Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness 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 24 BLM recreation sites in 13 states during fiscal year 2011 (FY11). 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 Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness 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 68%. 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

Rating

Very good 79%
Good 22%
Average 3%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: 116 respondents

FY11 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

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

97%
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 FY11. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 68% 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 $\pm 6\%$ with 95% confidence. This means that if different samples had been drawn, the results would have been similar ($\pm 6\%$) 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
### Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness Area Visitor Information

#### Providing useful maps and brochures

**FY11: 118 respondents**

<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>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 86%
- Average evaluation score: 4.2

#### Providing useful information on the Internet

**FY11: 111 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</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>

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 96%
- Average evaluation score: 4.6

#### Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations

**FY11: 130 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>36%</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>

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 90%
- Average evaluation score: 4.4

#### Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation

**FY11: 129 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 77%
- Average evaluation score: 4.1

#### Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information

**FY11: 129 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 91%
- Average evaluation score: 4.4
Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY11: 128 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY11: 118 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Maintaining a clean site
FY11: 132 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19%</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>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY11: 116 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>66%</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>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY11: 129 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>43%</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>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles

FY11: 111 respondents

Rating

Very good

Good

Average

Poor

Very poor

Proportion of respondents

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY11

Satisfaction measure: 98%

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Managing the number of people

FY11: 131 respondents

Rating

Very good

Good

Average

Poor

Very poor

Proportion of respondents

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY11

Satisfaction measure: 97%

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Keeping noise at appropriate levels

FY11: 120 respondents

Rating

Very good

Good

Average

Poor

Very poor

Proportion of respondents

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY11

Satisfaction measure: 98%

Average evaluation score: 4.7

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime

FY11: 92 respondents

Rating

Very good

Good

Average

Poor

Very poor

Proportion of respondents

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY11

Satisfaction measure: 91%

Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

FY11: 128 respondents

Rating

Very good

Good

Average

Poor

Very poor

Proportion of respondents

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY11

Satisfaction measure: 98%

Average evaluation score: 4.6
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness Area are summarized regarding visitor information (i.e., use of maps, signs, brochures), developed facilities, managing recreation waters; 24 BLM recreation sites in 13 states during fiscal year 2011 (FY11). The survey was developed to measure satisfaction measure: 90%

ARCA611 FY11: Satisfaction measure: 97%
FY11: Average evaluation score: 4.7

Adequately protecting the natural resources

Very good: 70%
Good: 29%
Adequately protecting the cultural resources

FY11: 128 respondents
FY11: 121 respondents
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 93%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 97%
FY11: Average evaluation score: 4.5
FY11: Average evaluation score: 4.7

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

Very good: 62%
Good: 31%
Adequately protecting the natural and cultural resources

Very good: 68%
Good: 31%

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

Average: 7%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%

Very good: 97%
Good: 97%
Very good: 4.6
Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness Area
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY11: 125 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY11: 104 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12%</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>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY11: 107 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY11: 121 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12%</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>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

FY11: 78 respondents

- Very good: 32%
- Good: 54%
- Average: 14%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

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

FY11: 90 respondents

- Very good: 57%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

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

FY11: 82 respondents

- Very good: 20%
- Good: 59%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

FY11: 96 respondents

- Very good: 40%
- Good: 43%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3
Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness Area

Fees

Total fees paid
FY11: 135 respondents

Amount spent
No fees 28%
Under $25 43%
$25 - $50 18%
> $50 11%

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY11: 115 respondents

Rating
Far too low 1%
Too low 11%
About right 84%
Too high 3%
Far too high 1%

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY11: 111 respondents

Rating
Strongly agree 64%
Agree 27%
Not sure 7%
Disagree 1%
Strongly disagree 1%

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services
FY11: 0 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.
Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness Area
Primary Activities at this Site/Area

Primary activities
FY1: 124 respondents**

- Camping: 55%
- Fishing: 0%
- Hunting: 0%
- Target shooting: 2%
- Sightseeing: 35%
- Picnicking: 21%
- Hiking/walking: 92%
- Swimming: 27%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 1%
- Horseback riding: 2%
- Rock climbing: 8%
- Driving for pleasure: 4%
- Bicycling: 0%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 1%
- Education and interpretation: 8%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 48%
- Other: 4%

** 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
FY1: 3 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.

FY11
Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4
### Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness Area
#### Demographics

**Visitor group composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 and over)</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (13-17)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 12)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of teenagers (13-17) in group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teenagers in group</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of adults (18 and over) in group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults in group</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of children (under 12) in group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in group</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 and over</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating**

- FY11: Satisfaction measure 100%
- FY11: Satisfaction measure 88%
- Teenagers: FY11: Satisfaction measure 99%

**Proportion**

- Visitor group composition: 78%
- Days of visit: 0%
- Hours spent visiting: 0%
- Number of trips: 0%
- Number of adults: 0%
- Number of teenagers: 0%
- Number of children: 0%
- Driving fee charged: 60%
- Proportion (of visitors) performing activity:
  - Hiking/walking: 60%
  - Sightseeing: 40%
  - Rock climbing: 20%
  - Hunting: 4%
  - Fishing: 32%
  - Boating/rafting: 40%
  - Motorized vehicles: 18%
  - Non-motorized vehicles: 27%
  - Motorized shooting: 55%
  - Hiking/walking: 60%
  - Sightseeing: 40%
  - Rock climbing: 20%
  - Hunting: 4%
  - Fishing: 32%
  - Boating/rafting: 40%
  - Motorized vehicles: 18%
  - Non-motorized vehicles: 27%
  - Motorized shooting: 55%

**Number of respondents**

- Total: 125
- FY11: 121 respondents
- Area: 34%
- Staff: 40%
- BLM: 20%
- Area: 40%
- Staff: 40%
- BLM: 20%

**Proportions**

- Visitor group composition: 78%
- Days of visit: 0%
- Hours spent visiting: 0%
- Number of trips: 0%
- Number of adults: 0%
- Number of teenagers: 0%
- Number of children: 0%
- Driving fee charged: 60%
- Proportion (of visitors) performing activity:
  - Hiking/walking: 60%
  - Sightseeing: 40%
  - Rock climbing: 20%
  - Hunting: 4%
  - Fishing: 32%
  - Boating/rafting: 40%
  - Motorized vehicles: 18%
  - Non-motorized vehicles: 27%
  - Motorized shooting: 55%
  - Hiking/walking: 60%
  - Sightseeing: 40%
  - Rock climbing: 20%
  - Hunting: 4%
  - Fishing: 32%
  - Boating/rafting: 40%
  - Motorized vehicles: 18%
  - Non-motorized vehicles: 27%
  - Motorized shooting: 55%

**Fees and Charges**

- FY11: $25 - $50
- FY11: No fees

**Visitors with需求**

- FY11: 107 respondents
- FY11: 115 respondents
- FY11: 107 groups
- FY11: 125 respondents
- FY11: 104 respondents
- FY11: 121 respondents
- FY11: 104 respondents

**Other**

- Provide educational and interpretive materials
- Recreational opportunities in the area
- Ability to understand the resources
- Visitor group composition
- Number of adults
- Number of children
- Respondent age
- Gender
- Rating
- Proportion
- Fees and Charges
Ability to adequately use the facilities

FY11: 14 respondents

Rating

Very good 57%
Good 43%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.

FY11: 9 respondents

Rating

Very good 43%
Good 57%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

CAUTION!
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.

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ability to understand the messages

FY11: 9 respondents

Rating

Very good 40%
Good 60%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ability to use the services in this area

FY11: 10 respondents

Rating

Very good 60%
Good 40%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

CAUTION!
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.

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.4