Jupiter Inlet Light House
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 Jupiter Inlet Light House 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**

FY11: 244 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>18%</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 GPRA Satisfaction Measure**

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

99%
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>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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 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
Jupiter Inlet Light House
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY11: 241 respondents

- Very good: 59%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 5%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY11: 278 respondents

- Very good: 70%
- Good: 28%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Providing useful information on the Internet
FY11: 159 respondents

- Very good: 56%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY11: 288 respondents

- Very good: 68%
- Good: 28%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY11: 288 respondents

- Very good: 67%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Report # JUIN611
Inside the report, regarding FY11, data first.

**Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles**
- FY11: 274 respondents
- Very good: 70%
- Good: 20%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

**Maintaining a clean site**
- FY11: 293 respondents
- Very good: 87%
- Good: 13%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

**Maintaining trails for non-motorized use**
- FY11: 223 respondents
- Very good: 74%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

**Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities**
- FY11: 232 respondents
- Very good: 80%
- Good: 19%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

**Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities**
- FY11: 287 respondents
- Very good: 78%
- Good: 21%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles

FY11: 205 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</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: 4.7

Managing the number of people

FY11: 286 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21%</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

Keeping noise at appropriate levels

FY11: 275 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>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime

FY11: 146 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>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

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

FY11: 284 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>28%</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: 4.7
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY11: 290 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17%</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

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY11: 286 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15%</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

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY11: 293 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12%</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

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY11: 292 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>17%</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
Staff treated me courteously
FY11: 279 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 99%
- Good: 9%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY11: 274 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 98%
- Good: 12%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY11: 252 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 87%
- Good: 12%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY11: 277 respondents

Rating
- Very good: 99%
- Good: 12%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

FY11: 228 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 70%
- Good: 27%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11 Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

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

FY11: 197 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 59%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 2%

FY11 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

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

FY11: 207 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 64%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 5%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

FY11: 229 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 67%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Fees

Total fees paid
FY11: 296 respondents

- No fees: 19%
- Under $25: 62%
- $25 - $50: 18%
- > $50: 2%

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY11: 233 respondents

- Strongly agree: 39%
- Agree: 57%
- Not Sure: 12%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly disagree: 0%

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY11: 230 respondents

- Far too low: 0%
- Too low: 1%
- About right: 99%
- Too high: 0%
- Far too high: 0%

Quality of Commercial Services
FY11: 88 respondents

- Very good: 91%
- Good: 9%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11
- Satisfaction measure: 100%
- Average evaluation score: 4.9
**Primary activities**

FY11: 219 respondents**

- Camping: 0%
- Fishing: 0%
- Hunting: 0%
- Target shooting: 0%
- Sightseeing: 69%
- Picnicking: 6%
- Hiking/walking: 36%
- Swimming: 1%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 0%
- Horseback riding: 0%
- Rock climbing: 0%
- Driving for pleasure: 5%
- Bicycling: 0%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 0%
- Education and interpretation: 44%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 5%
- Other: 10%

**Proportion of respondents**

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

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

**Quality of program(s) attended**

FY11: 246 respondents

- Very good: 85%
- Good: 12%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

**Proportion of respondents**

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 96%

Average evaluation score: 4.8
Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY11: 55 respondents
Rating
Very good: 58%
Good: 33%
Average: 9%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY11: 59 respondents
Rating
Very good: 61%
Good: 31%
Average: 8%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ability to understand the messages
FY11: 56 respondents
Rating
Very good: 70%
Good: 27%
Average: 4%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Ability to use the services in this area
FY11: 51 respondents
Rating
Very good: 65%
Good: 33%
Average: 2%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.6