Upper Colorado River SRMA 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 Upper Colorado River SRMA 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 90%. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>55%</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: 211 respondents

FY06 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

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

95%

Average evaluation score: 4.4
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.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Very Poor} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\text{Good} & \text{satisfaction measure} & & & &
\end{array}
\]

- 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 90% 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.

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
Providing useful maps and brochures
FY06: 175 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good: 22%
Good: 58%
Average: 18%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 0%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 79%
Average evaluation score: 4

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY06: 211 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good: 30%
Good: 66%
Average: 11%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 0%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY06: 210 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good: 20%
Good: 60%
Average: 17%
Poor: 2%
Very poor: 1%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4

Everywhere considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY06: 208 respondents

Rating

Proportion of respondents

Very good: 25%
Good: 61%
Average: 13%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 0%

FY06 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Upper Colorado River SRMA
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY06: 216 respondents

- Very good: 38%
- Good: 47%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY06: 139 respondents

- Very good: 23%
- Good: 55%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Maintaining a clean site
FY06: 221 respondents

- Very good: 50%
- Good: 41%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY06: 207 respondents

- Very good: 44%
- Good: 42%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 2%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY06: 218 respondents

- Very good: 37%
- Good: 53%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

FY06: Average evaluation score: 4.3

Upper Colorado River SRMA
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY06: 196 respondents

- Very good: 23%
- Good: 60%
- Average: 16%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%

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

Managing the number of people
FY06: 194 respondents

- Very good: 23%
- Good: 58%
- Average: 19%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY06: 182 respondents

- Very good: 29%
- Good: 60%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY06: 149 respondents

- Very good: 18%
- Good: 53%
- Average: 20%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY06: 215 respondents

- Very good: 22%
- Good: 66%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Upper Colorado River SRMA
Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY06: 209 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 28%
- Good: 52%
- Average: 18%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY06: 196 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 18%
- Good: 57%
- Average: 22%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY06: 169 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 25%
- Good: 53%
- Average: 19%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY06: 204 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 24%
- Good: 54%
- Average: 20%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4
Upper Colorado River SRMA
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY06: 190 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY06: 141 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 93%
       Average evaluation score: 4.5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY06: 164 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY06: 191 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 96%
       Average evaluation score: 4.6
Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

FY06: 136 respondents

- Very good: 15%
- Good: 57%
- Average: 24%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 71%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

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

FY06: 155 respondents

- Very good: 20%
- Good: 49%
- Average: 23%
- Poor: 7%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 69%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

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

FY06: 133 respondents

- Very good: 13%
- Good: 49%
- Average: 29%
- Poor: 9%
- Very poor: 1%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 62%
Average evaluation score: 3.6

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area

FY06: 135 respondents

- Very good: 13%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 27%
- Poor: 8%
- Very poor: 4%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 61%
Average evaluation score: 3.6

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

FY06: 200 respondents

- Yes: 73%
- No: 28%

FY06: Satisfaction measure: 69%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

FY06: 148 respondents

- Yes: 79%
- No: 21%
Upper Colorado River SRMA
Fees

**Total fees paid**
FY06: 224 respondents

- No fees: 34%
- Under $25: 58%
- $25 - $50: 6%
- > $50: 1%

**How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?**
FY06: 166 respondents

- Far too low: 1%
- Too low: 5%
- About right: 80%
- Too high: 7%
- Far too high: 1%

**The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.**
FY06: 162 respondents

- Strongly agree: 29%
- Agree: 51%
- Not Sure: 16%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly disagree: 1%
Primary activities
FY06: 213 respondents**

- Camping: 47%
- Fishing: 25%
- Hunting: 2%
- Sightseeing: 18%
- Picnicking: 16%
- Hiking/walking: 23%
- Swimming: 18%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 69%
- Horseback riding: 1%
- Bicycling: 3%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 1%
- Education and interpretation: 3%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 9%
- Other: 13%

** Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.
Upper Colorado River SRMA
Demographics

Visitor group composition (FY06: 169 groups)

- Adults (18 and over): 87%
- Teenagers (13-17): 6%
- Children (under 12): 7%

Number of adults (18 and over) in group (FY06: 169 groups)

- 6 and more: 35%
- 3-5: 37%
- 1-2: 28%

Gender (FY06: 212 respondents)

- Male: 59%
- Female: 41%

Respondent age (FY06: 211 respondents)

- 71 and over: 7%
- 61-70: 30%
- 51-60: 20%
- 41-50: 21%
- 31-40: 9%
- 22-30: 5%
- 18-21: 1%

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group (FY06: 169 groups)

- 6 and more: 2%
- 3-5: 9%
- 1-2: 11%
- none: 85%

Number of children (under 12) in group (FY06: 169 groups)

- 6 and more: 3%
- 3-5: 11%
- 1-2: 18%
- none: 75%