Rio Grande Boat Launches
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 Rio Grande Boat Launches 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 96%. 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.

RIO: 137 respondents
Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Report prepared by the University of Idaho Park Studies Unit for the Bureau of Land Management, US Department of the Interior
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. 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.

For most indicators, the survey data are expected to be accurate within ± 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

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.

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 ± 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

Demographics

Report # RIGR05

Number of adults (18 and over) in group FY05: 111 groups

Number of children (under 12) in group FY05: 111 groups

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group FY05: 111 groups

Rio Grande Boat Launches
Primary Activities at this Site/Area

Primary activities
FY05: 139 respondents

| Activity                  | Rating | FY05 Respondents%
|---------------------------|--------|------------------
| Camping                   | 14%    |                  
| Fishing                   | 7%     |                  
| Hunting                   | 7%     |                  
| Sightseeing               | 22%    |                  
| Picnicking                | 12%    |                  
| Hiking/walking            | 15%    |                  
| Swimming                  | 19%    |                  
| Motorized boating         | 2%     |                  
| Non-motorized boating/rafting | 68% |      
| Horseback riding          | 2%     |                  
| Bicycling                 | 2%     |                  
| Motorized recreation vehicles | 2% |       
| Education and interpretation | 8% |        
| Birdwatching/wildlife viewing | 11% |      
| Other                     | 15%    |                  

Activities

National Landscape Conservation System
Site Specific Goal

"As a Wild & Scenic River, this segment’s designated purpose is to provide opportunities for solitude on The Box, and social interaction on the Orilla Verde-Pilar. Based on what you experienced at this site during your visit, do you think the BLM is achieving this goal?"

Is the BLM achieving the site specific goal?
FY05: 160 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY05: 113 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY05: 143 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY05: 137 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY05: 115 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report # RIGR05
Rio Grande Boat Launches
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY05: 150 respondents
Very good 38%
Good 62%
Rating Average 85%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY05: 150 respondents
Very good 39%
Good 61%
Rating Average 85%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Maintaining a clean site
FY05: 150 respondents
Very good 42%
Good 58%
Rating Average 85%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY05: 155 respondents
Very good 39%
Good 44%
Rating Average 44%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY05: 158 respondents
Very good 29%
Good 71%
Rating Average 100%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Rio Grande Boat Launches
Fees

Total fees paid
FY05: 143 respondents
No fees 100%
Amount spent
Under $25 6%
$25 - $50 2%
> $50 0%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY05: 42 respondents
Far too low 0%
Too low 0%
Rating About right 100%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY05: 42 respondents
Strongly agree 63%
Agree 41%
Rating Not Sure 6%
Proportion of respondents: 2%
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4.0
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 4.0
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
Rio Grande Boat Launches
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site
FY05: 84 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources
FY05: 83 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 73%
Average evaluation score: 4

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site
FY05: 84 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area
FY05: 91 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?
FY05: 123 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program
FY05: 87 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY05: 140 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4

Managing the number of people
FY05: 152 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY05: 150 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY05: 114 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY05: 158 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4
Rio Grande Boat Launches
Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY05: 156 respondents
Very good: 38%  Very poor: 2%
Good: 58%  Poor: 3%
Average: 12%  Very poor: 2%
Rating

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY05: 144 respondents
Very good: 68%  Very poor: 2%
Good: 24%  Poor: 1%
Average: 8%  Very poor: 2%
Rating

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY05: 158 respondents
Very good: 49%  Very poor: 1%
Good: 51%  Poor: 2%
Average: 4%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY05: 156 respondents
Very good: 33%  Very poor: 1%
Good: 53%  Poor: 2%
Average: 14%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Staff treated me courteously
FY05: 54 respondents
Very good: 39%  Very poor: 2%
Good: 22%  Poor: 1%
Average: 1%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY05: 54 respondents
Very good: 39%  Very poor: 2%
Good: 22%  Poor: 1%
Average: 1%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY05: 104 respondents
Very good: 40%  Very poor: 1%
Good: 36%  Poor: 2%
Average: 3%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY05: 156 respondents
Very good: 33%  Very poor: 1%
Good: 54%  Poor: 2%
Average: 13%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY05: 158 respondents
Very good: 49%  Very poor: 1%
Good: 51%  Poor: 2%
Average: 4%  Very poor: 1%
Rating

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.5