Arctic Interagency Visitor Center
Visitor Survey

Introduction
In order for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), and better meet the needs of the public; a visitor satisfaction survey was conducted at 12 BLM recreation sites in 8 states during fiscal year 2005 (FY05). The survey was developed to measure each site's performance related to BLM GPRA Goal 3.1 - Provide for a quality recreation experience, including access, and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources on DOI managed and partnered lands and waters; and Goal 3.2 - Provide for and receive fair value in recreation. The information collected during the survey will also help the BLM better serve the public. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data regarding visitor information (i.e., use of maps, signs, brochures), developed facilities, managing recreation use, resource management, BLM staff and customer service, and educational and interpretive materials.

The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Arctic Interagency Visitor Center are summarized in this data report. A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on the next page. Below (left) is a graph summarizing visitor opinions of the "overall quality of recreation experience." The satisfaction measure next to this graph is a combined percentage of "good" and "very good" responses. This is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.1 and should be used for reporting performance for this goal (NOTE: the satisfaction measure may not equal the sum of "very good" and "good" percentages due to rounding).

The response rate for this site survey was 94%. The graph and satisfaction measure summarizing visitor opinions of the "value for fee paid", which is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.2, can be found on page 9.

FY05 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities: 99%

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY05: 336 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall quality of recreation experience

Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
Understanding the Results

Inside this report are graphs that illustrate the survey results. The report contains 8 categories of data regarding BLM amenities, staff, and services plus selected demographics. Within these categories are graphs for each indicator evaluated by site visitors. For example, the Visitor Information category includes indicators such as “providing useful maps and brochures”, “adequate signs on site for direction,” and so forth. In each category there is a graph entitled “Everything Considered” this graph is the basis for determining visitor satisfaction for each category and GPRA reporting numbers.

Each graph includes the following information:

- The number of visitor responses for the indicator;
- The percentage of responses which were "very good," "good," "average," "poor," and "very poor;"
- A "satisfaction measure" that combines the percentage of total responses which were "very good" or "good;" and
- An average evaluation score (mean score) based on the following values: very poor= 1, poor= 2, average= 3, good= 4, very good= 5.

The higher the average evaluation score, the more positive the visitor response
Graph percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Research Methods

Surveys were distributed to a random sample of visitors at this site during a selected period in FY05. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 94% of those randomly sampled responded to the survey. The data reflect visitor opinions about this site’s facilities, management, services, educational opportunities, and fees during the survey period. Visitor activities and selected demographics were also captured. A representative sample of the general visitor population were surveyed at selected locations. The results do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year, or visitors who did not visit the survey locations on site.

Returned surveys were electronically scanned and the data analyzed. Frequency distributions were calculated for each indicator and category. All percentage calculations were rounded to the nearest percent.

The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report. The sample size (n) varies from figure to figure, depending on the number of responses.

Caution is advised when interpreting any data with a sample size of less than 30. In such cases, the word “CAUTION!” is included in the graph. This report excludes any indicator with less than 10 responses.

For most indicators, the survey data are expected to be accurate within a 6% with 95% confidence. This means that if different samples had been drawn, the results would have been similar (±6%) 95 out of 100 times.

For more information about this survey, contact Jennifer Hoger, BLM Survey Project Coordinator at the University of Idaho Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806.
Arctic Interagency Visitor Center
Primary Activities at this Site/Area

**Primary activities**
FY05: 316 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/fishing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicle</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.

Arctic Interagency Visitor Center
Visitor Information

**Providing useful maps and brochures**
FY05: 363 respondents

- Very poor: 5%
- Poor: 8%
- Average: 4%
- Good: 36%
- Very good: 50%

**Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation**
FY05: 317 respondents

- Very poor: 5%
- Poor: 8%
- Average: 4%
- Good: 36%
- Very good: 50%

**Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations**
FY05: 344 respondents

- Very poor: 5%
- Poor: 8%
- Average: 4%
- Good: 36%
- Very good: 50%

**Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information**
FY05: 344 respondents

- Very poor: 5%
- Poor: 8%
- Average: 4%
- Good: 36%
- Very good: 50%

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Arctic Interagency Visitor Center
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY05: 339 respondents
Very good 40%
Good 40%
Average 10%
Poor 7%
Very poor 3%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY05: 196 respondents
Very good 64%
Good 6%
Average 10%
Poor 5%
Very poor 7%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Maintaining a clean site
FY05: 361 respondents
Very good 30%
Good 40%
Average 10%
Poor 7%
Very poor 3%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY05: 244 respondents
Very good 30%
Good 43%
Average 10%
Poor 5%
Very poor 7%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY05: 363 respondents
Very good 77%
Good 21%
Average 0%
Poor 3%
Very poor 0%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Arctic Interagency Visitor Center
Fees

Total fees paid
FY05: 374 respondents
No fees 4%
Amount spent
Under $25 6%
$25 - $50 3%
> $50 1%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY05: 12 respondents
Far too low 0%
Too low 12%
About right 44%
Too high 16%
Far too high 0%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY05: 51 respondents
Strongly agree 35%
Agree 28%
Rating
Not Sure 16%
Disagree 0%
Strongly disagree 13%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
**Arctic Interagency Visitor Center**

**Providing Educational and Interpretive Material**

- **Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site**
  - FY05: 337 respondents
  - Very good: 40%
  - Good: 8%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 8%
  - Very poor: 12%
  - FY05 Satisfaction measure: 99%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.8

- **Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site**
  - FY05: 133 respondents
  - Very good: 21%
  - Good: 16%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 24%
  - FY05 Satisfaction measure: 99%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.8

- **Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?**
  - FY05: 261 respondents
  - Yes: 56%
  - No: 41%

- **Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources**
  - FY05: 279 respondents
  - Very good: 48%
  - Good: 29%
  - Average: 10%
  - Poor: 6%
  - Very poor: 5%

- **Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area**
  - FY05: 186 respondents
  - Very good: 46%
  - Good: 26%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 8%
  - Very poor: 11%

- **Providing quality educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?**
  - FY05: 261 respondents
  - Yes: 56%
  - No: 41%

- **Managing the appropriate use of vehicles**
  - FY05: 196 respondents
  - Very good: 49%
  - Good: 46%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 1%

- **Managing the number of people**
  - FY05: 226 respondents
  - Very good: 56%
  - Good: 44%

- **Keeping noise at appropriate levels**
  - FY05: 239 respondents
  - Very good: 58%
  - Good: 36%

- **Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site**
  - FY05: 133 respondents
  - Very good: 21%
  - Good: 16%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 24%

- **Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site**
  - FY05: 133 respondents
  - Very good: 21%
  - Good: 16%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 24%

- **Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area**
  - FY05: 186 respondents
  - Very good: 46%
  - Good: 26%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 8%
  - Very poor: 11%

- **Providing quality educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?**
  - FY05: 337 respondents
  - Very good: 40%
  - Good: 8%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 8%
  - Very poor: 12%
  - FY05 Satisfaction measure: 99%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.8

- **Managing the number of people**
  - FY05: 226 respondents
  - Very good: 56%
  - Good: 44%

- **Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime**
  - FY05: 142 respondents
  - Very good: 44%
  - Good: 49%

- **Everything considered: visitor and recreation management**
  - FY05: 266 respondents
  - Very good: 69%
  - Good: 31%

- **Everything considered: interpretive and educational program**
  - FY05: 137 respondents
  - Very good: 74%
  - Good: 24%

- **Everything considered: interpretive and educational program**
  - FY05: 137 respondents
  - Very good: 74%
  - Good: 24%
Arctic Interagency Visitor Center
Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY05: 305 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY05: 271 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY05: 257 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY05: 302 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Staff treated me courteously
FY05: 350 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY05: 158 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY05: 322 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY05: 358 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

6 Report # ARIN05

Everything considered: performance
of BLM staff

FY05: 358 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Very good

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
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