Senator Wash Recreation Area 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 Senator Wash Recreation Area 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 99%. 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: 376 respondents

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

FY06 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:

85%
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.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
\text{Very} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\text{Poor} & & & & & \\
\text{Good} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

- 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 99% 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 ± 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

Report # SEWASummer06
Providing useful maps and brochures

FY06: 334 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation

FY06: 376 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 69%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations

FY06: 376 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 79%
Average evaluation score: 4

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information

FY06: 376 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4
Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY06: 392 respondents

Rating
Very good: 22%
Good: 43%
Average: 20%
Poor: 10%
Very poor: 5%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY06: 354 respondents

Rating
Very good: 29%
Good: 49%
Average: 18%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4

Maintaining a clean site
FY06: 393 respondents

Rating
Very good: 44%
Good: 44%
Average: 10%
Poor: 2%
Very poor: 1%

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

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY06: 387 respondents

Rating
Very good: 50%
Good: 40%
Average: 8%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 1%

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

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY06: 389 respondents

Rating
Very good: 39%
Good: 46%
Average: 11%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY06: 360 respondents

- Very good: 32%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 6%
- Very poor: 3%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 79%
Average evaluation score: 4

Managing the number of people
FY06: 375 respondents

- Very good: 38%
- Good: 47%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY06: 385 respondents

- Very good: 33%
- Good: 50%
- Average: 14%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%

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

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY06: 379 respondents

- Very good: 37%
- Good: 40%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 6%
- Very poor: 5%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY06: 390 respondents

- Very good: 38%
- Good: 45%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 9%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
Adequately protecting the natural resources

FY06: 375 respondents

Rating

Very good 37%
Good 45%
Average 14%
Poor 5%
Very poor 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

FY06: 375 respondents

Rating

Very good 37%
Good 42%
Average 17%
Poor 3%
Very poor 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 79%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

FY06: 359 respondents

Rating

Very good 30%
Good 48%
Average 12%
Poor 4%
Very poor 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

FY06: 375 respondents

Rating

Very good 39%
Good 42%
Average 15%
Poor 3%
Very poor 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
Staff treated me courteously

FY06: 379 respondents

Rating

Very good - 66%
Good - 25%
Average - 6%
Poor - 2%
Very poor - 1%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

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

FY06: 364 respondents

Rating

Very good - 52%
Good - 30%
Average - 10%
Poor - 2%
Very poor - 1%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

FY06: 372 respondents

Rating

Very good - 59%
Good - 30%
Average - 7%
Poor - 2%
Very poor - 1%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

FY06: 377 respondents

Rating

Very good - 60%
Good - 32%
Average - 8%
Poor - 2%
Very poor - 1%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Senator Wash Recreation Area
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site
FY06: 312 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources
FY06: 325 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site
FY06: 309 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Satisfaction measure: 73%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area
FY06: 313 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area's resources?
FY06: 356 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program
FY06: 321 respondents
Senator Wash Recreation Area

Fees

Total fees paid
FY06: 395 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount spent</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY06: 375 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too high</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY06: 364 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary activities
FY06: 384 respondents**

- Camping: 66%
- Fishing: 27%
- Hunting: 1%
- Sightseeing: 16%
- Picnicking: 35%
- Hiking/walking: 18%
- Swimming: 75%
- Motorized boating: 47%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 14%
- Horseback riding: 3%
- Bicycling: 7%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 28%
- Education and interpretation: 1%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 8%
- Other: 4%

** Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.
Senator Wash Recreation Area
Demographics

Visitor group composition
FY06: 301 groups

Age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 and over)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (13-17)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 12)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of adults (18 and over) in group
FY06: 301 groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group
FY06: 301 groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teenagers in group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of children (under 12) in group
FY06: 301 groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent age
FY06: 378 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 and over</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender
FY06: 366 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff demonstrated knowledge about the area's educational and interpretive materials, as well as recreational opportunities in the area. The evaluation of services was very good in FY06, with ratings of 73% for satisfaction and 80% for education. In Senator Wash Recreation Area, the average evaluation score was 3.9. For the National Landscape Conservation System, the satisfaction measure was 91% for FY06. School groups and other groups had similar positive feedback, with percentages ranging from 60% to 80%. The value of the recreation area was at least equal to staff treatment, with a rating of 65%. The quality of education and recreation was high, with satisfaction measures of 75% and 60% respectively for FY06. The proportion of respondents for different activities is shown:

- Birdwatching/wildlife: 48%
- Picnicking: 40%
- Swimming: 30%
- Hunting: 27%
- Sightseeing: 26%
- Boating: 18%

The total number of respondents for the different activities is as follows:

- FY06: 325 respondents
- FY06: 313 respondents
- FY06: 366 respondents
- FY06: 377 respondents
- FY06: 384 respondents
- FY06: 356 respondents
- FY06: 384 respondents**