Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center 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 Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center 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 89%. 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>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</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:

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 FY11. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 89% 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
The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center are captured.

**Providing useful maps and brochures**
- **FY11:** 198 respondents
  - Very good: 64%
  - Good: 23%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 2%

  **Satisfaction measure:** 87%
  **Average evaluation score:** 4.5

**Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations**
- **FY11:** 181 respondents
  - Very good: 42%
  - Good: 48%
  - Average: 10%
  - Poor: 2%
  - Very poor: 0%

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

**Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation**
- **FY11:** 211 respondents
  - Very good: 46%
  - Good: 37%
  - Average: 13%
  - Poor: 4%
  - Very poor: 0%

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

**Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information**
- **FY11:** 210 respondents
  - Very good: 57%
  - Good: 34%
  - Average: 8%
  - Poor: 2%
  - Very poor: 0%

  **Satisfaction measure:** 90%
  **Average evaluation score:** 4.5
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 Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center. The survey was developed to measure the results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center are use, resource management, BLM staff and customer service, and educational and interpretive materials.

The survey was conducted at Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center and Goal 3.2 - Adequately protecting the environment and Goal 3.1 - Provide for and receive fair value in recreation and other BLM lands.

The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center are as follows:

- **Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles**
  - FY11: 203 respondents
  - Very good: 54%
  - Good: 31%
  - Average: 10%
  - Poor: 4%
  - Very poor: 0%
- **Maintaining trails for non-motorized use**
  - FY11: 104 respondents
  - Very good: 57%
  - Good: 32%
  - Average: 11%
  - Poor: 0%
  - Very poor: 1%
- **Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities**
  - FY11: 194 respondents
  - Very good: 74%
  - Good: 22%
  - Average: 3%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%

**Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities**

- FY11: 208 respondents
  - Very good: 66%
  - Good: 26%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 94%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.6
Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY11: 140 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>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Managing the number of people
FY11: 161 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>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY11: 161 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY11: 106 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY11: 179 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>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.4
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY11: 177 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY11: 166 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY11: 170 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources
FY11: 186 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area

**Rating**
- Very good: 80%
- Good: 18%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%

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

Staff treated me courteously

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

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

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

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

**FY11**
- Satisfaction measure: 99%
- Average evaluation score: 4.8
Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

**FY11:** 180 respondents

- **Very good:** 63%
- **Good:** 28%
- **Average:** 4%
- **Poor:** 4%
- **Very poor:** 1%

**FY11**

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

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

**FY11:** 157 respondents

- **Very good:** 54%
- **Good:** 33%
- **Average:** 10%
- **Poor:** 2%
- **Very poor:** 1%

**FY11**

- Satisfaction measure: 87%
- Average evaluation score: 4.4

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

**FY11:** 178 respondents

- **Very good:** 60%
- **Good:** 28%
- **Average:** 7%
- **Poor:** 4%
- **Very poor:** 1%

**FY11**

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

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

**FY11:** 185 respondents

- **Very good:** 59%
- **Good:** 30%
- **Average:** 5%
- **Poor:** 4%
- **Very poor:** 1%

**FY11**

- Satisfaction measure: 90%
- Average evaluation score: 4.4
Missouri Breaks Interpretive Center

Fees

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY11: 74 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY11: 73 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too high</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services
FY11: 22 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9%</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>

FY11
Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Primary activities
FY11: 191 respondents

- Camping: 41%
- Fishing: 32%
- Hunting: 8%
- Target shooting: 4%
- Sightseeing: 57%
- Picnicking: 15%
- Hiking/walking: 44%
- Swimming: 24%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 20%
- Horseback riding: 0%
- Rock climbing: 4%
- Driving for pleasure: 48%
- Bicycling: 2%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 6%
- Education and interpretation: 35%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 20%
- Other: 2%

** 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
FY11: 93 respondents

- Very good: 88%
- Good: 12%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11
Satisfaction measure: 98%
Average evaluation score: 4.8