Smullin Visitor Center at Rand 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 Smullin Visitor Center at Rand 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 44%. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY08: 78 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>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

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

92%
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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</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</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 44% 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
In order for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, the BLM conducted a visitor survey at 23 recreation sites in 11 states during fiscal year 2008 (FY08). The survey was developed to measure the BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The visitor survey contains 16 indicators that were developed to evaluate BLM’s recreation performance. The indicators include: providing useful maps and brochures, providing useful information on the internet, providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation, ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations, providing educational and interpretive materials, coordinating with local organizations, ensuring visitor safety and security, ensuring visitor health and cleanliness, protecting public use of vehicles, adequate protection of the resource, ensuring visitor satisfaction, providing information for selected opportunities, managing the condition of developed facilities, providing for a quality recreation experience, minimizing noise at recreation sites, and providing for quality customer service. The visitor survey was sent by mail to visitors who used designated recreation sites during FY08. The survey consisted of questions to measure satisfaction with the BLM’s services and resources at the recreation sites. The survey was designed to measure visitor satisfaction with the recreation services, resources, and conditions. The survey results were used to evaluate the BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were also used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience. The survey results were used to develop strategies to improve BLM’s performance in providing a quality recreation experience.
Visitor opportunities, randomly first FY08, (left) is a graph summarizing visitor opinions of the “overall quality of recreation experience.” The satisfaction measure: 88%

For FY08: 78 respondents
FY08: Average evaluation score: 4.2

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY08: 67 respondents

Maintaining cleaningliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY08: 77 respondents

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY08: 65 respondents

Maintaining a clean site
FY08: 82 respondents

For FY08: 83 respondents
FY08: Satisfaction measure: 94%
FY08: Average evaluation score: 4.5

Eveything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Smullin Visitor Center at Rand are summarized in the figure, as illustrated on page 9. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data from 23 BLM recreation sites in 11 states during fiscal year 2008 (FY08). The survey was developed to measure the BLM’s progress in meeting goals set forth in the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), and better meet the needs of the public. A visitor satisfaction survey was conducted at Smullin Visitor Center at Rand to evaluate the quality of visitor experiences at the site.

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY08: 52 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 92%
- Average evaluation score: 4.2

Managing the number of people
FY08: 74 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 89%
- Average evaluation score: 4.3

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY08: 53 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 92%
- Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY08: 45 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 78%
- Average evaluation score: 4

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY08: 77 respondents
- Satisfaction measure: 88%
- Average evaluation score: 4.3

The graphs show the distribution of responses for each category, with Very good responses being the most common. The graphs also illustrate the proportion of respondents who rated the service as Very good, Good, Average, Poor, and Very poor. The average evaluation scores range from 4.0 to 4.3, indicating generally high satisfaction levels.

Additional details about specific services and facilities, such as visitor safety, facilities, and overall satisfaction, are also provided, with percentages and ratings for each category.
Adequately protecting the natural resources

<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>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: 75 respondents
Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

<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>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: 73 respondents
Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47%</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>

FY08: 68 respondents
Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08: 76 respondents
Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
**Staff treated me courteously**

FY08: 71 respondents

- **Very good**: 83%
- **Good**: 13%
- **Average**: 4%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY08

- **Satisfaction measure**: 96%
- **Average evaluation score**: 4.8

---

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

FY08: 58 respondents

- **Very good**: 60%
- **Good**: 33%
- **Average**: 2%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY08

- **Satisfaction measure**: 98%
- **Average evaluation score**: 4.6

---

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

FY08: 66 respondents

- **Very good**: 73%
- **Good**: 24%
- **Average**: 3%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY08

- **Satisfaction measure**: 97%
- **Average evaluation score**: 4.7

---

**Everything considered: performance of BLM staff**

FY08: 71 respondents

- **Very good**: 75%
- **Good**: 21%
- **Average**: 4%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

FY08

- **Satisfaction measure**: 96%
- **Average evaluation score**: 4.7
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

FY08: 69 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 20%
- Good: 61%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 4%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4

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

FY08: 73 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 48%
- Good: 42%
- Average: 8%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 1%

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

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

FY08: 68 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 34%
- Good: 59%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 4%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

FY08: 75 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 30%
- Good: 51%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 3%

FY08: Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.2
Smullin Visitor Center at Rand

Fees

Total fees paid
FY08: 85 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>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY08: 73 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>4%</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.
FY08: 74 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services
FY08: 39 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Primary activities

** FY08: 84 respondents**

- Camping: 81%
- Fishing: 24%
- Hunting: 0%
- Target shooting: 0%
- Sightseeing: 42%
- Picnicking: 19%
- Hiking/walking: 60%
- Swimming: 61%
- Motorized boating: 1%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 94%
- Horseback riding: 0%
- Rock climbing: 1%
- Driving for pleasure: 4%
- Bicycling: 0%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 0%
- Education and interpretation: 13%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 49%
- Other: 7%

** 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: 7 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.

- FY08: Satisfaction measure: 86%
  Average evaluation score: 4.4
Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY08: 4 respondents

**Rating**

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.

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 50%
Average evaluation score: 3.5

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY08: 3 respondents

**Rating**

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.

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 67%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Ability to understand the messages
FY08: 3 respondents

**Rating**

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.

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 67%
Average evaluation score: 4

Ability to use the services in this area
FY08: 5 respondents

**Rating**

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.

FY08
Satisfaction measure: 60%
Average evaluation score: 3.8