Dumont Dunes 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 23 BLM recreation sites in 11 states during fiscal year 2008 (FY08). 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 Dumont Dunes 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
FY08: 353 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>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

FY08 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:
88%
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>Very</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</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 FY08. 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 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
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Dumont Dunes are summarized in this data report.

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY08: 363 respondents
- Very good: 37%
- Good: 45%
- Average: 16%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%
FY08: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY08: 326 respondents
- Very good: 25%
- Good: 47%
- Average: 21%
- Poor: 5%
- Very poor: 3%
FY08: Satisfaction measure: 71%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Providing useful information on the internet
FY08: 324 respondents
- Very good: 40%
- Good: 46%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%
FY08: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY08: 363 respondents
- Very good: 28%
- Good: 43%
- Average: 22%
- Poor: 5%
- Very poor: 2%
FY08: Satisfaction measure: 71%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY08: 365 respondents
- Very good: 26%
- Good: 50%
- Average: 16%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%
FY08: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on the next page. Below (left) is a graph showing the results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Dumont Dunes.

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY08: 388 respondents
- Very good: 29%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 20%
- Poor: 11%
- Very poor: 14%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 55%
Average evaluation score: 3.4

Maintaining a clean site
FY08: 380 respondents
- Very good: 43%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 2%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY08: 285 respondents
- Very good: 29%
- Good: 49%
- Average: 18%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 3%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY08: 308 respondents
- Very good: 34%
- Good: 44%
- Average: 18%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 3%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY08: 376 respondents
- Very good: 26%
- Good: 52%
- Average: 16%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 1%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY08: 377 respondents

Rating

Very good 33%
Good 54%
Average 11%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%

Proportion of respondents

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Managing the number of people
FY08: 359 respondents

Rating

Very good 30%
Good 48%
Average 14%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%

Proportion of respondents

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY08: 363 respondents

Rating

Very good 36%
Good 47%
Average 13%
Poor 2%
Very poor 1%

Proportion of respondents

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY08: 366 respondents

Rating

Very good 37%
Good 51%
Average 10%
Poor 2%
Very poor 1%

Proportion of respondents

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY08: 372 respondents

Rating

Very good 32%
Good 55%
Average 12%
Poor 5%
Very poor 1%

Proportion of respondents

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
Dumont Dunes
Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY08: 356 respondents
Very good: 43%
Good: 47%
Average: 9%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 0%

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY08: 345 respondents
Very good: 42%
Good: 49%
Average: 9%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 1%

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY08: 346 respondents
Very good: 43%
Good: 46%
Average: 9%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 1%

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY08: 349 respondents
Very good: 43%
Good: 48%
Average: 9%
Poor: 1%
Very poor: 1%

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.3
Dumont Dunes
BLM Staff and Service

**Staff treated me courteously**

FY08: 326 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

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

FY08: 269 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

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

FY08: 292 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>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

**Everything considered: performance of BLM staff**

FY08: 314 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>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

**FY08: 243 respondents**

- **Very good**: 22%
- **Good**: 53%
- **Average**: 19%
- **Poor**: 4%
- **Very poor**: 2%

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

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

**FY08: 263 respondents**

- **Very good**: 32%
- **Good**: 47%
- **Average**: 18%
- **Poor**: 3%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

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

**FY08: 237 respondents**

- **Very good**: 23%
- **Good**: 49%
- **Average**: 22%
- **Poor**: 4%
- **Very poor**: 2%

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

**FY08: 268 respondents**

- **Very good**: 28%
- **Good**: 49%
- **Average**: 19%
- **Poor**: 3%
- **Very poor**: 1%

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4
Dumont Dunes
Fees

Total fees paid
FY08: 396 respondents

Amount spent

No fees 29%
Under $25 2%
$25 - $50 47%
> $50 22%

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY08: 314 respondents

Rating

Strongly agree 14%
Agree 41%
Not Sure 24%
Disagree 10%
Strongly disagree 6%

Commercial Recreation Operations

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY08: 328 respondents

Rating

Far too low 1%
Too low 1%
About right 48%
Too high 30%
Far too high 13%

Quality of Commercial Services
FY08: 147 respondents

Rating

Very good 61%
Good 30%
Average 7%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Dumont Dunes
Primary Activities at this Site/Area

Primary activities
FY08: 385 respondents**

- Camping: 59%
- Fishing: 2%
- Hunting: 2%
- Target shooting: 2%
- Sightseeing: 11%
- Picnicking: 9%
- Hiking/walking: 10%
- Swimming: 2%
- Motorized boating: 2%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 1%
- Horseback riding: 1%
- Rock climbing: 2%
- Driving for pleasure: 25%
- Bicycling: 3%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 88%
- Education and interpretation: 2%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 3%
- Other: 5%

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

Programs (interpretive, walk, tour, exhibit, presentations, etc.)

Quality of program(s) attended
FY08: 42 respondents

- Very good: 20%
- Good: 57%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Dumont Dunes
Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities

Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY08: 96 respondents
- Very good: 39%
- Good: 52%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY08: 81 respondents
- Very good: 32%
- Good: 63%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 7%
- Very poor: 2%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ability to understand the messages
FY08: 92 respondents
- Very good: 35%
- Good: 53%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 2%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Ability to use the services in this area
FY08: 92 respondents
- Very good: 38%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 7%
- Very poor: 3%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2