Las Cienegas National Conservation 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 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 Las Cienegas National Conservation 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 91%. 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: 37 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>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

**FY08 GPRA Satisfaction Measure**
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:

95%
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 FY08. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 91% 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
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY08: 33 respondents

Very good: 52%
Good: 24%
Average: 24%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY08: 36 respondents

Very good: 30%
Good: 42%
Average: 19%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing useful information on the internet
FY08: 17 respondents

Very good: 29%
Good: 30%
Average: 29%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY08: 38 respondents

Very good: 34%
Good: 39%
Average: 24%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY08: 39 respondents

Very good: 33%
Good: 44%
Average: 22%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
### Las Cienegas National Conservation Area Developed Facilities

#### Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
- **FY08:** 40 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Satisfaction measure</th>
<th>Average evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
- **FY08:** 37 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Satisfaction measure</th>
<th>Average evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
- **FY08:** 38 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Satisfaction measure</th>
<th>Average evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
- **FY08:** 39 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Satisfaction measure</th>
<th>Average evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY08: 35 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Managing the number of people
FY08: 36 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY08: 37 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>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY08: 23 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY08: 37 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Report # LAC1608
### Adequately protecting the natural resources

**FY08: 40 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>Proportion</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

### Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

**FY08: 38 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>Proportion</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Adequately protecting the cultural resources

**FY08: 35 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>Proportion</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

### Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

**FY08: 40 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>Proportion</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.3
Staff treated me courteously
FY08: 37 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY08: 33 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY08: 34 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY08: 37 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site
FY08: 28 respondents
Very good 32%
Good 43%
Average 18%
Poor 4%
Very poor 4%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 4

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources
FY08: 25 respondents
Very good 44%
Good 32%
Average 12%
Poor 12%
Very poor 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site
FY08: 26 respondents
Very good 42%
Good 23%
Average 27%
Poor 4%
Very poor 4%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 4

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program
FY08: 27 respondents
Very good 33%
Good 37%
Average 28%
Poor 4%
Very poor 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 4
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area Area

Fees

Total fees paid
FY08: 42 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount spent</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY08: 5 respondents

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY08: 6 respondents

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services
FY08: 5 respondents

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area
Primary Activities at this Site/Area

**Primary activities**

FY08: 48 respondents**

- Camping: 45%
- Fishing: 0%
- Hunting: 8%
- Target shooting: 0%
- Sightseeing: 28%
- Picnicking: 25%
- Hiking/walking: 48%
- Swimming: 0%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 0%
- Horseback riding: 75%
- Rock climbing: 0%
- Driving for pleasure: 13%
- Bicycling: 3%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 8%
- Education and interpretation: 13%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 15%
- Other: 13%

**Proportion of respondents**

** 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: 13 respondents

- Very good: 77%
- Good: 23%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

**CAUTION!**
Visitor group composition

Age group

- Adults (18 and over) 90%
- Teenagers (13-17) 9%
- Children (under 12) 4%

Number of adults (18 and over) in group

- 6 and more 30%
- 3-5 15%
- 1-2 48%

Number of children (under 12) in group

- 6 and more 0%
- 3-5 0%
- 1-2 9%

Respondent age

- 71 and over 8%
- 61-70 6%
- 51-60 13%
- 41-50 15%
- 31-40 39%
- 22-30 23%
- 18-21 3%

Gender

- Male 44%
- Female 56%
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area
Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities

Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY08: 9 respondents

| Rating | FY08 | Satisfaction measure: 89%
|        |      | Average evaluation score: 4.4 |

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY08: 8 respondents

| Rating | FY08 | Satisfaction measure: 75%
|        |      | Average evaluation score: 4.3 |

Ability to understand the messages
FY08: 8 respondents

| Rating | FY08 | Satisfaction measure: 88%
|        |      | Average evaluation score: 4.4 |

Ability to use the services in this area
FY08: 9 respondents

| Rating | FY08 | Satisfaction measure: 89%
|        |      | Average evaluation score: 4.3 |