El Malpais 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 2010 (FY10). 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 El Malpais 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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: 183 respondents

### FY10 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

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

98%

FY10 Satisfaction measure: 98%

Average evaluation score: 4.8
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Research Methods

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>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 FY10. 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
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Providing useful maps and brochures
FY10: 193 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY10: 185 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Providing useful information on the Internet
FY10: 115 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY10: 198 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25%</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>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY10: 201 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles

FY10: 199 respondents

- Very good: 62%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Maintaining a clean site

FY10: 199 respondents

- Very good: 70%
- Good: 21%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use

FY10: 156 respondents

- Very good: 58%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 1%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities

FY10: 184 respondents

- Very good: 72%
- Good: 24%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities

FY10: 199 respondents

- Very good: 73%
- Good: 23%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at El Malpais National Conservation Area are
provided in this report. The report includes satisfaction measures, average evaluation scores, and
responses from 23 BLM recreation sites in 11 states during fiscal year 2010 (FY10). The survey was
developed to measure the Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM) performance for this goal (NOTE: the
satisfaction measure may not equal the sum of “very good” and “good” percentages due to rounding).

Understanding the Results

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY10: 144 respondents
Rating
Very good 59%
Good 35%
Average 4%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%
FY10: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Managing the number of people
FY10: 165 respondents
Rating
Very good 70%
Good 26%
Average 3%
Poor 0%
Very poor 1%
FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY10: 160 respondents
Rating
Very good 69%
Good 28%
Average 3%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%
FY10: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY10: 125 respondents
Rating
Very good 55%
Good 27%
Average 14%
Poor 2%
Very poor 2%
FY10: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY10: 180 respondents
Rating
Very good 84%
Good 31%
Average 4%
Poor 1%
Very poor 0%
FY10: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY10: 193 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY10: 184 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>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY10: 186 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24%</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>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY10: 194 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28%</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>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
El Malpais National Conservation Area
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY10: 201 respondents

Rating

Very good 67%
Good 3%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY10
Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 5

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY10: 192 respondents

Rating

Very good 92%
Good 8%
Average 1%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY10:
Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY10: 196 respondents

Rating

Very good 91%
Good 8%
Average 1%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY10
Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY10: 201 respondents

Rating

Very good 92%
Good 7%
Average 1%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY10:
Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
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Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

**Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site**
FY10: 173 respondents
![Graph showing satisfaction measures and average evaluation scores.]
- **Rating**
  - Very good: 69%
  - Good: 28%
  - Average: 2%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%
- FY10: Satisfaction measure: 98%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.7

**Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources**
FY10: 156 respondents
![Graph showing satisfaction measures and average evaluation scores.]
- **Rating**
  - Very good: 69%
  - Good: 25%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%
- FY10: Satisfaction measure: 94%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.6

**Providing a sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources at this site**
FY10: 169 respondents
![Graph showing satisfaction measures and average evaluation scores.]
- **Rating**
  - Very good: 67%
  - Good: 28%
  - Average: 4%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%
- FY10: Satisfaction measure: 95%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.6

**Everything considered: interpretive and educational program**
FY10: 173 respondents
![Graph showing satisfaction measures and average evaluation scores.]
- **Rating**
  - Very good: 71%
  - Good: 25%
  - Average: 2%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%
- FY10: Satisfaction measure: 97%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.7
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Fees

Total fees paid
FY10: 211 respondents

Amount spent

- No fees: 100%
- Under $25: 0%
- $25 - $50: 0%
- > $50: 0%

Proportion of respondents

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY10: 18 respondents

Rating

- Far too low: 17%
- Too low: 17%
- About right: 67% CAUTION!
- Too high: 0%
- Far too high: 0%

Proportion of respondents

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY10: 17 respondents

Rating

- Strongly agree: 47%
- Agree: 18%
- Not sure: 35% CAUTION!
- Disagree: 0%
- Strongly disagree: 0%

Proportion of respondents

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services
FY10: 30 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 87%
- Good: 13%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Proportion of respondents

FY10

Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
Staff demonstrated knowledge about the interpretive material about the area.

**Proportion of respondents**

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

**Quality of program(s) attended**

FY10: 81 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

**Proportion of respondents**

**Primary activities**

FY10: 187 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/rafting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicles</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities

**Ability to adequately use the facilities**
FY10: 30 respondents

- Very good: 63%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

**Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.**
FY10: 34 respondents

- Very good: 62%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

**Ability to understand the messages**
FY10: 32 respondents

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

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

**Ability to use the services in this area**
FY10: 35 respondents

- Very good: 77%
- Good: 17%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY10: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.7