Upper Salmon River
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 Upper Salmon River 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 92%. 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: 102 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</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:

97%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
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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>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</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 92% 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
Upper Salmon River
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY07: 91 respondents

- Very good: 48%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07
Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY07: 105 respondents

- Very good: 58%
- Good: 42%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07
Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY07: 104 respondents

- Very good: 56%
- Good: 42%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07
Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY07: 104 respondents

- Very good: 57%
- Good: 42%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07
Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY07: 107 respondents
- Very good: 79%
- Good: 23%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
FY07: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY07: 47 respondents
- Very good: 47%
- Good: 43%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%
FY07: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Maintaining a clean site
FY07: 109 respondents
- Very good: 67%
- Good: 11%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
FY07: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY07: 104 respondents
- Very good: 88%
- Good: 10%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
FY07: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY07: 108 respondents
- Very good: 89%
- Good: 9%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
FY07: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles

 FY07: 100 respondents

- Very good: 67%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Managing the number of people

 FY07: 100 respondents

- Very good: 78%
- Good: 21%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Keeping noise at appropriate levels

 FY07: 104 respondents

- Very good: 74%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime

 FY07: 59 respondents

- Very good: 54%
- Good: 29%
- Average: 8%
- Poor: 7%
- Very poor: 2%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

 FY07: 107 respondents

- Very good: 74%
- Good: 24%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY07 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY07: 107 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>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY07: 90 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY07: 77 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>40%</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>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY07: 104 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
**Upper Salmon River**
**BLM Staff and Service**

### Staff treated me courteously

**FY07: 103 respondents**

- **Very good**: 90%
- **Good**: 0%
- **Average**: 0%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 5

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

**FY07: 83 respondents**

- **Very good**: 86%
- **Good**: 14%
- **Average**: 0%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

### Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

**FY07: 92 respondents**

- **Very good**: 89%
- **Good**: 10%
- **Average**: 1%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

### Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

**FY07: 103 respondents**

- **Very good**: 90%
- **Good**: 10%
- **Average**: 0%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
Upper Salmon River
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

FY07: 74 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>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

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

FY07: 71 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

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

FY07: 100 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

FY07: 78 respondents

<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>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY07: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area

FY07: 72 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>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

FY07: 82 respondents

<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>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</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
Total fees paid  
FY07: 109 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount spent</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?  
FY07: 95 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td>0%</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>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too high</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.  
FY07: 95 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Primary activities**

FY07: 106 respondents**

- **Camping**: 87%
- **Fishing**: 33%
- **Hunting**: 2%
- **Sightseeing**: 59%
- **Picnicking**: 29%
- **Hiking/walking**: 39%
- **Swimming**: 8%
- **Motorized boating**: 1%
- **Non-motorized boating/rafting**: 8%
- **Horseback riding**: 2%
- **Bicycling**: 6%
- **Motorized recreation vehicles**: 7%
- **Education and interpretation**: 6%
- **Birdwatching/wildlife viewing**: 39%
- **Other**: 5%

**Proportion of respondents**

**Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.**
Staff demonstrated knowledge about educational and interpretive materials.

- **Rating**
  - FY07: Satisfaction measure: 91%
  - FY07: Average evaluation score: 4.2

- **Visitor group composition**
  - (18 and over): Teenagers 71 and over
  - (13-17): Children 3-5
  - Adults 6 and more
  - (under 12): Groups (13-17) in group 4%
  - Groups (3-5) in group 3%
  - None: 0%

- **Activities**
  - Educational: 90%
  - Interpretive: 90%
  - Proportion:
    - Motorized recreation: 20%
    - Non-motorized recreation: 40%
    - Education: 50%
    - Visitor-led tours: 10%
    - Other: 20%

- **Recreation**
  - Strongly agree:
    - Picnicking: 96%
    - Hiking/walking: 98%
    - Horsback riding: 98%
    - Hunting: 98%
    - Fishing: 98%
    - Boating: 96%
    - Swimming: 82%
    - Picnicking: 92%
  - Strongly disagree:
    - Motorized recreation: 0%
    - Non-motorized recreation: 0%
    - Education: 0%
    - Visitor-led tours: 0%
    - Other: 0%
    - Other: 0%

- **Fee**
  - Under $25: 20%
  - $25-$50: 20%
  - $51-$75: 19%
  - $76-$100: 42%
  - Over $100: 4%

- **Gender**
  - Male: 35%
  - Female: 60%

- **Amount spent**
  - Under $25: 20%
  - $25-$50: 20%
  - $51-$75: 20%
  - $76-$100: 20%
  - Over $100: 0%

- **Goals of groups**
  - Visitor: 99%
  - Staff: 99%

- **Proportion**
  - Upper: 0%
  - Lower: 0%
  - Average: 4%
  - Too high: 0%
  - About right: 40%
  - Too low: 60%
  - Far too high: 0%
  - Far too low: 0%

- **Park**
  - BLM: 99%
  - National Landscape Conservation System: 99%
  - Atlantic Salmon: 60%
  - Pacific Salmon: 40%
  - Upper River: 20%
  - Middle River: 40%
  - Lower River: 40%
  - Other:
    - Motorized recreation: 20%
    - Non-motorized recreation: 40%
    - Education: 50%
    - Visitor-led tours: 10%
    - Other: 20%