Oregon Trail Interpretive 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 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 Oregon Trail Interpretive 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 95%. 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

- **Very good**: 88%
- **Good**: 12%
- **Average**: 0%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

**FY06**

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

### FY06 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

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

**100%**
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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](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

- 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 95% 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
Oregon Trail Interpretive Center
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY06: 158 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good 64%
Good 34%
Average 1%

Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY06: 162 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good 62%
Good 31%
Average 6%

Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY06: 150 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good 45%
Good 50%
Average 5%
Poor 0%

Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY06: 165 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good 68%
Good 30%
Average 1%

Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Oregon Trail Interpretive Center
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY06: 161 respondents

Rating
Very good 84%
Good 16%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

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

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY06: 88 respondents

Rating
Very good 72%
Good 28%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

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

Maintaining a clean site
FY06: 163 respondents

Rating
Very good 85%
Good 14%
Average 1%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY06: 150 respondents

Rating
Very good 84%
Good 15%
Average 1%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY06: 161 respondents

Rating
Very good 78%
Good 22%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

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

FY06                   Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
FY06:                 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
FY06                   Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
FY06:                 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
FY06:                  Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY06: 121 respondents

Rating

Very good 69%
Good 29%
Average 2%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Managing the number of people
FY06: 147 respondents

Rating

Very good 63%
Good 36%
Average 1%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY06: 146 respondents

Rating

Very good 59%
Good 38%
Average 3%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY06: 88 respondents

Rating

Very good 99%
Good 39%
Average 1%
Poor 1%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY06: 149 respondents

Rating

Very good 86%
Good 34%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY06: 146 respondents
Very good  73%
Good  25%
Average  1%
Poor  0%
Very poor  0%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY06: 150 respondents
Very good  73%
Good  26%
Average  1%
Poor  0%
Very poor  0%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY06: 145 respondents
Very good  66%
Good  32%
Average  2%
Poor  0%
Very poor  0%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

FY06                   Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

FY06:                 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Oregon Trail Interpretive Center
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY06: 155 respondents

Rating

Very good: 93%
Good: 0%
Average: 1%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY06: 123 respondents

Rating

Very good: 79%
Good: 16%
Average: 9%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY06: 116 respondents

Rating

Very good: 62%
Good: 18%
Average: 3%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY06: 153 respondents

Rating

Very good: 88%
Good: 13%
Average: 2%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

**FY06: 138 respondents**

- Very good: 83%
- Good: 17%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

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

**FY06: 137 respondents**

- Very good: 77%
- Good: 22%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

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

**FY06: 122 respondents**

- Yes: 66%
- No: 34%

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

**FY06: 137 respondents**

- Very good: 73%
- Good: 26%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

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

**FY06: 105 respondents**

- Very good: 62%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 8%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area

**FY06: 97 respondents**

- Very good: 63%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Oregon Trail Interpretive Center
Fees

**Total fees paid**
FY06: 167 respondents

- No fees: 57%
- Under $25: 41%
- $25 - $50: 1%
- > $50: 1%

**How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?**
FY06: 87 respondents

- Far too low: 0%
- Too low: 7%
- About right: 91%
- Too high: 2%
- Far too high: 0%

**The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.**
FY06: 83 respondents

- Strongly agree: 47%
- Agree: 45%
- Not Sure: 8%
- Disagree: 0%
- Strongly disagree: 0%
**Primary activities**

FY06: 127 respondents**

- **Camping** 12%  
- **Fishing** 3%  
- **Hunting** 2%  
- **Sightseeing** 70%  
- **Picnicking** 7%  
- **Hiking/walking** 14%  
- **Swimming** 1%  
- **Motorized boating** 1%  
- **Non-motorized boating/rafting** 2%  
- **Horseback riding** 1%  
- **Bicycling** 0%  
- **Motorized recreation vehicles** 3%  
- **Education and interpretation** 58%  
- **Birdwatching/wildlife viewing** 5%  
- **Other** 3%  

**Proportion of respondents**

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

---

**National Landscape Conservation System**

**Site Specific Goal**

"As a National Historic Trail Interpretive Center, the designated purpose of this site is to preserve, interpret and educate on the historic, cultural heritage, and natural features. Based on what you experienced at this site/area during your visit, do you think the BLM is achieving this goal?"
### Oregon Trail Interpretive Center Demographics

#### Visitor group composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Proportion of groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 and over)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (13-17)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 12)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of adults (18 and over) in group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of adults</th>
<th>Proportion of groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of teenagers (13-17) in group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teenagers</th>
<th>Proportion of groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of children (under 12) in group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Proportion of groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Respondent age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 and over</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>