained, public places normally don't get much money allocated to them
- Public have access and that equals litter and more problems should be tackled
- The places with public access are mainly for the use of people who have not got the means to contribute substatially to environmental improvments etc. Wheras private clubs and landowners do.
- Usually the restricted areas are the best
- Because it is good for public to have access to such environment, rather than restricting it for private usage
- Places where more people go - should concentrate on because more important to the public in general
- Because if there is private access then the people who've got that private access should be doing more to improve these things and should pay for improvements
- Needs to be mainteained to be enjoyed and enjoyable to be visited
- Private water areas should be kept by owners
- Being a walker i enjoy going to areas of the countryside and appreciating wildlife
- I think these types of water body are extremeley important to maintain
- Private landowneers can pay for their own
- Clubs and private landowners should maintain their own land
- Public money shouldn't nessesarily be spent on private facilities
- Because not everybody can afford to be a club member/ find a club near their area
- Lots of nice areas should be open to all, even if access is limited
- More money for public, because more people
- Why should bother private places? They have their own workers to take care of them

- I don't want resources wasted on places that only a few people visit
- Money should go to areas where everyone has access regardless of financial situation.
- The public should have access to all areas
- I want everything best for the society as a whole
- Favouring the public
- Private places have somebody to take care of them compared to public places
- Because by improving it the general public will benefit and go there more often.
- Because it's landowners' responsibility to look after their patches and the public's to look after theirs
- Everybody should be entitled to access the experience surrounding them.
- I don't see why private clubs should get preference over the general public
- People should have easy access to these places.
- I think that these types of water body should be available to the public
- Private should look after themselves
- Common sense that public is more important than private
- Places that are visited loads, are likely to be spoiled
- Because private areas are for people who are in an advantage of a higher income group so should manage it properly themselves.
- I think that the private landowners should be allowed to be maintain the land themselves
- If the place is easy then it makes it safer for the public who visit it
- Because general public should be able to enjoy a safe and comfortable environment
- Private landowners should do it themselves
- Because there is a difference between what the government has to support centrally and what is supported by private contribution.
- Private should be paid for by subscriptions etc
- Public should be able to take part in hobbies as far as possible
- Bloody southerners come down and take the beaches
- More people go there and more people will be better off compared to certain group of people who have access to the private places
- I think everybody should have the same availability to funds
- Other people who aren't willing to share- why should they get help for free
- The public should not have access to all places.
- I think the priority should be given to places the public can access in order for people to appreciate what they are given.
- There shouldn't be any private land owners around this area
- Everywhere should have access. There should be no private clubs or landowners that get funding.
- Public places need to be care more compared to private places because for private places there are people to take care of them
- People should be free to go wherever they want and more people use public spaces
- For the people should be available to all e.g. seaside and lakes
- Land owner can look after themselves
- Should be open for everyone
- Everything should be improved for the general public
- More people go there and the places should be clean and tidy
- It's so everybody can benefit, not just the selective few
- All people should have access to areas of beauty - not just those who have

- privilidge
- Privte landowners should pay for things themselves. Public money should be used in areas where public have access
 - They should get the benefit they they pay for
 - Access for everyone should be the priority, if cant access no need to give priorities on those places
 - Because not everyone has their own land- we should have the same quality as everyone else
 - Because the more people that can enjoy it, the better - there's no point in spending money were only rich folks can reep the benefit
 - Public, should be available to everyone
 - If the place is restricted to clubs et cetera, they do not deserve the public money to get those places to be treated
 - Benefits more people and clubs should sort themselves out instead of keepin land in poor condition
 - Becasue private people can afford it-
 - Because water bodies are public goods but where there is restricted use, more priority should be given to public water bodies for the general good of the public
 - Should not be restricted to clubs -freedom to roam is important
 - Access to any public resource should be open to all
 - Because theres no point in making stuff look brilliant and not being able to use it as its public money thats been spent
 - Im, a socialist, everyone should have access as long as they behave themselves
 - Its public property , it shouldnt just be privated, anyone should have access to all public spaces, there are very few places, water bodies, that can be accessed by people living in the city
 - People should have unrestricted access to public places
 - Because everyone is seeing them.
 - If people see the area they improve they will make more of an effort to take care of it.
 - Its there for everybody so they should tackle that
 - If its restricted to a few people than i dont see why public money should be used to improve things and if it is private land they should be responsible for improving things.
 - I reckon that the private people can pay for them themselves
 - Because where it is visited by lots of people, the management of it is extremely important.
 - Government funding for the public
 - Because private landowners usually will look after their own land because they care about it.
 - Because most places are public.
 - I think more places should be accessible to the public
 - Everyone should have the oppurtunity to access the countryside, wildlife and so forth
 - Private owned should do imprmes themselves
 - Because the local landowners can be complete bastards about the trespassing laws.
 - There is alot of private place so public places should be given more prority because there are anumber of people who cant afford the private places
 - I feel that is the way it should be done. That's logical.
 - Everyone has a right to enjoy the waters as everybody pays taxes

- Because i think are going to visit this places they should look at their best, if it's club or private lands, then the landowners should have the obliged to look after his land.
- Higher priority should be given to the public.
- More people would benefit.
- Important for general public to get access to water bodies so as to make best use of it
- Clubs and private landowners can afford to maintain their water environments
- Because having access for walkers/ramblers is important for health reasons and keeping active
- Because i dont see why the public should pay something that they cant access
- Priority should definately be given to water bodies that benefit the public than in areas which are restricted because privately owned/controled areas are in most cases private investments and should be treated as such
- Clubs and private land owners are minority groups and resources should be targeted to the general population.
- Cases where more people enjoy water bodies and wild life should be made more accessible and improved
- Access should be more improved in such ares where people frequent
- You want to find them in best possible condition
- I amthe general public and consider being more important
- I think that public land owners should not be able to keep the public away.
- They are natural and should be open to every body
- Alot of nice places around which u cant access due to privately owned
- Alot of places what are have got specific wildlife you cant get to it
- To control the littering / display messages where appropriate / beware throwing anything in the water / they should have a fine system set up like with cigarette butts
- Because if the land belongs to all it should be accessible for all as its good for health
- Landowners can maintain their access themselves, rather than using public money
- Public money should nbe spent on p welfare
- If its private its the responsibilty of the owner ... Taxpayers money
- Everyone should have access to all water bodies, due to fairness
- As somebody who pays a hugh amount of tax and water rates, i want to be able to access them.
- Everybody should have the right to visit these water bodies so they need to tackle these areas.
- People dont want to go somewhere and find it is covered in rubbish
- Because not everybody can afford to join clubs
- Difficult to sail a ding on the coast around nw kent, virtually impossible to get access to a slipway, eed access toa club
- If you have private land then you are responsible for generally maintaining it.
- Equal priority if access is in question , but for water bodies it should be equal.
- Because public places are in use more so often, more improvements are required.
- More important to have access for puplic
- O
- General public should be able to enjoy nature
- Everyone should have the right to access
- Less restrictions

- Because if it's a public place that is receiving more visits then it's more likely to suffer from erosion and damages
- Places like that should be for all around
- I think that if its roundabout where people can get, if people can get to them, it should be paid for
- Because the youngster usually ruin public property and litter it so we should keep on top of that rather than prvate areas that silly children cant get to
- The general public should not have to pay to get to places that are open to the general public
- Because it would give the public more oppurtunnities for outdoor activites in the open.
- Because if the majority of people can access it then it would be a great service to the community
- Facilities for all
- Coz too many parts of the british island close to the general public
- I think we have a right to use these surroundings, walk along the river or beaches when we want
- Need more for the public esp children
- I visit alot of those places myself
- Should be for everybody!
- Places visited by the public tend to need more upkeep as they are used by the general public. Private areas are more protected from pollution and litter.
- These are the places that get used the most so they should be tackled first
- Because more people go there/ is not exclusive
- Sailing clubs then you can't get near the water such as farmers lands means you are tresspassing
- Because i think clubs should sort it out themsleves if there is any improvement to be done.
- Everybody should have access to all types of water enviroments and should not be restricted, within reason.
- All people should have access
- General public should have right to access and if private access wants to benefit they can pay themselves
- Because it's pointless if it's not public
- Because it's important for the public to have an open are for outdoor exercise.
- All the public should have access to all areas
- I am a member of the public and it is what would affect me
- I think everybody has a right to enjoy the nice areas around us
- Dont think people have a right to have less or more access
- Well because the public visit it and without meaning to sound strange - if the public go it should be prioritised rather than if someone happens to own it
- We should be able to enjoy the water enviroment without it costing too much money, these days out are enjoyable fpr everyone.
- The water should be free everybody to use and should not be restricted to private landowners

Q15B Higher priority should be given to places that are physically accessible than to places that are not.

Strongly Disagree – 29 people

- I dont think it makes any difference whether the public are there or not
- Don't know
- i don't think the numbers are the thing you do it for - you do it for the environment and the suffering animals, not the people
- BECAUSE IT SHOULD ALL BE SORTED - IT'S THE ENVIRONMENT, NOT A PICTURE SHOW FOR TOURISTS
- NEED TO TAKE CARE OF MORE PRISTINE ENVIRONMENTS
- Why would you want to improve places which are remote or not visited much by the public
- because of public use
- where people go there should be improvements
- because the public deserve it
- not many places are out of bounds- the mess will seep through to the places that are accessible
- nobody should be barred from not accessing any parts of the countryside anywa
- just because you can't get to it doesn't mean to say that you shouldn't look after it
- feel that places that are not accessible still need to be looked after.
- because they should look after everything not just where people go
- because more people will get pleasure from it
- because it should all be equal across the board
- the wilder the better
- because the busy areas get more people there - and hence more pollution from litter
- JUST BECAUSE PEOPLE AREN'T THERE, THEY SHOULD BE GOOD FOR WILDLIFE THAT'S THERE
- no priority when comes to making improvements. all should be kept natural
- they should all have equal importance for the animals/wildlife
- We should be looking after the environment overall, wether you can see the place or not.
- BECAUSE THERES MORE CHANCE OF PLANT LIFE, BIRD LIFE THE FURTHER AWAY THEY ARE TO HUMANS
- I dont think it matters, improvments should be made whether we've got access or not
- Well, it's the same thing, if the public can get there then they are more likely to be affected, if they are not accesable, then people won't damage them.
- The same, wherever needs it
- In termsof water quality, what you don't see is as important as what you do see; we need to worry about all water bodies and access is important but not the only thing
- because usually neglected places feed the bigger places
- no

Strongly Agree – 95 people

- You've got more disabled people getting out and about - it's more access
- Priority should be given to where people can get to
- Don't know

- In terms of taxation and water rates - it ought to be provided for the majority of bill payers who fund it
- If people can get to it then they are more likely to respect the area
- Because they are accessible you can get people that are not as able as others to be able to enjoy it
- If it is accessible it would get more visits and thus it should take priority
- I want my daughter to experience those, because they are easily accessible to her.
- Again, it is fair to give people access to every places so that when treating the environment problem, equal attention is given
- I feel strongly about this as disabled person
- I think priority should be given to places of popular interest
- Why not, if people enjoy these type of activities
- Dont know
- Everyone should be able to take advantage of these facilities
- Should be treated equally with no preference
- So that more people can make the best use of it
- To encourage people to use good accessible facilities.
- As a tax payer, what i see should be in good condition.
- I think that if everyone has access to these areas also landowners have the right to maintain their land
- Pleasure of public should be first priority
- I think that if more people go there then there should be a priority to make sure they look at quality - to please people
- Not acceptable to restricted areas to have more attention than public places
- Public interest again, should outweigh the private interests
- Access for disabled people important
- If not easily accessible, not fair to people who cant enjoy the environment like restricted places et cetera
- All places should be accessible to the people, if not, the priority is not for them
- People can go there and should have the chance to do so
- Makes it easier for everybody to view or be influenced by the improvements
- For safety reasons if its open to public its very important to maintain conditions
- If they can have access to it- it should be looked after-
- Access needs to be looked after inaccessible places will be more natural so look after themselves. I've seen problems where more human contact occurs
- In the places which are inaccessible are looked after by nature and they shouldn't acquire litter, erosion etc. And do not need it as much.
- They should tidy up all places
- More people have access, so more people can enjoy it
- They should be looked after for the animals themselves
- The money is going towards more people.
- I want the best for me, and other members of society
- Benefitting the public
- To encourage people to go, so they get a good experience.
- Because people go there.
- Important for people to have access to places that are available to them
- If public money is been spent then the money should be invested where people would get the most benefit
- To stop people trying to access unaccessible places and risking themselves

- Places that public go to must have priority
- Would like to think people use the facilities
- Why improve a place if it is not physically accessible
- Places should be accessible to the general public but definitely regulated
- Better off for the people and society in general
- If you've got somewhere that is not physically accessible, the usage of it will be next to none. It would be a waste to spend money in a place that people will have little or no use for.
- If you're allowed to go there they should be cleaner than places that you're not
- Because it should be accessible all the time for everyone
- Everybody can enjoy the public places compared to private places
- All people should have access to areas of beauty - not just those who have privilege
- I am disabled and need easy access.
- Think that family should enjoy amenities
- What's the point in spending money if it's not going to be used
- People will benefit more and people causing more damage so more need for help
- Private landowners should have their say who has access to their area rather than allowing all general public to have access
- Resources shouldn't be wasted in inaccessible waterbodies
- More people would enjoy
- Because people are visiting them and seeing them.
- If people see it improve they will make more of an effort
- More people means pollution which needs to be cleaned
- If more people can use then it should be checked
- Because I would like to visit more places so the accessibility should improve.
- If there is more access to them then more people are going to visit them
- Because the public needs to be given the opportunity to enjoy benefits that accrue from water bodies without restrictions/limitations
- I feel that is the way it should be done. That's logical.
- If they were more accessible there would be more erosion and then they would become more dangerous
- So people can enjoy the outside without rubbish everywhere and be encouraged to continue using the areas
- Start obviously where it is visible and worry about the inaccessible areas later
- There is no point in getting access to a place you can't get to
- It has to be safe enough, it has got to be well maintained, or else people would complain, or people wouldn't visit these places
- Nobody is going to remote places and access is more to general places
- You will always find someone trying to close the public foot path.
- This would encourage more people to visit if the facilities are improved
- Should be there to enjoy... Disabled people
- If it is accessible then the people will go there which means it needs to be maintained
- The more people you have, the more you have to keep an eye on it, plants should be given attention and animals shouldn't be bothered by people
- It's everybody's right to have that possibility
- Places that are visited more by the general public should be given more priority.
- More people using the public areas so they need more attention

- L
- I just think it should be available to all/every1
- Just think they should be
- Access should be for everyone.
- Accebility is important
- It should be available to everyone
- Safe access so people can visit esp for families
- Easily accessable should be of the highest standard
- The public cause the litter and pollution (so more accessible places need more attention)
- Because they can
- Access to all
- It is open to a wider range of people
- It's because that's where accidents would happen if it's accessible
- Because if its a palce where all members of the place can get to you obviously want it to be safe dont you

Q15C Higher priority should be given to places where more visits are made by the general public.

Strongly Disagree – 13 people

- Because it should all be sorted - it's the environment, not a picture show for tourists
- Because they are more used
- Water that has been made to irrigate certain areas or have other social functions should be restricted to the general public
- Because the general public are the majority
- Just because it's not visited doesn't mean it shouldn't be taken care of
- Because it should all be equal across the board
- Because the busy areas get more people there - and hence more pollution from litter
- All areas should be kept nice for the animals etc living there
- I think the whole area should be maintained
- They should all have equal importance for the animals/wildlife
- If concentrate on areas where people go, other areas get neglected and the cycle continues
- Its the same, they're repeating themselves. What i would say is that your going to have a lot more maintenance because the general public create the problems themselves in so many cases and in private cases the owners will do the repairs themselves so it depends on whether you're talking public money or private money
- Should aoll be treated the same

Strongly Agree – 129 people

- It's for more people to enjoy it, so there's more benefit for the public
- Money need to go to these areas in order to safegaurd the water and insure that it's kept clean.
- In terms of taxation and water rates - it ought to be provided for the majority of bill payers who fund it
- People need to get to theseplaces
- Health and safety considerations eg litter could cause health problems
- I think that if people want to enjoy the country then they should be allowed to do so
- Because people get to enjoy the nature and see what needs to be saved - then they will be more caring themselves once they have something good to protect
- Nice for people to go there in summer, so needs to be kept up to scratch
- Amount of people that visit, requires more time to make sure things are safe, if not things will go downhill i.e don't look after a place then people wont go there
- I am ocmmitted to recreational access
- Let them go wherever they like
- It concerns the general public (majority)
- Encourages more people to go if they are clean and tidy
- Because it benefits old people
- I believe the paths should be maintained for the public but they should also respect the habitats and ohter local wildlife
- If its more popular then it will get more damaged
- To ensure that they are maintained in a good standard
- If public is there they need to be kept up to scratch to keep public satisfied
- I think that if more people go there then there should be a priority to make sure they look at quality - to please people

- Don't know
- Public is more important than private people, and represents the society at large
- Not many people can afford to go to private clubs.
- Because more people can get there
- The public should be made to visit these places
- Popularity of a site should influence its priority so its enjoyed as much as possible by more people
- Everything should be prioritised should not depend on whether we can see it or not
- It makes the people feel better
- If demand is high, should be kept that way
- More people will go if its kept well
- That's where the best facilities are needed
- Improving quality of life in general
- Nothing specific - just agree with statement
- More damage can be caused by the public, so more care needs to be taken
- The public should be encouraged to go out and enjoy all these facilities
- If more people visit should be kept cleaner and safer
- Because the money is being shared between more people.
- People could get hurt
- People have more access- thus it should be looked after- less injuries as well- plus people might want to pay for it
- Access is an important feature. Seems pointless to improve places nowhere will see/visit
- People living in towns don't respect the country they need to be more aware and less flippant with regards to the environment when they do
- Allows people more access and more pleasurable
- Public places have priority
- Public places need to be cleaned more because more people means more mess
- It's a good use of funds to focus on these areas
- The money is going towards more people.
- If you are going to the places with small children etc.
- Best interest of the people should prevail
- Health reasons, if lots of people are going there they should be safe when using the water
- Benefitting the public
- The greatest happiness for the greatest number of people - utilitarianism
- Accessibility is important.
- Because more people are using that part of the environment and its important as people can see that something is being done and improved
- Where there are a lot of people they often have a small majority who abuse the facilities so need maintenance to rectify that
- To stop people trying to access unaccessible places and risking themselves
- To improve facilities- wild life (hide)
- Certain areas are restricted by private landowners.
- Because if people see the visual effect and appreciate the impact it will have a knock on effect and more people and public opinion would support it.
- You get a lot of people would visit if the places to walk and enjoy the country more if they were kept clean.
- Because you've got more people going there, so more pollution and more tidying

needed.

- The places that people enjoy visiting should be preserved to good taste
- Public places should have more importance than private places
- I think everybody should have access and the funds should meet public demand
- Because you will get better value for money- more people will enjoy what you provided
- More maintenance is required because of the volume of visitors.
- Because priority to those areas will be appreciated by more people.
- Because if a place is nice enough to have people there it should be accessible and funding should be directed towards it.
- General public trash waste so should be looked after more
- More damage occurs due to human contact leading to ecological damage
- If they have people visiting it's more important- for health and safety reasons.
- I think that where general public are allowed to enter these types of water body they should be well maintained
- Leisure time is extremely important. We should improve the environment to improve people's leisure time
- Fair for the people because they can enjoy the scenery
- It's all about what the people want
- All people should have access to areas of beauty - not just those who have privilege
- Where I live there is a lot of greenery and we should all (public) be able to enjoy the water bodies around them.
- Family enjoyment
- There's no point spending money if it's not going to be used. They might as well spend money on Mars.
- If public go there, should have priority because it's benefiting the society at large
- If the public visit there is more demand so it should be the best it can be
- They need to be checked to be in good condition, the fact that they are visited, means that people enjoy them, instead of giving priority to places where people don't normally go
- Need to advertise these waters
- It is because if more people go it is more likely to be messed up - it will lead to man-made pollution.
- Same reason, because everyone is visiting them.
- If people see it improve they will make more of an effort
- If you get a lot of people going to the one place then they should keep it nice and encourage people to go there
- More people means pollution which needs to be cleaned
- Same as the previous answers
- Because I would like to visit more places so the accessibility should improve.
- Because the more people visiting, the more detrimental it would be if it's not maintained to a high standard.
- I feel that is the way it should be done. That's logical.
- To maintain safety
- It is important people don't go to these
- So all the people can enjoy watersides if they wish to
- Public bring consumerism so popular areas should be tackled
- The public are paying for it through rates and tax
- We need to preserve these areas as they are visited the most

- For the same reason
- People are still trying to stop people from using public access.
- Its nice to be out somewhere restrictions are not made
- Lots of families like to use to coastal waters to enjoy the outdoors so the improvements should be made here.
- If it's more accesable it should be in better conidition so we can visit them more often
- General public go there , and a lot of people go there it is obviously popular, a it needs controlling and b it need maintaining, because a lot of people are going the litter has to be picked up
- Because more people should be more connected with the land they're on, and the nature that surrounds them.
- Leisure activities.. Healthy and helpful
- Because if youv got more general public going youv got more children and if youv got children going in contact with the water its imoportant that the waters rly good quality
- When more people use an area then it tends to need more upkeep.
- More people using it therefore should be given more attention than private places
- Because i like the idea of being able to get to the water, groups of children should be able to get to the water
- Generally feel if its club orientated then its a restricted audience. If its open more availability to general public
- If more people come along and see the difference they are more likely to look after it,
- Best to fix those that are being used and are more visible than those nobody knows even exist if they are secluded
- Thats where the most mess us going to be and it will demand the most upkeep.
- More people going then thats were the rubbish is need to be more aware of this. They go for the quiet places. Parks have been shut off..
- Its nice to walk around the lakes in my area
- It would be subject to higher erosion and damages
- Things should be easy to visit places.
- Because the family should have access to these places for entertainment purposes
- To encourage the general public to make more use of these facilities
- Because the general public should have access to these places
- For families
- Higher numbers more need to be taken care of
- Alot of people needs to be kept nice to stop people complaining
- The public cause the litter and pollution.
- Because i just think that its good that everybody should be able to go where they want
- Pleases more people
- If a place is already popular then by tackling that area first it will probably increase tourism and things like that
- Because people should hace the choices to visit open areas.
- Because if you concentrate on improving where the public are going then it will have more of an imediate effect, and people will be able to witness the improvements as soon as they happen.
- Your dealing with much larger numberas of people so you've got to obviously make it as safe as possible

- Same as last time, want everyone to be safe

Q15D Higher priority should be given to places with more serious problems, without taking into account accessibility and number of visits by the public

Strongly Disagree – 10 people

- It's not about people, it is about the environment, regardless of whether it is accessible or not
- Because there is plenty of space available without encroaching on private access
- If the country's falling apart and the worst issues need dealing with first when there is little money, that's why the public opinion is important
- If people visit somewhere regularly then they should get the best quality
- Water board should make everything good regardless of the condition of the water bodies
- Priority should always be given to the most serious problems
- Because the coastline near to us is eroding wildlife, scytering the wildlife and people are losing their houses into the sea, some areas are not accesible by road now to people that live there.
- I think all water bodies are important whether visited by the public or not.
- If you have one area that is particularly bad, then it should be sorted out straight away, or it will be beyond repair, and its also more sensible to do this, that way the worst places get done first and people will treat it with more respect then.
- If its private land then the owners should be responsible for the upkeep.

Strongly Agree – 177 people

- I feel the ecology of the area is more important, if certain areas are affected then others will follow
- If you have a serious problem, then that problem needs to be given priority for the animals - otherwise people wouldn't want to visit it anyway - in the long term or at any time
- Inaccessible areas will affect accessible areas in long term
- Because if problems are not tackled with rivers, lakes etc because they are not accessible, this could lead to catastrophes in the future
- You have to safeguard places even if people go there or not
- To improve overall eco system
- Because my husband is a landowner
- Don't know
- If the unaccesible places are not maintained e.g. rivers being littered. Eventually it will spread to the accesible areas as the mess will run down.
- The water will still travel through other areas so they will still be affected
- Quality should take precedence over accessibility
- More priority for wildlife and plants
- General enviromental concern
- If its a serious problem, you need access to rectify the problem
- None
- To make sure that everything is clean and tidy with regards to the environment
- Everywhere should be maintained thesame
- I think we should be looking after the environment for future generations to

appreciate the wildlife

- Because the quality of water and its surrounding environment is of greater importance than merely amenity to the public
- I think that all waterways should have a priority not just sections of it
- The quicker the problem is resolved the less damage and money is needed to improve it.
- Because I would think it is important to maintain the areas surrounding the water bodies well regardless of whether they are visited by the public
- Because everywhere should be clean
- Because if it is due to ecology and wildlife it should be preserved whether public have access or not.
- If the problem is serious, it needs to be sorted
- Seriousness of the problem needs to be addressed first
- If it's an emergency it should be dealt with. Should take priority
- Because it's important for the environment. Even if the area is unpopular, we need to prioritise the environment
- It's important. Should be given priority as you can't create a pocket
- Even if people don't go there it is still a damage to the environment
- People who are interested in the preservation of the environment generally should be given access to these areas.
- Public safety is an issue
- All areas need to be taken care of to prevent problems from spreading
- Serious problems should be tackled in all circumstances and determine the action taken
- A nearby water body that granddaughter visits sometimes is hard to get to and has not many visits from public but has become very overgrown and messy can't even see the water properly. So feel severity of issues very important.
- Just strongly agree serious problems need tackling first
- More serious problems deserve more attention.
- All water bodies are important as they are linked, so if problems are left in some areas they could impact on others
- Important to visit places that are environmentally pleasing
- Should all be treated the same
- To benefit the wildlife in that area.
- I think if something needs repairing it needs to be maintained regardless of whether it has access to the public or not
- Quality should come first- as well as tackling the issues before it gets out of control
- Even if it's not very accessible if the problem is very bad it should be dealt with
- General problems need to be tackled
- Assuming that the serious problems include things that are dangerous to the general public such as flooding, cliff collapse etc.
- Need to take care of everything, not just certain things, if not then irreparable damage will take place to the environment
- If there is a problem it needs to be cleared up - it shouldn't just be left because no one goes there
- For wildlife preservation. The places people do not visit may also need attention especially for the baby wildlife who may need help.
- Has knock on effect up stream problems can go further down stream and effect

more people

- It is important
- Because it doesn't matter where the area is - if they need help then they should be given help
- No matter where it is - it will affect every other waterway cos it all leads into one
- Mess should be cleaned up, doesn't matter whether it is a public or private place
- Should care of everything, should not discriminate the places
- Because it's very important - if you mess the water up it has bad consequences, what people want doesn't always come first - sometimes you have to just do stuff for the good of the planet
- Accessibility for everyone
- Again just because you cannot get to it does not mean it cannot be looked after. People spoil places and leave them so things still need to be maintained regardless of visits by the public.
- All areas need to be cleaned up. Need to work on all areas
- I believe in that statement, all problems are equal
- I think ecology is important wherever it is, no matter whether it is visited or not
- All linked together
- If it is serious, some improvements are ought to be made
- Because then more people will use it where accessible
- These problems do need be resolved
- Priority in maintaining these areas need to be fulfilled if they are accessible to the public
- It's for the benefit of everyone that serious problems are tackled regardless of public accessibility.
- Any problem should be tackled
- You need to tackle the problem, not pander to the people
- Damage caused needs to be dealt with regardless of whether or not the places are visited
- Because they are some issues which are very serious like water contamination should be given priorities. Water bodies are not just for enjoyment.
- Because the conservation of wildlife is the major priority
- If there is a serious problem I think it should take priority, i.e like major erosion
- Litter and other issues move around
- It's important to keep the place clean for future generations
- Ecological issues should be tackled wherever it is
- Need to deal with issue according to the seriousness rather than concentrating on the people visits - selfish if we concentrate on the latter
- People can't see it then it still matters
- Got to have priority - e.g oil ship running off ground.
- A very serious problem needs dealing with
- Irrespective of the public usage, it should be given priority. It's not just humans that are using it, there will be wild life affected.
- Of course if there is a serious need for something you have to do it
- Visits are all very well, but environment needs to be kept protected regardless of whether seen or not.
- Because the busy areas get more people there - and hence more pollution from litter
- All important to keep wildlife etc safe and in abundance

- If problems exist they need to be fixed in all circumstances
- Wildlife watching in places that are inaccessible still needs to be tackled to make this easier
- Its all about making good for us- its about taking care of any damage we've done
- Because water ways are not just for the people visiting them. It is the environment and the local ecology which need to be concentrated on.
- Everything should be kept clean and tidy
- Important to sort problems rather than depending on the number of visits, important for the ecology in general
- Dont sort the problem in one area and ignore other areas
- If there is something wrong you should be able to put it right quickly
- Its that you need to clean everything up. Getting it to a controllable state. Not let it get out of hand.
- Water moves and spreads - we cannot discriminate between private or public places!
- If it's serious then it needs to be tackled now - not tomorrow
- More concerned about what is correct for birds and plants etc -- if fenced off should be respected
- Doesn't matter if nobody goes there, it's still a water system that needs to be maintained. It could lead into other water systems
- Big problems need to be sorted out.
- If it needs to be done then it needs to be done everywhere
- Every where has the right to be treated the same
- Public access shouldnt matter
- If a large problem is dealt with, then maybe the public will start going there.
- Serious problems need to be tackled regardless of the area and remoteness.
- If there is any problem -should cure, regardless where it is located
- Because it doesnt matter whether people use it or visit, its about the water environment. So should focus on severity of problem
- Everything should be looked after equally- regardless of visites
- Serious problems should be tackled fast before it spreads out to other water bodies
- Because at the end of the day even though im a socialist we do live in a democracy and if you vote for people then you have to put a certain amount of trust in the buggers, because you can vote the sods out in the long run, but if you go in pubs and you hear the general publics views you hear a lot of manure, but you vote them in, you can vote them out if you disagree
- Need to be access for general public
- If there is a problem a there - ecological concerns should be addressed!
- If the enviroment is improved then people would visit anyway and the improvement would be good for the wildlife.
- We are looking after the ecology, doesn't matter if we cant see it, we should be helping it.
- It is not about people, it is about enviroment. Improvements are made for the enviroments benefit and not for the publics benefit.
- I think these waterways should be maintained regardless of how many people visit them.
- If the wildlife is there, it should remain a wildlife sanctuary
- Its important to maintain the animal and plant life

- Exactly right and how they should conduct themselves
- Cause if there are problems then these need to be dealt with regardless of whether or not these are visited often or not.
- Because a problem will still be there, regardless if people will see it or not.
- Ecology is important to every one
- At the end of the day its about equality and wildlife, so by ignoring the less accessible areas, you are not sorting out the problem, you are just sweeping it under the mat...
- Importance takes priority
- Because the most important thing it's make sure we are preserving the water general
- All environments should be fixed regardless of where they are.
- Teach geography so i think water resources should be accessible to every body
- Important that priority is given to problems that may be harmful
- Important to get ecology right
- Problems should be tackled from worst to least worst
- I feel that is the way it should be done. That's logical.
- You must tackle serious environmental damage fast to avoid more pollution of the environment
- I feel if there is a rare species being wiped out or if there are things damaging the environment it is important for the area to be given attention.
- It is important maintain the water ways and tackling pollution etc should be high priority
- If it badly needs done then it should get priority, if its a crisis it should be sorted as soon as possible.
- Some places that are visited a lot and are desperately in need should be priority.
- Because a major problem could spread to neighbouring water bodies
- If no access to the problem then the problem will never be fixed.
- If there is any problem then they should rectify it immediately
- If something needs something, if something is in dire need of repair or maintenance, it should still be seen to
- Water systems and waterways are connected so once contaminated it affects all
- They need to address the most serious problem so it doesn't spread elsewhere and cause harm
- Um, *coughs* um, a lot of places we need to get to there's a lot of places there's a lot of rubbish, and people chuck wheelie bins in the rivers and they're not always easy to get to and there's lots of wildlife on the rivers, wans and geese
- Because i think its important to protect the environment even though people are not seeing or looking at the environment directly
- If somewhere needs cleaning up it should be cleaned up. There are no priorities.
- Where it may be
- Some of these bird sanctuaries, the birds numbers have dropped, but i don't like species disappearing
- Safer for the future encourage people to visit.
- Well if you've got something that's really polluted you shouldn't leave it cos it'll go into the ground anyway and spread to other places, and everywhere should be treated the same in my opinion
- If there is a problem, just because the people don't access it, its still important to correct it

- Because it is important whether people see it or not
- It should be like that
- Because it's important to tackle the problem for the wildlife environment, regardless if it's visited by the public or not.
- If its a serious problem it should be dealt with sooner rather than later
- Because if something has a high scientific interest, it should be looked after, you wouldnt want anyone to affect the water body
- Anything should be done if it needs it
- Because if we want to prevent ecological problems like erosion of banks and shores for example, it's important to tackle the problem in all areas, regarding being a private or public land.
- Peoples priority comes first/people are paying for this so they should come first
- Irrespective of the number of people, the place has to be clean ofr people to go to it
- Everything is connected, all the water will go around, you cant leave another place and expect it not affect other body types
- Enviromental reason take priority
- Because if there is a general deterioration around water bodies, even if people dont visit the place it will cause problems in the eco system
- Because wherever it is its going to affect the water, if it goes to the river it will eventually go to the coastal waters
- Because whether or not it accessed, it should be improved, for people will finally access it when made better
- Because we should prioritise the wildlife/animals environment.
- It doesn't matter if anyone goes there - if the problem is more serious then it should be dealt with first
- You need the water to be safe regardless of if you can get there
- Just think it's important that priority is given where it's needed
- Well if it's dangerous then it is dangerous for everyone to visit there so it should not be allowed
- Because it could be dangerous to life so its important its addressed before it spreads
- Because if you dont look at small bits then bigger parts are at risk linked
- Because all the water should be cleaned, not only the water body visited.
- If the problem is serious it is more important to deal with it
- If there is any problem like erosion it needs to be sorted out for the publec
- If its a serious issue it needs to be dealt with regardless of whether the public visits or not.
- Have to concentrate where the problems are
- I think these waters may not be accessible but they flow into others that are, so if you don't deal with them, they could be the source that needs to be dealt with first,
- Doesn't matter where it is, it needs cleaning up
- Because i just believe if theses a problem thats severe it should be sorted quickly before it spreads to other areas

Q16A Except where I've said "I don't know", I have enough knowledge of the issues covered in this survey to offer a reasonably informed opinion.

Strongly Disagree –6 people

- Have no interest in water ways-
- I have first hand knowledge
- Have never been so keen about water bodies, save for the husband
- I havnot been to any of the water places recently ,so dont know much about the state of the water
- I live near the thames and i aware of the issues verw well
- Dunno just do

Strongly Agree –116 people

- I have witnessed these issues first hand
- I am a gardener have great interest in environmental issues
- I have been boating for about 30 years in all sorts of seasons and i feel i have enough knowledge
- I do voluntary conservation work, . Spend a lot of time going out into nature, i think i get an overall picture and idea of whats happening and as an rspb member, i go to a wide variety of bodies of water on a regular basis
- Because of the survey, i understand what i am looking at and the way the survey is conducted i understand the answers i am giving
- Science degree and vteaching experience as science teacher
- We like going to the nature and it's important for us
- By going around, finding out from others what the situation is where they are. On the news you see different areas.through floods, you also see the situation of water.
- I probably have more knowledge of subject than the designers of this survey. I have designed the bbest river remediation system in world in hong kong .i was a water treatment engineer many years ago
- Good coverage of issues me. Being a walker in the countryside
- I'm very opinionated and always been in the vicinity of water bodies
- I have enough experience in regards to the environment
- Because i have a strong interest in environmental issues and particularly in fresh water bioligy
- Priority should be given to peoples enjoyment
- Because i'm 50 years old and i feel i've lived long enough to pass an opinion
- I have covered the things expected
- I found the questions accessible to understand
- Well informed and lots of wildlife
- I have lived along time and seen most of the social changes happening in this country and i am an observant and concerned person
- I have tried to rediscover an interest with my son, who is interested in sailing
- I believe we need to preserve the environment for future generations and indigenious wildlife and plantlife
- Based answers on my knowledge and experience
- Because i live on the coast and walk alot and have a general interest in the

environment and how society should share and protect it.

- I have always lived in the country or by the coast. I have an overview of farming. Horseriding and i have a dog that i walk.
- I walk miles 2 or 3 times a week with grandchildren, so have a vested interest
- Environmental issues are strong on my agenda
- Although my experience is narrow, i feel involved in the issues concerned and observe the state of the water bodies that i visit.
- Geography teacher - and i teach environmental issues, so i am well informed!
- I take an avid interest, especially in wildlife
- Takes an interest in natural features, so well educated on the subject
- I have understood the questions but felt the questionnaire had been broken down to discuss different water types ie-sea water, tap water etc
- I live by the seaside and am often out and about - have grandchildren
- We got to preserve what we got
- A life member of the national trust - read their magazines and conservation letters
- From what i've seen. And experience of the local area
- I use to be a district councillor i have been involved in local environment issues
- Because he 'knows' water environments
- During the weekends we spend alot of leisure activities outside, particularly around the water
- Strongly agree that everything should be done
- I see enough of the water bodies to know
- Use a lot of water facilities in day to day life, so keep up to speed.
- I have a young family and i like to get out with them and do the things we've been talking about (ie visiting water bodies)
- Take interest and have experience over many years
- I know the country side well
- As family we are concerned with nlocal environment
- I'm in my eighties and probably have a wiser set of priorities than some young people
- I'm surrounded by water (cornwall)
- Live around alot of these things
- I have been involved with various environmental groups over the years and i'm very concerned with the preservation of wildlife throughout the country.
- I am both interested in the environemnt and educated.
- We are significant water users
- Engaging in community spirit
- I've lived close to water for over 34 years and before that i've always been interested in water and the environment. I've had hobbies including fishing and taking part in boating activities.
- Involved in conservation of waterways and river navigation, so well educated. |highly interested in wildlife too
- We're in a farming community where we come across it a lot more than the town people
- Highly interested in wildlfe and nature etc
- I am very well read on the subject
- I have lived by the water for a long time.

- I have a science degree and i'm actively involved in ecology, i do lots of wildlife watching, so i'm highly informed
- I visit these places regularly
- I know enough about water
- Because i live right next to a canal and i take an interest in the environment
- I go surfing a lot and live near the thames - and i listen to the news and am aware of the issues - and i'm interested in it in general
- Interested in water system maintenance and the environment in general
- I spend a lot of time near water
- We live near river and know the sorts of issues that go on
- Yes i'm an associate of the institute of environment management
- Common sense!
- I am just a normal human being taking care of mother nature. I am not an extremist by any means
- I spend enough time at water bodies that i can make an informed opinion
- I have a good knowledge of water areas near me
- Just from seeing the environment, wildlife and plants i have seen how a bad environment affects them.
- Well, i've walked all over this country, and at my age, i think my opinion is as good as anyone else's, and i've sailed all around it well, so i'm happy with my knowledge of the subject.
- Because you visit and i am interested
- I work on the water so i know a lot about it
- This town attracts so many people and this improves year on year.
- Because i'm an outdoor person.
- Because i'm quite well educated and very outdoor active.
- I do use waterbodies quite a lot and besides am well educated
- Because enough adverts and notices around our area, which keep us informed, and so i think i'm quite knowledgeable about it.
- Have good knowledge
- I just believe the environment needs looking after. the litter around these water bodies is criminal.
- Something i have an interest in and visit particular water bodies very often.
- I have given an objective opinion and drive over 1000 miles a week and see a lot of water bodies.
- I am a member of the wildlife trust so i am ecologically informed.
- Have a knowledge, we go out and about and can see what's going on, and can compare environments, and we are aware of most of the issues, especially if you notice a bad environment.
- I don't really know,
- Have done a lot of walking in their lifetime, are out and about quite a lot and live by the sea. Keen bird watchers.
- The fact that i do walk round the lake nearly every single day, not always the same lake i hasten to add, one is much cleaner than the other, but it's less open to the public, one is very open to the public, and the other 2 i do are far more green trees and the birds and bees and that sort of thing
- Until recently i was a member of the rspb so i keep relatively informed
- Read it through, thought about it. Well informed about these issues.

- Because i represent the community.
- The fact that i have a knowledge of whats going on. Im a geography teacher therefore envirnmental issues are of great importance
- Because ive spent quite a lot of my leisure time and some of my working time havinge xperience of quite a different variety of water bodies
- The interviewer explain the issues clearly which enabled me to make an informed opinion.
- Well i do take an interest in environmental issues
- I know a lot about environment issues (professional career)
- I have enough knowledge to have an opinion which is what i have given throughout this survey.
- Because we live in a coastal environment, we see what goes on to keep this area clean
- We use water a lot, to the beaches and rivers,
- I have enough knowledge about the issues as i am a regular visitor to the types of body u have discussed in this survey
- Ive lived near the water most of my life so i have enough knowledge to comment on the state of the water bodies.
- Because its my environment, i go around and my friends to, we talk about these issues, and even read them on the papers and television
- I live in n area wth alot of water.
- Because i am quite well aware of environment issues.
- Because well informed and read
- I am knowledgable enough to understand the environment issues
- I live on a river, access to the biggest water ways in the country.
- I have enough knowledge, do alot of walking and mountain climbing
- Because i'm a member of the liaison policy for the thames river basin for the water framework directive, i'm going to be strongly involved with the wfd
- I keep update with both local and national news.
- Where i'm living there is a group called the local woodlands and they are trying to clear up rivers.etc and i've been keeping an eye on improvements etc.
- I have got two kids so litter and things that look bad have an impact on me as i don't want my kids to play near anything that isn't safe or messy
- Because we do spend a lot of time at the areas that weve been speaking about and doing things weve done and weve seen it first hand and were there very regularly and i think i can answer fairly
- I read the local paper, and interested to the environmet issues... Not nice to have a smelly place.... I live in the same place for quite sometime and its nice to see it improve. I have seen the little streams getting worse over the past years and its quite nice to see its quality improving.
- Youve explained everything to me fully before asking the questions
- Bec\ause its on the news on the moments about the enviornment and how people aer dumping stuff everywhere and everywhere there are leaflets get through the door about being kinder to the enviornmen

Q16B Other members of the public are more informed than me, and should have a greater influence in setting improvement priorities

Strongly Disagree –51 people

- It is part of my motivation in life, the environment
- I'm reasonably well informed from regular visits.
- The majority of people do not fully understand the impact of their visits to these bodies of waters and the problems that the litter and the things they leave behind can cause
- Because we should all be equal
- The knowledge that i have i feel that i am entitled to my say as much as anyone else
- 35 years spent at sea
- I don't know what knowledge they have
- Because he has seen as many water environments as other people
- Because i keep abreast of issues
- Because everybody is entitled to an opinion, it is tax payers money so tax payers should have a say.
- I have done quite a bit of walking so i feel i know the areas like the ones we have discussed
- Some people may not be fully informed and thus not having better ideas.
- Depends on members of public, some people are not knowledgeable - depending on their backgrounds - some people have special skills like environmentalists and scientists
- To be fair to everyone, regardless of their knowlege
- I am very informed in these issues.
- I like to form my own opinion
- I'm in the countryside all the time. I've got strong opinions
- I have always lived in the country or by the coast. I have an overview of farming. Horseriding and i have a dog that i walk.
- Becuase i have great knowledge of the canals
- Everybody should have their say
- I am out and about and strongly feel i am using water bodies to a great extent
- Because everyone's aware of what state these places are sometimes left in - you haven't got to visit them regularly to know this - i think things have improved over the last twenty years but it's still nowhere near where it needs to be.
- Because i think i have a good understanding
- I am a member of the genreal public. Ihave a valid opinion
- Everyone is equal
- I've lived in the country and the town, so i'm interested in ecology, but not at any price. I also spent a lot of the time on the canals in my youth and i'd hate to see them go into decline, so ecology is a subject close to my heart
- I feel confident in what i've said
- I think i am more informed than the general public
- Not all people get to see all the environments
- I am more experienced than many others
- I am both interested in the environemnt and educated.
- Heavly involved in water conservation knowledge high.

- We're in a farming community where we come across it a lot more than the town people
- Highly informed as i have a high interest in this area
- I have a science degree and i'm actively involved in ecology, i do lots of wildlife watching, so i'm highly informed
- Because i take an active interest in this kind of thing and i have a strong interest in the environment
- I watch alot of wildlife. Walk down to the beach about 4 times a week.
- *laughs* this is not an area famed for people becoming famous, look, we havent a lot of jrr tolkies around here, this is thickie city, nblows raspberry, inbred city
- Because joe public is a huge range of people and some are very experienced and have tremendous knowledge and some dont know anything and have never grown up with nature.
- Cause i do not think its true. Some people may be better informed but the majority are not.
- I am informed and think i have a valid opinion
- Its democracy! We all have a right to voice our opinion.
- Because i think i know as other people but i dpnt know as much as people its their job
- Not saying that i know lots moer, but i dont think m any more people know lots more than i do, partly because of being a primary teacher, and a science at degree level
- I think i have enough knowledge about the water environment issues to give an informed opinion
- I think everyone should have an equal say, whether they are informed or not,
- Other people might have more information and others might not ,so should not generalise the idea
- Im not arrogant - it's just a lot of people wouldn't have a clue about what this is about, it's something i'm involved with that's why
- I did work for the national assembly for wales and i am more informed than most
- Same as before, because im a member of the general public and i do have experience of the waterways and for years now weve walked round the lake
- Dunno just do

Strongly Agree –36 people

- Because those who are more informed, should take an interest
- People who are better educated should have more of a say than me
- I am just a normal member of public, some people might be more expert than me in this area
- Some people are more knowledgeable
- Some people are better educated than me
- I think that people should have decisions in having a say over the environment not just the government and other agencies
- Personal experience which i have not got
- I don't visit enough waterways
- Don't have as much knowledge as others
- Some of people in society might have better opinion than me

- There are people who can use these facilities, they should give their opinion
- A lot of people would know more about it than me
- Others may use water bodies more often
- The more informed should obviously have a bigger influence, it is only logical, and other people use them more than me .
- They probably do
- Because of my age and limited use of these facilities i am not qualified to prognosticate
- Everyone in society should have their say in this matter
- There are people who will have more knowledge about water than i do
- I've got yeqrs of experience
- Other people have taken more action
- Alot more people are more inteligent than me
- Because i live right next to a canal and i take an interest in the environment
- Some people will be more informed than me. If they are more informed than me, then they should have more of a say.
- I do know that much, my knowledge on the subject on the subject is not that comprehensive
- Dont know how other people feel or what knowledge they have
- I think i know about these things
- People with jobs in the relevant areas are better suited to takle the issues, but the public should be there aswell, but the more qualified or in charge people are the more they care about places
- Only because i cant give my opinion in all these because i am not knowledgeable enough, i dont visit these places as much as others
- I dont hve vast knowledge on water and environment issues
- Just because am not very knowledgable in the area
- Well i am getting old but other people should get access
- By putting more pressure on general public , would be much easier to improve the environment issues
- If they have more information than me, then i would like them to give their extra input
- Definitely everyone needs to be more informed
- Always be people that know more
- I don't see enough of it to make an opinion
- Because ive only been to the coast tiwce here so other people kknow more and go moer often

Q16C Decisions on setting priorities for improvement should be left to experts within the government and its agencies.

Strongly Disagree –89 people

- I feel the ecology of the area is more important, if certain areas are affected then others will follow
- Needs to be local participation- not all done behind closed doors
- Govt bodies are not aware of what has been going on - professionals should be brought in for the sake of knowledge
- You need people who care about the water environment or who use it frequently, the government has other bigger issues to deal with
- We are the ones using it and we should be asked what needs to be done.
- There are other experts who are not part of the government who might have a better input
- People working for the government dont check out locations, they look at paperwork.
- Public should have a say in important matters like this
- Everybody should voice their opinion
- Public should be more widely consulted about enviromental issues
- Because it is for the people that actually use them to have an opinion.
- Anything the government gets into they mess up not a believer in governments
- It should be down to all individuals - not just those who can visit things whenever they like
- Politics have too much agendas and limits that what they can do. Best to set up an independent body to monitor the environment that is free from any of these problems
- The pulbic are the ones using the facilities
- They never get out to see the places do they?
- Experts ideas are good in theory, but dont work out in practice
- Think we the public should have a big say
- They always mess things up and also have their own agenda
- Because there may be conflicts of opinions, by the experts
- People should have a say and not just the gorvenment
- Because they probably don't visit them enough either to be left to the local people or experts
- They are useless and cant control the simplest of things. They only do what is right for business and money.
- No way
- Up to the general public to get the things done - if more voice made by the public, the government will listen then
- The government don't always make the right decision. It should be in the hands of the people who have first hand experience.
- It should be left to real experts - rather than lay people bitching and trying to win votes
- I guess because i believe local people have more influence on what agencies do.
- They should get more feed back from the people- they are the ones paying for it-
- Becuase i know abot the canals
- Well to be fare, they are all in l:ondon and they don't have to live in these areas and

experience what we do.

- Landowners need to be involved in decisions as well as government
- Because half of them don't know what they are doing
- Quite often they don't seem to prioritise correctly/peoples feelings are not taken account of
- Half the time the government doesn't know what it's doing, or it's doing it for financial reasons and the rest of us just have to fall in line
- I think public areas of interest should be accessible to everyone at all times.
- Should be up to local community
- Their opinions are tinted.
- It should be with people who know about these things - which the government don't
- Most of them don't know what they're doing, just catering for their own needs
- Most of them haven't got a clue
- Because if left to the government, these things will never get done
- People should have a say as well, because they live near places.
- The more people are told about it, the more people are available to come up with better solutions
- Because the public should have a general say to all the wild life and everything- plus they are not there to view it themselves- too few people making the decision
- I don't hold with people in high office that don't have direct experience
- I think the people who are living around the water bodies should have their opinions heard
- Because they wear a suit and sit in the office. Haven't got a clue what's happening in the real world.
- Should be for everyone - decision should be made jointly
- The public have more a privledge in determining the preservation of wildlife in this country
- They don't always know what is the best for environment
- I think its very important to get the publics opinion
- Does the gov have experts? They seem to build thing only to last a few years- and not take into account the lay out of the land
- How do the government know about it aplace if they haven't been to the area
- I always think the government should listen to the public and value peoples opinion. Government should enhance and teach.
- The government people are being bad lately - lay people should be involved too
- They don't live in the country - they haven't got a greater knowledge
- The government needs to have a water resources board which deals with general water issues.
- I believe that other groups (protestors, environmental groups) have as much a right as the government in determining what happens to these types of water body
- Because they think they know it all- they are out there talking to the people who live there day by day.
- They don't know and they don't care (the government is full of experts that don't know sod all from arse to elbow) would Gordon Brown know the difference between a woodlark and a skylark? No!
- Experts and gov can't be trusted to deal with improvements. Should be left to others
- They don't know what they're talking about - especially if it's Labour
- You should always consult lay people before decisions are made

- Well we, the public, have every right to comment on where are money is going and to approve government decisions
- Hahahaha, because theyve been consistently wrong and theyre a sack of liars, they only behave according tyo their own... Let me out it this way, if your told not to eat something cos your told itl makle you explode and your entire family and we're all doomed, and the govt. Has a lobby from whoever itis supplies it, the govt. Scientisrts say its safe, and i wonder why... I dont trust govt. Appointess cos their on the gravy tyrain, they'll lose their jobs and the govt. Knows where their kids go to school, and all of a sudden their kids arent in the catchment area
- Because members of the public will be wider places visited.
- Very categorcial about that, because they usually have self interest
- Everybody should have a say but for technical things , such as water quality the government should have a say
- Because the government haven't got a clue sometimes.
- The public should have the say in what happens around them.
- It should be influenced by local people and people that use the water bodies
- More influence should come from the people who use the areas.
- People who are using the water facility should also have the rights to give their opinions
- Because they should consult the public
- Its in everyone's interest to make sure that the environment is looked after
- Because they make mistakes.
- Everybody should have a say in what affects them
- Because they dont live in the same world i live in, they dont live in the countryside they dont live in the real world
- Shouldnt just be for people in one area to choose how others live
- Everyone should have the right to give their opinions and be heard
- Because as a general public, we get to see where improvements need to be made.
- It shouldnt be left to the gov and agencies, because everybody is equal
- Every 1 should have the rights to express their views & opinions
- Because the government often does not make the right decisions. Made by the people more so.
- They should probably have a vote for these sort of things as the government doesn't always get things correct / public have a right to have a say about what should be done
- It should be both the general public and the government bodies
- Cos the government dont do aything right and the public should have dione their opinion, better to be done by research tan people who just sit down, and they probably dont visit them anyway so its best left to people who know
- Because i think the public should be able to give their own opinion.
- Beacue they tend to have blinkers on and its all about money wyhereas the general public tend to see it fro the reality of it all rather than figures and finances and so they should ask the public more

Strongly Agree –38 people

- Professional people have obviously got more knowledge than the man in the street. So let them get on with their job

- They know more than anyone
- Experts are the most qualified to deal with these issues
- They should know more than general public
- They are trained in that field
- I think the experts have the knowlege needed so they should have the priviledge to control it
- More knowledgable
- More money and better opinion because they are experts in their own areas
- They are supposed to be experts and have the money
- They have the expertise
- General public can be very fussy and not know all the facts whereas government bodies would have the budget to withhold any research
- The vast majority are not experts on water quality and environmental issues- they may think they are but often they're not
- Because they are experts - for example, i would be more interested in animal welfare, whereas there might be other things to consider
- They are more knowledgeable than others
- Because they are people employed by the government to look after these things and do it as part of their everyday life and have better knowledge than a person who does not deal with these issues everyday
- Because they are hoprfully experties, and you just have any body surting problems out- you've got to have experts give their views
- Because the more expert you are the better you are to deal with water issues
- Because the environment agency need to learn to do their jobs.
- Hthey get paid more- and they should do more
- The water bodies have a better knowledge
- The people in the government are no better in a position to give an answer than i am. Its the general public who use the facilities so its the general public that should be asked
- Leave it to the experts, but not to politicians
- They have access to more info
- Well people in the public like me and possibly you dont really know what doing so its best left to the professionals
- They are more imformed
- They are the people that know - its their job to know how to best tackle these situations
- Well some people have more expertise that what we are, locally
- Experts know the subject better than public think they do
- Decision should be left to the ruling body
- The general public do not have expert knowledge to enable them to make these decisions.
- You have stop at certain point, experts to do that. People should also have their say
- There are more clout that what weve got
- Need the experts to solve problems
- They should know what are they doing - what is best for people
- Stops interferring they can co-ordinate without speaking to people who might not agree
- They have a more extensive knowledge of the subject

- They know and understand the eco problem they know best
- Just do
- Youve got to be properly infomred,

APPENDIX E. SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS TABLES

E.1. The Importance of Accessibility

E.1.1. Cross-Tabulations of Accessibility Statement Agreement Ratings

	Higher priority to places that are physically accessible than to places that are not					
Higher priority to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	15	4	4	6	2	31
Disagree	2	38	11	19	1	71
Neither agree nor disagree	2	21	44	42	14	123
Agree	3	35	60	173	14	285
Strongly agree	7	18	33	86	63	207
Total	29	116	152	326	94	717

Note: The total base for this table is 717 respondents. The remaining 33 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Higher priority to places where more visits are made by the general public					
Higher priority to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	9	8	7	5	2	31
Disagree	0	32	8	25	6	71
Neither agree nor disagree	0	17	44	47	18	126
Agree	1	26	50	177	33	287
Strongly agree	2	14	31	98	70	215
Total	12	97	140	352	129	730

Note: The total base for this table is 730 respondents. The remaining 20 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Higher priority according to the seriousness of the problem regardless of the accessibility of the water or the number of visits					
Higher priority to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	4	1	4	8	13	30
Disagree	2	7	7	36	17	69
Neither agree nor disagree	0	6	33	53	33	125
Agree	2	23	71	129	56	281
Strongly agree	2	20	43	85	55	205
Total	10	57	158	311	174	710

Note: The total base for this table is 710 respondents. The remaining 40 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Higher priority to places where more visits are made by the general public					
Higher priority to places that are physically accessible than to places that are not	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	10	8	7	2	2	29
Disagree	0	57	16	35	9	117
Neither agree nor disagree	0	15	65	56	17	153
Agree	2	14	41	222	50	329
Strongly agree	0	1	11	33	50	95
Total	12	95	140	348	128	723

Note: The total base for this table is 723 respondents. The remaining 27 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Higher priority according to the seriousness of the problem regardless of the accessibility of the water or the number of visits					
Higher priority to places that are physically accessible than to places that are not	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	4	0	3	6	16	29
Disagree	1	12	11	52	41	117
Neither agree nor disagree	1	3	34	68	46	152
Agree	3	30	87	151	48	319
Strongly agree	1	12	24	28	23	88
Total	10	57	159	305	174	705

Note: The total base for this table is 705 respondents. The remaining 45 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Higher priority according to the seriousness of the problem regardless of the accessibility of the water or the number of visits					
Higher priority to places where more visits are made by the general public	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	2	0	0	3	8	13
Disagree	2	8	9	40	39	98
Neither agree nor disagree	2	4	33	52	48	139
Agree	2	30	87	177	50	346
Strongly agree	2	16	32	38	32	120
Total	10	58	161	310	177	716

Note: The total base for this table is 705 respondents. The remaining 45 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

E.1.2. Analysis of Reasons for Agreeing / Disagreeing with Accessibility Statements

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Higher priority should be given to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
Equal priority should be given to public and private areas	14	45
Protection of the environment should be prioritised, not accessibility	7	23
There should be equal access to all areas/more areas should be accessible	7	23
Priority should be given to places where more people/the public have access	5	16
Areas with greater access would require more maintenance	3	10
Private areas should be privately maintained	3	10
Other	1	3
Total strongly disagreeing	30	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
Priority should be given to places where more people/the public have access	63	29
There should be equal access to all areas/more areas should be accessible	55	25
Private areas should be privately maintained	40	19
People should have access to the environment/should be encouraged to enjoy it	37	17
Public money should be spent on areas where the public have access	25	12
Areas with greater access would require more maintenance	22	10
Not everyone can afford access to restricted areas	9	4
Greater access would promote awareness of aquatic ecosystems	3	1
Equal priority should be given to public and private areas	2	1
Other	10	5
Total strongly agreeing	216	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Higher priority should be given according to the seriousness of the problem regardless of the accessibility of the water or the number of visits		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
Protection of the environment should take precedence over accessibility, visits by the public etc	2	20
All water bodies should be treated equally	2	20
The most serious problems demand most attention	2	20
Priority should be given to areas accessible by the public	2	20
Private land should remain private and be privately maintained	2	20
Other	2	20
Total strongly disagreeing	12	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
Protection of the environment should take precedence over accessibility, visits by the public etc	58	33
Problems should be addressed regardless of accessibility or location	41	23
The most serious problems demand most attention	40	28
Water bodies are linked - a problem in one area will affect another	26	15
All water bodies should be treated equally	17	10
Addressing problems would encourage the public to visit	8	4
Greater access promotes greater awareness of the environment	4	2
Priority should be given to areas accessible by the public	4	2
Accessibility is necessary in order to rectify problems	2	1
Other	8	4
Total strongly agreeing	178	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Higher priority should be given to places where more visits are made by the general public		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
All areas should be treated the same	5	38
There are more people to benefit/the majority would benefit	3	23
Protection of the environment should be prioritised	3	23
Areas with greater access would require more maintenance/health and safety provision	2	15
It would be a better use of public funds	1	8
Other	1	8
Total strongly disagreeing	13	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
Areas with greater access would require more maintenance/health and safety provision	46	35
There are more people to benefit/the majority would benefit	44	34
If the areas are well-maintained then people would be encouraged to go	13	10
Accessibility is important	13	10
Greater access promotes awareness/respect of eco-systems	10	8
It would be a better use of public funds	9	7
Not everyone can access privately-owned water bodies	6	5
It's how it should be	2	2
All areas should be treated the same	1	1
Other	6	5
Total strongly agreeing	130	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Higher priority should be given to places that are physically accessible than places that are not		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
Equal priority should be given to accessible/inaccessible areas	6	21
Protection of the environment should be prioritised, not physical accessibility	6	21
Inaccessible areas still need to be looked after	5	17
Priority should be given to places with greater access - more people to enjoy, benefit	4	14
Areas with greater access would require more maintenance, should be made safe	2	7
Inaccessible areas don't require maintenance	3	10
Water bodies are inter-connected/neglecting one neglects both	2	7
Resources shouldn't be wasted on inaccessible water bodies	1	3
Don't know	1	3
Other	2	7
Total strongly disagreeing	29	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
Priority should be given to places with greater access - more people to enjoy, benefit	39	41
Areas with greater access would require more maintenance, should be made safe	17	18
Resources shouldn't be wasted on inaccessible water bodies	11	11
Disabled people or those less physically able should have access	7	7
Public interest should outweigh the private	6	6
Greater access promotes awareness and respect of eco-systems	5	5
Equal priority should be given to accessible/inaccessible areas	3	3
Access should be regulated/private landowners should have their say	3	3
It's how it should be done	3	3
Inaccessible areas don't require maintenance	2	2
Don't know	2	2
Protection of the environment should be prioritised, not physical accessibility	1	1
Other	4	4
Total strongly agreeing	96	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

E.2. Decision-Making Process

E.2.1. Cross-Tabulations of Decision-Making Process Agreement Ratings

	Other members of the public are more informed than me, and should have a greater influence in setting improvement priorities					
Except where I've said "I don't know", I have enough knowledge of the issues covered in this survey to offer a reasonably informed opinion.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	1	2	2	1	0	6
Disagree	2	13	9	15	3	42
Neither agree nor disagree	5	24	45	40	5	119
Agree	20	144	105	149	20	438
Strongly agree	22	32	25	24	8	111
Total	50	215	186	229	36	716

Note: The total base for this table is 716 respondents. The remaining 34 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Decisions on setting priorities for improvement should be left to experts within the government and its agencies					
Except where I've said "I don't know", I have enough knowledge of the issues covered in this survey to offer a reasonably informed opinion.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0	1	2	1	1	5
Disagree	10	11	14	8	0	43
Neither agree nor disagree	10	32	34	38	8	122
Agree	47	162	100	116	18	443
Strongly agree	19	35	18	31	12	115
Total	86	241	168	194	39	728

Note: The total base for this table is 728 respondents. The remaining 22 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

	Decisions on setting priorities for improvement should be left to experts within the government and its agencies					
Other members of the public are more informed than me, and should have a greater influence in setting improvement priorities	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	19	9	8	10	3	49
Disagree	25	89	38	54	7	213
Neither agree nor disagree	18	48	64	50	5	185
Agree	13	80	48	71	16	228
Strongly agree	11	9	5	5	7	37
Total	86	235	163	190	38	712

Note: The total base for this table is 712 respondents. The remaining 38 respondents in the sample said "Don't know" to, or refused to answer, one or both of the statements.

E.2.2. Analysis of Reasons for Agreeing / Disagreeing with Decision-Making Process Statements

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Except where I've said "Don't know", I have enough knowledge of the issues covered in this survey to offer a reasonably informed opinion.		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
I have no interest in or knowledge of water bodies	3	50
I live near/have access to/have experience of water bodies	2	33
Other	1	17
Total strongly disagreeing	6	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
I live near/have access to/have experience of water bodies	46	40
I'm interested in the environment, nature, wildlife, conservation	37	32
I'm well-informed, well-read, knowledgeable	34	29
I spend leisure time outdoors in a natural environment	15	13
I'm involved in conservation, ecological issues/educating others on the environment	11	9
The questions are easy to understand/survey easy to understand	5	4
This knowledge of issues comes with age	5	4
I'm part of/belong to a community	3	3
Other	5	4
Total strongly agreeing	116	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Other members of the public are more informed than me, and should have a greater influence in setting improvement priorities		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
I'm well-informed and have experience/I should have influence	20	40
Everyone in society should have their say	10	20
I'm more experienced and have greater knowledge than a lot of others	9	18
Knowledge varied greatly among public sections/some people may not be fully informed	7	14
Actively involved in ecology/ecology is a subject close to my heart	4	8
I don't know what knowledge others have	3	6
Others are more informed/better educated about water bodies	2	4
The majority of people do not understand the issues involved	2	4
Other	2	4
Total strongly disagreeing	50	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
Others are more informed/better educated about water bodies	18	49
Others have more experience of and access to water bodies	11	30
Those who are better informed should have more influence	6	16
Everyone in society should have their say	3	8
I'm well-informed and have experience/I should have influence	3	8
I don't know what knowledge others have	1	3
I'm too old to be well-informed on these issues	2	5
Other	2	5
Total strongly disagreeing	37	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

Statement / Agreement / Explanation	Frequency	Percent
Decisions on setting priorities for improvement should be left to experts within the government and its agencies		
STRONGLY DISAGREE		
Government bodies are out of touch/make a mess of things	36	40
People should also have their say/should be more widely consulted	34	38
People who use the water bodies should be consulted	21	24
Government bodies seem to have their own agenda	9	10
Non-governmental, independent bodies should be consulted	5	6
Professional people are more knowledgeable/qualified	3	3
The more informed people are, the better their solutions	3	3
Other	5	6
Total strongly disagreeing	89	100
STRONGLY AGREE		
Professional people are more knowledgeable/qualified	28	72
The general public are not as well-informed	10	26
It's their job to make these decisions	8	21
They have control over funding	3	8
People should also have their say/should be more widely consulted	2	5
Government bodies seem to have their own agenda	1	3
The more informed people are, the better their solutions	3	8
Total strongly disagreeing	39	100

Note: the frequencies sum to more than the total agreeing or disagreeing, and the percents sum to more than 100, because some respondents gave more than one explanation type.

E.3. Comparison of CRP 4c Revisits with New Recruits

E.3.1. Priorities for Types of Improvement:

Aesthetic Characteristics

**Table E.1: How important is it to your household that the water environment are free of ... where 1 = not at all important and 10 = extremely important?
How satisfied is your household with the current state of the water environment with respect to where 1 = not at all satisfied and 10 = extremely satisfied?**

Attribute	Mean Importance	Don't Know %	Mean Satisfaction	Don't Know %	Gap
General litter					
CRP4c revisit	9.3	0.5	5	3.2	4.3
New	9.4	0.6	5.1	5.1	4.4
All	9.4	0.5	5	4.5	4.3
Bad smells					
CRP4c revisit	8.4	1.4	6.5	5.9	1.8
New	8.4	1.1	6.9	7.7	1.6
All	8.4	1.2	6.7	7.2	1.7
Foam or slime on surface					
CRP4c revisit	8.1	2.3	6.3	9.1	1.8
New	7.9	2.5	6.4	8.7	1.6
All	8	2.4	6.4	8.8	1.7
Erosion of banks/shores					
CRP4c revisit	7.4	3.6	6.2	8.2	1.2
New	7.3	4.7	6.3	12.8	1
All	7.3	4.4	6.3	11.5	1.1
Murkiness or discolouration					
CRP4c revisit	7.4	1.4	6.2	9.5	1.2
New	7.2	3	6.3	7.9	0.9
All	7.3	2.5	6.3	8.4	1
Algae or bindweed					
CRP4c revisit	7.1	3.2	6.4	10.9	0.7
New	6.8	5.3	6.5	11.5	0.3
All	6.9	4.7	6.5	11.3	0.4
Man-made features					
CRP4c revisit	5.1	6.4	6.9	16.4	-1.8
New	5.2	9.1	7.1	16.2	-1.9
All	5.2	8.3	7	16.3	-1.9
Crowds of people					
CRP4c revisit	5	1.8	6.7	5.5	-1.7
New	5.3	4.5	6.9	9.2	-1.6
All	5.2	3.7	6.8	8.1	-1.7

Note: The base for the CRP4c revisit sample is 220 respondents, the base for the New sample is 530 respondents, and the base for the full sample is 750 respondents.

Ecological Characteristics

**Table E.2: How important is it to your household (/ you) that the water environment in general provides a ... where 1 = not at all important and 10 = extremely important?
How satisfied are you with the current state of the rivers, lakes, etc. with respect to ... where 1 = not at all satisfied and 10 = extremely satisfied?**

Attribute	Mean Importance	Don't Know %	Mean Satisfaction	Don't Know %	Gap
Abundance of fish, birds and other animals					
CRP4c revisit	8.7	0.9	6.9	4.5	1.8
New	8.8	0.9	7	6.4	1.8
All	8.8	0.9	6.9	5.9	1.8
Variety of fish, birds and other animals					
CRP4c revisit	8.7	1.4	6.9	5.9	1.8
New	8.8	0.9	6.8	7.2	2
All	8.7	1.1	6.8	6.8	1.9
Abundance of plants and greenery					
CRP4c revisit	8.9	1.4	6.8	6.4	2.1
New	8.9	0.8	6.6	8.7	2.3
All	8.9	0.9	6.7	8	2.3
Variety of plants and greenery					
CRP4c revisit	8.9	0.9	6.8	6.4	2.2
New	8.9	0.8	6.6	10.6	2.3
All	8.9	0.8	6.6	9.3	2.3

Note: The base for the CRP4c revisit sample is 220 respondents, the base for the New sample is 530 respondents, and the base for the full sample is 750 respondents.

Litter and Ecology

Table E.3: On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neither; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree, how far do you agree with the following statements?

Statement	Mean Agreement	Don't Know %
Clearing the waters and surrounding environments of general litter should come first before tackling ecological concerns		
CRP4c revisit	3.7	0.9
New	3.9	2.3
All	3.8	1.9
Improving ecological quality should be the first priority, even where there is general litter present		
CRP4c revisit	3.5	0.9
New	3.5	2.1
All	3.5	1.7

Note: The base for the CRP4c revisit sample is 220 respondents, the base for the New sample is 530 respondents, and the base for the full sample is 750 respondents.

Accessibility and Provision of Public Facilities

Table E.4: For any of the activities that you have done, or have considered doing, in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the current amount of access available to you, where 1 = not at all satisfied and 10 = extremely satisfied?

Activity	Mean Satisfaction	Don't Know %	Base
Walking, running, cycling, etc			
CRP4c revisit	8.2	4.1	187
New	8.2	4.7	456
All	8.2	4.5	643
Bird watching			
CRP4c revisit	7.8	8.6	126
New	7.8	8.7	311
All	7.8	8.7	437
Fishing			
CRP4c revisit	7.7	12.3	69
New	7.9	12.5	205
All	7.8	12.4	274
Paddling, wading			
CRP4c revisit	7	7.7	104
New	7.4	11.7	262
All	7.2	10.5	366
Sailing, windsurfing			
CRP4c revisit	6.7	10	61
New	7	14	173
All	6.9	12.8	234
Canoeing			
CRP4c revisit	6.4	12.3	62
New	7	14.7	176
All	6.8	14	238
Narrow/cruise boating			
CRP4c revisit	6.5	11.8	66
New	6.7	14.5	172
All	6.7	13.7	238
Swimming			
CRP4c revisit	6.3	8.6	93
New	6.6	12.5	257
All	6.5	11.3	350
Rowing			
CRP4c revisit	6.1	14.1	55
New	6.6	14.3	177
All	6.4	14.3	232
Water skiing, jet skiing			
CRP4c revisit	5.9	15	48
New	6	17.2	138
All	6	16.5	186
Surfing			
CRP4c revisit	5.2	15	48
New	5.5	16.4	153
All	5.4	16	201
Scuba diving, snorkelling			
CRP4c revisit	5.1	15	51
New	4.9	19.1	133
All	5	17.9	184

Note: The base for the CRP4c revisit sample is 220 respondents, the base for the New sample is 530 respondents, and the base for the full sample is 750 respondents. The base varies by activity because respondents were asked to answer only for those activities that they had done, or considered doing in the last 12 months.

E.3.2. Priorities for Where to Make the Improvements

Table E.5: On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neither; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree, do you agree that higher priority should be given...

Statement	Mean Agreement	Don't know %
according to the seriousness of the problem regardless of the accessibility of the water or the number of visits		
CRP4c revisit	3.8	1.8
New	3.8	4.5
All	3.8	3.7
to places where the general public has access than to places where access is restricted to clubs and private landowners		
CRP4c revisit	3.7	0
New	3.8	2.5
All	3.8	1.7
to places where more visits are made by the general public		
CRP4c revisit	3.6	0
New	3.7	1.7
All	3.7	1.2
to places that are physically accessible than to places that are not		
CRP4c revisit	3.4	0.9
New	3.5	3.8
All	3.5	2.9

Note: The base for the CRP4c revisit sample is 220 respondents, the base for the New sample is 530 respondents, and the base for the full sample is 750 respondents.

E.3.3. Decision-Making Process

Table E.6: On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neither; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree, do you agree that...

Statement	Mean Agreement	Don't know %
Except where I've said "I don't know", I have enough knowledge of the issues covered in this survey to offer a reasonably informed opinion.		
CRP4c revisit	3.9	0.9
New	3.8	0.9
All	3.8	0.9
Other members of the public are more informed than me, and should have a greater influence in setting improvement priorities		
CRP4c revisit	3	2.3
New	3	3.6
All	3	3.2
Decisions on setting priorities for improvement should be left to experts within the government and its agencies		
CRP4c revisit	2.8	1.8
New	2.8	1.3
All	2.8	1.5

Note: The base for the CRP4c revisit sample is 220 respondents, the base for the New sample is 530 respondents, and the base for the full sample is 750 respondents.

Appendix F. REVIEW OF WIDER LITERATURE

This section contains a review of two reports from the wider literature relevant to understanding household priorities with respect to types of WFD measures. These reports, given to us by DEFRA for the purposes of this scoping study, are:

- University of Brighton (2001) *Water-Based Sport and Recreation: The Facts*, Report for DEFRA, British Waterways, Countryside Agency, Countryside Council for Wales, Environment Agency and Sport England, and
- University of Brighton (2004) *Improving Access for Canoeing on Inland Waters: A Study of the Feasibility of Access Agreements*, Technical Report for the Countryside Agency.

The remainder of this section reviews each of these reports in turn. Our review focuses on information pertaining to the identification of different relevant types of people, their prevalence in the population, their demographic characteristics, and the priorities they have for different types of water environment related improvements.

F.1. Review of University of Brighton (2001) *Water-Based Sport and Recreation: The Facts*

F.1.1. Introduction and overview

University of Brighton (2001) was commissioned by DEFRA and partners in response to concerns about access to inland water in England and Wales for sport and recreation. The stated aim of the research was to help the Government consider what actions, if any, it should take to secure access for inland waters for sport and recreation.

The study undertook to investigate the current access arrangements across England and Wales for users of inland water bodies, the levels of usage by different types of user and on different types of water body, the characteristics of the different types of user, the extent of latent demand for water-based sport and recreation, the barriers to participation and the concerns of user groups and other stakeholders regarding access arrangements. The study then proposed potential solutions to some key concerns.

The research involved combining and analysing a range of existing data sources, and conducting interviews with key stakeholders, a wider stakeholder consultation, and focus groups with members of the public. For assessment of the effectiveness of current arrangements in light of the research, and to agree on potential solutions to address key concerns, the study concluded with a ‘Delphi’ stage involving the facilitation of six expert panels around England and Wales.

The key findings to emerge from the research, on use of the water environment, and on public priorities in relation to WFD measures, are outlined below.

F.1.2. Use of the water environment

The report cites findings from a number of surveys. The main ones were: (i) the UK Day Visits Survey (UKDVS) 1998, (ii) a Gallup poll of 1000 adults in 1998, conducted for the Country Landowners’ Association, and (iii) a survey of 23,200 adults in Wales by the Sport Council for Wales.

- According to the UKDVS, which was considered by stakeholders as the most authoritative source on overall participation rates, approximately five million people (12% of the adult population) made some use of inland water in 1998 as part of a day leisure visit. Of these, 55% were male and 45% female. Over 60% of all visits were to destinations less than five miles from home.
- According to a 1998 Gallup poll of 1000 adults, conducted for the Country Landowners' Association, around 6% of the population undertook some form of in-stream sport or recreation in inland waters within the past year. No information was obtained on participation in near-stream activities.
- According to a survey of 23,200 adults in Wales by the Sport Council for Wales, approximately 3% of the population participated in water-based sport and recreation within four weeks prior to the survey. This rate was stable from 1995 to 1998.
- Other surveys, including the General Household Survey 1998, and the Scottish Sports Council Survey showed very similar results on the overall participation rate.

Table F.1 shows the breakdown of regular users of inland waters for sport and recreation in Wales by demographic characteristics, as derived from the large-scale Sports Council for Wales survey.

Table F.1: Percentage of Adult (15+) Population Participating in In-Stream Activities in Wales During Previous Four Weeks

Gender	Male	5.5
	Female	0.8
	Total	3.1
Age range	15-24	5.6
	25-34	4.5
	35-44	3.7
	45-54	2.6
	55-64	2.0
	65+	0.8
Social group	AB	3.3
	C1	3.5
	C2	3.8
	D	3.0
	E	1.9
Angling	Male	3.8
	Female	0.3

Source: Sports Council for Wales. % that participated in at least one of: canoeing, angling, rowing, sub aqua, surfing, windsurfing or sailing during the previous four weeks. Sample size is 23 206.

The above table shows that, in Wales, the vast majority of regular in-stream users were men, with a higher proportion of younger people, and a lower proportion in social group E. The bias towards men was even more pronounced for angling than for water-based activities as a whole.

In addition to its review of other surveys, University of Brighton (2001) also reports findings from a user group consultation conducted as part of the study. In this consultation:

- User groups expressed the view that numbers would probably remain stable for the foreseeable future.

- Little evidence was found of widespread unmet demand for inland water-based sport and recreation. Rather, there were some specific ‘hotspot’ areas where demand was greater than supply for specific resources, such as white water. The authors suggest that demand could increase if there were more information available on the supply of opportunities.
- Regular dedicated water sports enthusiasts tended to travel long distances to participate.

The report cites findings from a study by Mintel (1998) on participation rates for a range of water-based activities in the UK. Table F.2 below shows the main findings.

Table F.2: Participation Estimates for Water-Based Activities in UK

	Club members	Regulars	Occasional	Trends over time
Dinghy sailing	87 000			up
Windsurfing		640 000		down
Water-skiing	9 000	80-100 000	400 000	static
Canoeing	35 000	100 000	500-1 000 000	up
Fishing	1 500 000	3 000 000		static

Source: Mintel 1998

The above table shows that angling was by far the most popular water-based sport and recreation activity. According to stakeholder interviews, participation in canoeing and rowing is growing the fastest of all the in-stream activity types.

F.1.3. Views on water use issues expressed by general public

A key concern of the focus groups was to understand whether use was being prevented by unnecessary barriers to participation, such as access constraints or lack of information, and any other reasons for non-use. This concern was motivated by the fact that only a small proportion of the population use inland waters for in-stream activities.

In the main, most people in the focus groups perceived that there was no real shortage of available space for water recreation, although it did emerge in the focus groups that the need to travel to facilities by car severely restricted access for young people.

In the focus groups conducted for the study, many participants stressed the importance of inland waters for walking and picnicking beside, rather than for in-stream activities.

Views regarding reasons for non-participation were wide-ranging.

- Some clubs were perceived as ‘snobbish’, ‘elitist’ and ‘unwelcoming’.
- Some activities were considered by some to be old-fashioned, relative to other forms of keeping fit.
- Lack of time and experience were barriers to participation, especially for women. Some expressed the view that low participation simply reflects a reluctance to join sports clubs of any type.
- There were mixed views on cost as a barrier to participation. The cost of equipment purchase was considered more of a constraint to participation than an entry fee.
- Flexibility was considered important to many people. People expressed a reluctance to commit to annual memberships, preferring the option of day tickets where available. Some expressed the view that for women in particular, flexible

arrangements would be preferable to allow them to try out new sports in a non-judgemental manner.

- The likelihood of participation in water-based activities was considered by some to be influenced by the extent of parental involvement, and whether or not activities were taught in school or higher education.
- Some suggested that more information might increase participation. Certainty and security were important elements of this information, particularly for women. Little additional participation was expected without aggressive marketing though.
- The quality of the water was cited by a number of focus group participants as a key barrier to participation in water sport and recreation. The main concern was pollution, which was mentioned in all focus groups by all age ranges. People recounted incidents of pollution or newspaper articles of the dangers of swimming in rivers and lakes, and feared becoming ill as a result of contact with the water. No-one in any of the groups believed that inland water was clean enough to swim in.

F.1.4. Views expressed by stakeholders and users

The points mentioned below are drawn from the stakeholder interviews and questionnaires carried out in the University of Brighton study unless otherwise stated.

Quantity of space available / access arrangements

As expected, much of the focus of the stakeholder research concerned the amount of space available for the activities performed, and the access arrangements. Most user and representative groups questioned in the stakeholder interviews and questionnaires desired more spaces in which to undertake their activities. The region with most resource constraint concerns was the South East. In the case of angling, the main concern of stakeholders was to protect currently accessible space from disturbance from other activities. Many argued that, in some cases, sharing access with other users would diminish the quality of the angling experience. Canoeing organisations desired particular types of resource, especially white water and longer lengths of waterway for canoe touring. Rowing and windsurfing organisations did not distinguish different types of resource, simply desiring more space for their activities, in places where demand outstrips supply, eg on the fringes of London. More rowing spaces were desired around some other major cities such as Birmingham. For water-skiing, more space is desired in some areas of the West Midlands and the West country and to retain spaces currently used (especially in National Parks) or find suitable local alternatives.

There was a general concern about the lack of coordinated planning policy guidance, which has led to underprovision of facilities, particularly inland marinas, by local authorities. In some cases, use was said to be prevented by environmental designation of areas as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) There were also many claims of conflicts between users of inland waters, eg between anglers and canoeists, owing to either competing needs for space, or encounters between legal and illegal users.

A separate study by British Marine Industry Federation (BMIF), 1997, concluded that physical access for water-based recreation was adequate but that the quality of access could be improved.

In assessing all the results from GDSS analysis, the focus groups, and the stakeholder research, there was a consensus among the expert panels that there was little need for any wholesale development of new facilities, but that there were some local hotspot

areas, and some local issues that needed addressing with regard to conflicts. In addition, there were access problems for canoeing that needed addressing at a larger scale.

Quality of water environment

Many stakeholders, across all user groups, stressed the importance of waterside facilities, including car parking, changing rooms, toilets, and launch facilities.

A separate study by British Waterways, 1997, surveyed 1616 boat owners and found that 23% of those surveyed mentioned depth of water as a concern. In addition, clearance of rubbish, litter and weed was also mentioned. The courtesy, helpfulness and efficiency of waterside staff, and the improving quality of the bankside landscape were mentioned as positives in this study, and in three other studies (British Waterways 2000; Marine Leisure Research Group 1998 and Environment Agency 1997).

Willingness to travel

Stakeholders expressed the view that regular dedicated water sports enthusiasts tended to travel long distances to participate, mostly by car, but that novices and irregular participants in rowing, sailing, canoeing and diving tend to need spaces closer to home.

F.1.5. Other relevant evidence reported

From the GDSS tool developed for the study, measures of rivers with public navigation rights and canals, per head of population, suggest a shortage of resource in the South East. The South East also has the lowest number of enclosed water bodies per 10,000 population. The analysis suggests that up to half of the enclosed water resource in and around all urban areas was unused.

F.1.6. Conclusions

The focus of the University of Brighton (2001) report was to present the facts and the views of stakeholders and the public pertaining to issues of access to inland waters for sport and recreation. This focus is somewhat tangential to the purpose of the CRP 4d prioritisation study, however, the report contains some useful information.

One very useful set of information is on the prevalence of different categories of people relevant to investigating the public's priorities between schemes. Combining a number of authoritative surveys, which gave consistent results, the population can usefully be split into non-users (88%), near-stream-only users (6%) casual in-stream users (3%), and regular in-stream users (3%). Data are also reported on participation rates for individual water-use activities.

The focus group participants are drawn from the general public. Their views tell us the most about the population as a whole. As expected, given the relative participation rates, many in the focus groups stressed the importance of inland waters for walking and picnicking beside, rather than for in-stream activities. No information is reported on how such users perceive the quality of the environment, nor whether there are specific improvable features that distinguish places from each other, nor what priorities they would have for improvements. We do learn that the majority of visits are local, hence either people choose to live nearest to sites that they judge to be best quality in the region, or they do not consider the improvements to be gained by travelling to justify the extra time and cost of the journey.

The findings from the focus groups do suggest that water bodies are widely perceived as polluted, and, as a consequence, are not considered safe for contact activities. This presents a barrier to participation for some. Thus, making the waters safe, and conveying that message successfully, would probably generate value to these people. The report tells us nothing new about the priorities of the general public with respect to improvement options for the water environment.

The University of Brighton study tells us a little more about the minority of the public that use inland waters regularly for sport and recreation. There are numbers of messages from the stakeholders relating to access arrangements, but little relating to priorities between types of improvement to water environments. We learn that regular dedicated water sports enthusiasts tended to travel long distances to participate, even where facilities are available closer to home. These users therefore distinguish between water environments, and thus appreciate differences in the quality, as they judge it. We do not learn, however, anything about the relative worth of different types of WFD improvements.

F.2. Review of University of Brighton (2004) Improving Access for Canoeing on Inland Waters: A Study of the Feasibility of Access Agreements

The University of Brighton (2004) study was commissioned by the Countryside Agency to follow up on the finding from the 2001 study by the same authors that there were some problems regarding the access arrangements for certain users of inland waters in England and Wales. In particular, canoeists had successfully argued that there was insufficient accessible space for their activities. The purpose of the work was to explore the feasibility of alternative access arrangements for solving this deficiency without harming existing users.

The study began with the detailed development of candidate access arrangement alternatives using expert panels, and desk-based research. The study then conducted four case study evaluations of these arrangements. Each case study focussed on a particular area where access problems were known about. Small group consultations were conducted to explore the feasibility of the arrangements in each area.

In reviewing this report, we could not identify any useful information relevant to exploring the public's priorities between WFD measures, nor with regard to aiding the design of a quantitative survey of public preferences. The only new information on the public's views obtained during the course of the study pertained to stakeholder views on access arrangements in the four case study areas. This information is not informative in the present study context.