Gila Box Riparian NCA 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 17 BLM recreation sites in 11 states during fiscal year 2006 (FY06). 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 Gila Box Riparian NCA 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 83%. 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.

Overall quality of recreation experience

FY06: 28 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06

Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

FY06 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities: 96%
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.

![Graph showing visitor satisfaction with satisfaction scale from Very Poor to Very Good]

- 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 FY06. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 83% 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 with in ±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 Russell, BLM Survey Project Coordinator at the University of Idaho Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806
Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY06: 32 respondents
- Very good: 47%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 20%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
FY06
- Satisfaction measure: 72%
- Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY06: 35 respondents
- Very good: 40%
- Good: 40%
- Average: 14%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
FY06
- Satisfaction measure: 86%
- Average evaluation score: 4.3
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Gila Box Riparian NCA are summarized in this report. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data on various aspects of the site's performance related to BLM GPRA Goal 3.1 - Managing the appropriate use of Federal resources; each site's performance related to BLM GPRA Goal 3.2 - Ensuring public awareness and involvement; and better meet the needs of the public; a visitor satisfaction survey was conducted at Gila Box Riparian NCA. The information collected during the survey will also help the BLM better serve the public. The survey included questions about the overall condition of developed facilities, the cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities, and the non-motorized trails. The results of the survey are summarized in the following charts:

- **Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles**: FY06: 35 respondents
  - Very good: 31%
  - Good: 43%
  - Average: 26%
  - Poor: 0%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY06: Satisfaction measure: 74%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.1

- **Maintaining trails for non-motorized use**: FY06: 22 respondents
  - Very good: 41%
  - Good: 41%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 9%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY06: Satisfaction measure: 82%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.1

- **Maintaining a clean site**: FY06: 34 respondents
  - Very good: 68%
  - Good: 24%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY06: Satisfaction measure: 88%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.5

- **Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities**: FY06: 29 respondents
  - Very good: 71%
  - Good: 18%
  - Average: 7%
  - Poor: 4%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY06: Satisfaction measure: 89%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.6

- **Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities**: FY06: 34 respondents
  - Very good: 44%
  - Good: 47%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 0%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY06: Satisfaction measure: 91%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.4
Managing Visitor Satisfaction and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY06: 29 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good: 52%</th>
<th>Good: 38%</th>
<th>Average: 7%</th>
<th>Poor: 3%</th>
<th>Very poor: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Managing the number of people
FY06: 25 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good: 68%</th>
<th>Good: 24%</th>
<th>Average: 8%</th>
<th>Poor: 0%</th>
<th>Very poor: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY06: 30 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good: 53%</th>
<th>Good: 33%</th>
<th>Average: 13%</th>
<th>Poor: 0%</th>
<th>Very poor: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY06: 25 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good: 52%</th>
<th>Good: 39%</th>
<th>Average: 12%</th>
<th>Poor: 0%</th>
<th>Very poor: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY06: 30 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good: 47%</th>
<th>Good: 50%</th>
<th>Average: 3%</th>
<th>Poor: 0%</th>
<th>Very poor: 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Report # GIBOSummer06
Adequately protecting the natural resources

FY06: 30 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06
Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

FY06: 26 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAUTION!

FY06:
Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

FY06: 28 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06
Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

FY06: 31 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAUTION!

FY06:
Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Staff treated me courteously

FY06: 35 respondents

- Very good: 80%
- Good: 20%

Rating

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area

FY06: 26 respondents

- Very good: 80%
- Good: 20%

Rating

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

FY06: 29 respondents

- Very good: 69%
- Good: 31%

Rating

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

FY06: 35 respondents

- Very good: 69%
- Good: 20%

Rating

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Gila Box Riparian NCA
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site
FY06: 23 respondents

- Very good: 43%
- Good: 39%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Providing a sufficient *quantity* of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site
FY06: 23 respondents

- Very good: 39%
- Good: 43%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 4%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area's resources?
FY06: 28 respondents

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources
FY06: 25 respondents

- Very good: 40%
- Good: 44%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 4%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area
FY06: 23 respondents

- Very good: 52%
- Good: 22%
- Average: 22%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 4%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program
FY06: 23 respondents

- Very good: 48%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 4%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
### Inquiry into BLM's Achievements and Visitor Feedback

#### Total Fees Paid
**FY06: 35 respondents**

- No fees: 74%
- Under $25: 26%

#### Appropriateness of Fees
**FY06: 12 respondents**

- Too low: 0%
- Far too low: 0%
- About right: 100%
- Too high: 0%
- Far too high: 0%

#### Value of Recreation Opportunity
**FY06: 11 respondents**

- Strongly agree: 27%
- Agree: 30%
- Not sure: 30%
- Strongly disagree: 0%
Primary activities
FY06: 34 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/rafting</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicles</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

National Landscape Conservation System
Site Specific Goal

"As a Riparian National Conservation Area, this site's designated purpose is to protect riparian habitats and related values for present and future generations. 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?
FY06: 32 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
Gila Box Riparian NCA
Demographics

Visitor group composition
FY06: 27 groups

Age group

Proportion of groups

Adults (18 and over) 61%
Teenagers (13-17) 10%
Children (under 12) 29%

CAUTION!

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group
FY06: 27 groups

Teenagers in group

Proportion of groups

6 and more 6%
3-5 0%
1-2 37%
none 59%

CAUTION!

Number of adults (18 and over) in group
FY06: 27 groups

Adults in group

Proportion of groups

6 and more 37%
3-5 22%
1-2 41%
none 4%

CAUTION!

Number of children (under 12) in group
FY06: 27 groups

Children in group

Proportion of groups

6 and more 15%
3-5 22%
1-2 26%
none 37%

CAUTION!

Respondent age
FY06: 32 respondents

Age (years)

Number of respondents

71 and over 7%
61-70 13%
51-60 34%
41-50 28%
31-40 19%
22-30 0%
18-21 3%

Gender
FY06: 31 respondents

Gender

Number of respondents

Male 48%
Female 52%
### Educational and Interpretive Materials

Staff demonstrated knowledge about educational and interpretive materials in group rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>children (0-17)</th>
<th>teenagers (18-24)</th>
<th>adults (25-40)</th>
<th>adults (41-50)</th>
<th>adults (51-70)</th>
<th>adults (71 and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY06:</td>
<td>29 respondents</td>
<td>32 respondents</td>
<td>35 respondents</td>
<td>31 respondents</td>
<td>30 respondents</td>
<td>27 respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Visitor Group Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Children (0-17)</th>
<th>Teenagers (18-24)</th>
<th>Adults (25-40)</th>
<th>Adults (41-50)</th>
<th>Adults (51-70)</th>
<th>Adults (71 and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY06:</td>
<td>35 respondents</td>
<td>27 respondents</td>
<td>29 respondents</td>
<td>31 respondents</td>
<td>30 respondents</td>
<td>27 respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Visitor Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Number of Teenagers</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY06:</td>
<td>35 respondents</td>
<td>27 respondents</td>
<td>29 respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Visitor Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06: Satisfaction measure</th>
<th>FY06: Evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Visitor Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06: Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Visitor Opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06: Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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