**Susan Creek Campground 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 Susan Creek Campground 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 16%. 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.
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. 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.

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;" and
- 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

Reports & Publications

For more information about this survey, contact Jennifer Hoger, BLM Survey Project Coordinator at the University of Idaho Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806
Primary activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY05: 41 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/hunting</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseriding</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicles</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are proportions of respondents who participated in each activity.

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

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Susan Creek Campground

**Developed Facilities**

**Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles**
- FY05: 41 respondents
  - Very good: 88%
  - Good: 5%
  - Average: 4%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 2%

**Maintaining trails for non-motorized use**
- FY05: 41 respondents
  - Very good: 7%
  - Good: 23%
  - Average: 25%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 31%

**Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities**
- FY05: 42 respondents
  - Very good: 12%
  - Good: 10%
  - Average: 59%
  - Poor: 7%
  - Very poor: 2%

**Maintaining a clean site**
- FY05: 40 respondents
  - Very good: 98%
  - Good: 2%
  - Average: 0%
  - Poor: 0%
  - Very poor: 0%

**Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities**
- FY05: 42 respondents
  - Very good: 68%
  - Good: 10%
  - Average: 15%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 6%

**Fees**

**Total fees paid**
- FY05: 43 respondents
  - No fees: 9%
  - $0 - $25: 21%
  - $26 - $50: 21%
  - $51 - $75: 10%
  - > $75: 5%

**Amount spent**
- FY05: 43 respondents
  - Less than $25: 58%
  - $25 - $50: 17%
  - $51 - $75: 12%
  - $76 - $100: 10%
  - > $100: 3%

**How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?**
- FY05: 40 respondents
  - Far too high: 0%
  - Too high: 10%
  - About right: 88%
  - Too low: 2%
  - Far too low: 0%

**The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.**
- FY05: 39 respondents
  - Strongly agree: 36%
  - Agree: 40%
  - Not sure: 6%
  - Disagree: 5%
  - Strongly disagree: 3%
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

- **FY05:** 33 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 63%
    - Good: 22%
    - Average: 11%
    - Poor: 3%
    - Very poor: 0%

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

- **FY05:** 37 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Yes: 62%
    - No: 38%

Managing the number of people

- **FY05:** 41 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 73%
    - Good: 11%
    - Average: 11%
    - Poor: 5%
    - Very poor: 0%

Keeping noise at appropriate levels

- **FY05:** 40 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very poor: 0%
    - Poor: 3%
    - Average: 24%
    - Good: 73%
    - Very good: 0%

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area

- **FY05:** 39 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 45%
    - Good: 32%
    - Average: 12%
    - Poor: 7%
    - Very poor: 4%

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources

- **FY05:** 38 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 31%
    - Good: 11%
    - Average: 23%
    - Poor: 11%
    - Very poor: 15%

Providing sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site

- **FY05:** 34 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 34%
    - Good: 26%
    - Average: 20%
    - Poor: 9%
    - Very poor: 1%

Providing a sufficient quality of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site

- **FY05:** 35 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 33%
    - Good: 33%
    - Average: 26%
    - Poor: 8%
    - Very poor: 0%

Everythings considered: interpretive and educational program

- **FY05:** 33 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 45%
    - Good: 42%
    - Average: 5%
    - Poor: 2%
    - Very poor: 0%

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

- **FY05:** 42 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 21%
    - Good: 88%
    - Average: 3%
    - Poor: 0%
    - Very poor: 0%

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

- **FY05:** 39 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 41%
    - Good: 38%
    - Average: 18%
    - Poor: 3%
    - Very poor: 0%

Providing information about resource preservation and management

- **FY05:** 29 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 60%
    - Good: 17%
    - Average: 18%
    - Poor: 4%
    - Very poor: 0%

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site

- **FY05:** 34 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 45%
    - Good: 26%
    - Average: 20%
    - Poor: 9%
    - Very poor: 1%

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site

- **FY05:** 35 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 33%
    - Good: 33%
    - Average: 26%
    - Poor: 8%
    - Very poor: 0%

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime

- **FY05:** 33 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 21%
    - Good: 88%
    - Average: 3%
    - Poor: 0%
    - Very poor: 0%

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site

- **FY05:** 34 respondents
  - **Rating:**
    - Very good: 45%
    - Good: 26%
    - Average: 20%
    - Poor: 9%
    - Very poor: 1%
Susan Creek Campground Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY05: 40 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>%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY05: 40 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>%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY05: 33 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>%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY05: 41 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>%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Staff treated me courteously
FY05: 33 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>%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY05: 33 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>%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY05: 37 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>%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY05: 42 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>%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9