Penitente Canyon 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 Penitente Canyon 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**

FY07: 114 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY07 GPRA Satisfaction Measure**

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

91%

Average evaluation score: 4.3
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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 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
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Penitente Canyon
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY07: 109 respondents

Rating

Very good 17%
Good 49%
Average 18%
Poor 13%
Very poor 3%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 66%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY07: 120 respondents

Rating

Very good 31%
Good 41%
Average 22%
Poor 5%
Very poor 2%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY07: 115 respondents

Rating

Very good 25%
Good 51%
Average 17%
Poor 7%
Very poor 0%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY07: 119 respondents

Rating

Very good 29%
Good 45%
Average 18%
Poor 4%
Very poor 1%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 3.9
Penitente Canyon
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY07: 119 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Maintaining a clean site
FY07: 119 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY07: 115 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY07: 184 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>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY07: 112 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.3
Penitente Canyon
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY07: 112 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>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Managing the number of people
FY07: 109 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY07: 103 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>55%</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>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY07: 85 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY07: 110 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>56%</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>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY07: 119 respondents
- Very good: 30%
- Good: 50%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 6%
- Very poor: 1%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY07: 114 respondents
- Very good: 29%
- Good: 58%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 1%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY07: 106 respondents
- Very good: 27%
- Good: 54%
- Average: 15%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY07: 119 respondents
- Very good: 28%
- Good: 55%
- Average: 15%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Penitente Canyon
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY07: 106 respondents

- Very good: 75%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY07: 90 respondents

- Very good: 62%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY07: 93 respondents

- Very good: 65%
- Good: 32%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY07: 105 respondents

- Very good: 69%
- Good: 29%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
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Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site
FY07: 102 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 50%
Average evaluation score: 3.5

Providing a sufficient *quantity* of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site
FY07: 101 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 50%
Average evaluation score: 3.4

Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?
FY07: 110 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program
FY07: 107 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 55%
Average evaluation score: 3.6

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources
FY07: 110 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 57%
Average evaluation score: 3.6

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area
FY07: 104 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 56%
Average evaluation score: 3.4
Total fees paid
FY07: 121 respondents

Amount spent

- No fees: 67%
- Under $25: 30%
- $25 - $50: 3%
- > $50: 0%

Proportion of respondents

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY07: 49 respondents

Rating

- Far too low: 0%
- Too low: 8%
- About right: 68%
- Too high: 4%
- Far too high: 0%

Proportion of respondents

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY07: 48 respondents

Rating

- Strongly agree: 42%
- Agree: 44%
- Not Sure: 13%
- Disagree: 2%
- Strongly disagree: 0%

Proportion of respondents
Penitente Canyon
Primary Activities at this Site/Area

**Primary activities**

FY07: 105 respondents**

- Camping: 43%
- Fishing: 3%
- Hunting: 1%
- Sightseeing: 24%
- Picnicking: 5%
- Hiking/walking: 50%
- Swimming: 0%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 0%
- Horseback riding: 0%
- Bicycling: 22%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 0%
- Education and interpretation: 5%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 5%
- Other: 37%

**Proportion of respondents**

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

Visitor group composition
FY07: 95 groups

Age group

- Adults (18 and over) 89%
- Teenagers (13-17) 9%
- Children (under 12) 6%

Proportion of groups

Number of adults
(18 and over) in group
FY07: 95 groups

- 6 and more 9%
- 3-5 33%
- 1-2 58%

Proportion of groups

Number of teenagers
(13-17) in group
FY07: 95 groups

- 6 and more 0%
- 3-5 1%
- 1-2 8%
- None 91%

Proportion of groups

Number of children
(under 12) in group
FY07: 95 groups

- 6 and more 0%
- 3-5 2%
- 1-2 8%
- None 91%

Proportion of groups

Respondent age
FY07: 111 respondents

- 71 and over 3%
- 61-70 30%
- 51-60 29%
- 41-50 14%
- 31-40 12%
- 22-30 9%
- 18-21 1%

Age (years)

Number of respondents

Gender
FY07: 111 respondents

- Male 60%
- Female 40%

Gender

Number of respondents
recreational opportunities in the area

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the value of the recreation

PECA1007

FY07                   Satisfaction measure: 50%
FY07                   Satisfaction measure: 97%

Providing educational and interpretive material

Very poor
Average
Good

Average evaluation score: 3.4
Average evaluation score: 3.5

National Landscape Conservation System

Visitor group composition

71 and over
0%

Age

21%
(13-17)
20%
51-60
20%

FY07: 111 respondents

8%

Respondent age

0
0%
12%

Penitente groups

18%
80%
5%

FY07: 105 respondents

5%
80%
20%

Penitente groups

60%

88%
67%

FY07: 121 respondents

100%
88%
89%

Penitente groups

60%
37%
91%

FY07: 104 respondents

95
95%

Number of adults

100%
100%
100%

8%
4%

FY07: 8% groups

95
95%

Number of groups

95
95%
95%

Female

40%

Education

20%
60%
40%

Groups

20%
80%
20%

FY07: 104 respondents

20%

Proportion

80%
5%

Other

60%

21%
80%

Primary

80%
80%
80%

FY07: 111 respondents**