El Mirage Dry Lake 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 21 BLM recreation sites in 12 states during fiscal year 2007 (FY07). 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 El Mirage Dry Lake 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 98%. 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
FY07: 262 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>FY07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:

92%
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 FY07. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 98% 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
Providing useful maps and brochures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 241 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 283 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 68%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 277 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 273 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at El Mirage Dry Lake Recreation Area are discussed in this report. The survey was designed to gauge visitor satisfaction with various aspects of the recreation area, including the condition of developed facilities, the cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities, and visitor information. The survey was conducted to better meet the needs of the public and ensure public awareness of the area's resources.

### Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles

**FY07:** 292 respondents

- **Very good:** 40%
- **Good:** 41%
- **Average:** 19%
- **Poor:** 2%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY07:** Satisfaction measure: 83%

Average evaluation score: 4.2

### Maintaining trails for non-motorized use

**FY07:** 230 respondents

- **Very good:** 30%
- **Good:** 44%
- **Average:** 20%
- **Poor:** 2%
- **Very poor:** 1%

**FY07:** Satisfaction measure: 77%

Average evaluation score: 4.1

### Maintaining a clean site

**FY07:** 290 respondents

- **Very good:** 43%
- **Good:** 30%
- **Average:** 19%
- **Poor:** 4%
- **Very poor:** 2%

**FY07:** Satisfaction measure: 79%

Average evaluation score: 4.2

### Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities

**FY07:** 253 respondents

- **Very good:** 43%
- **Good:** 30%
- **Average:** 19%
- **Poor:** 4%
- **Very poor:** 2%

**FY07:** Satisfaction measure: 79%

Average evaluation score: 4.1

### Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities

**FY07:** 287 respondents

- **Very good:** 33%
- **Good:** 48%
- **Average:** 17%
- **Poor:** 2%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY07:** Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.1
El Mirage Dry Lake Recreation Area
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

### Managing the appropriate use of vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 276 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

### Managing the number of people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 259 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>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

### Keeping noise at appropriate levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 270 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

### Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 264 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 67%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

### Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY07: 280 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 79%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Adequately protecting the natural resources

- FY07: 275 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 83%
- Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

- FY07: 257 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 79%
- Average evaluation score: 4

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

- FY07: 245 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 81%
- Average evaluation score: 4.1

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

- FY07: 272 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 81%
- Average evaluation score: 4.1
El Mirage Dry Lake Recreation Area
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY07: 263 respondents

- Very good: 79%
- Good: 19%
- Average: 5%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Staff demonstrated knowledge about
the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY07: 225 respondents

- Very good: 57%
- Good: 29%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Staff demonstrated knowledge about
recreational opportunities in the area
FY07: 243 respondents

- Very good: 58%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: performance
of BLM staff
FY07: 259 respondents

- Very good: 58%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
El Mirage Dry Lake Recreation Area
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site
FY07: 219 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 68%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site
FY07: 210 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources
FY07: 235 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area
FY07: 219 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?
FY07: 259 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program
FY07: 221 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.8
Staff demonstrated knowledge about the resources and educational program in this area.

FY07: 215 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 65%

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Very good: 44%

Very poor: 7%

Good: 40%

Poor: 12%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 0%

FY07: 219 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 94%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Visitor group composition

(18 and over) in group

31-40

FY07: 259 respondents

FY07: 263 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 86%

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

(13-17)

FY07: 221 respondents

FY07: 277 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

6 and more

FY07: 310 respondents

FY07: 319 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 100%

Average evaluation score: 5.0

Very good: 100%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 100%

Poor: 0%

Average: 0%

Excellent: 100%

Gender

Male

FY07: 219 respondents

FY07: 266 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Female

FY07: 221 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 84%

Average evaluation score: 4.3

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Number of adults

0-3

FY07: 253 respondents

FY07: 263 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

4-6

FY07: 29 respondents

FY07: 263 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

7-9

FY07: 24 respondents

FY07: 221 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

10-12

FY07: 17 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Proportion

0-5

FY07: 243 respondents

FY07: 266 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

6-10

FY07: 27 respondents

FY07: 221 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

11-20

FY07: 17 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

21-30

FY07: 14 respondents

FY07: 221 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

31-40

FY07: 22 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

41-50

FY07: 13 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

51-60

FY07: 7 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

61-70

FY07: 6 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

71-80

FY07: 6 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

81-90

FY07: 5 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

91-100

FY07: 5 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Proportion

0-19

FY07: 247 respondents

FY07: 266 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

20 or more

FY07: 17 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Gender

Male

FY07: 218 respondents

FY07: 266 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%

Female

FY07: 222 respondents

FY07: 215 groups

Satisfaction measure: 80%

Average evaluation score: 4.4

Very good: 58%

Very poor: 0%

Good: 30%

Poor: 20%

Average: 3%

Excellent: 20%
**Primary activities**

FY07: 258 respondents**

- **Camping**: 41%
- **Fishing**: 1%
- **Hunting**: 2%
- **Sightseeing**: 10%
- **Picnicking**: 11%
- **Hiking/walking**: 9%
- **Swimming**: 1%
- **Motorized boating**: 1%
- **Non-motorized boating/rafting**: 1%
- **Horseback riding**: 0%
- **Bicycling**: 9%
- **Motorized recreation vehicles**: 74%
- **Education and interpretation**: 2%
- **Birdwatching/wildlife viewing**: 5%
- **Other**: 23%

**Proportion of respondents**

** Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.**
Visitor group composition
FY07: 215 groups

- Adults (18 and over): 73%
- Teenagers (13-17): 6%
- Children (under 12): 20%

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group
FY07: 215 groups

- 6 and more: 2%
- 3-5: 7%
- 1-2: 16%
- None: 75%

Number of adults (18 and over) in group
FY07: 215 groups

- 6 and more: 43%
- 3-5: 29%
- 1-2: 33%
- None: 31%

Number of children (under 12) in group
FY07: 215 groups

- 6 and more: 15%
- 3-5: 8%
- 1-2: 19%
- None: 59%

Respondent age
FY07: 277 respondents

- 71 and over: 7%
- 61-70: 19%
- 51-60: 22%
- 41-50: 22%
- 31-40: 13%
- 22-30: 12%
- 18-21: 9%

Gender
FY07: 266 respondents

- Male: 72%
- Female: 28%
Staff demonstrated knowledge about educational and interpretive material.

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

Providing information about resource preservation and management.

Providing a sufficient quality of BLM staff.

Very good

Good

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Proportion

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Proportion

Very good

Good

Providing interpretive material about the resources.

Providing a sufficient quantity of BLM staff.

Very good

Good

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Proportion

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Providing a sufficient quality of BLM staff.

Very good

Good

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Proportion

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Providing a sufficient quality of BLM staff.

Very good

Good

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Proportion

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Providing a sufficient quantity of BLM staff.

Very good

Good

Average evaluation score: 3.8

Proportion

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Proportion

Very poor

Poor

Providing a sufficient quality of BLM staff.