National Historic Oregon Trail 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 National Historic Oregon Trail 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 98%. 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>FY11: 154 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>81%</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%**
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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>Very Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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 98% 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
Each calculated site applies to Visitor opportunities, facilities, National Rating ORTR811 found on page 9. Opinions of the "value for fee paid," which is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.2, can be experienced. The satisfaction measure next to this graph is a combined percentage of "good" and "very good." The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center captured.

- **Providing useful maps and brochures**: FY11: 180 respondents
  - Very good: 64%
  - Good: 34%
  - Average: 2%
  - Poor: 0%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY11: Satisfaction measure: 98%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.6

- **Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations**: FY11: 147 respondents
  - Very good: 42%
  - Good: 50%
  - Average: 5%
  - Poor: 2%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY11: Satisfaction measure: 93%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.3

- **Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation**: FY11: 181 respondents
  - Very good: 59%
  - Good: 33%
  - Average: 7%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY11: Satisfaction measure: 92%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.5

- **Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information**: FY11: 183 respondents
  - Very good: 60%
  - Good: 30%
  - Average: 3%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%
  - FY11: Satisfaction measure: 96%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.6
In order for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) indicators, the BLM visitor information websites and Visitor Centers must provide for a quality recreation experience, which includes providing visitor facilities that are representative of their respective sites. This is done through a Visitor Satisfaction Survey conducted at National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center. The graph to the right summarizes the results of the survey for FY11.

- **Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles**
  - FY11: 186 respondents
  - Satisfaction measure: 100%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.8

- **Maintaining trails for non-motorized use**
  - FY11: 120 respondents
  - Satisfaction measure: 100%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.7

- **Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities**
  - FY11: 153 respondents
  - Satisfaction measure: 100%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.8

- **Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities**
  - FY11: 186 respondents
  - Satisfaction measure: 99%
  - Average evaluation score: 4.8
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

### Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
**FY11**: 137 respondents
- **Very good**: 61%
- **Good**: 36%
- **Average**: 2%
- **Poor**: 1%
- **Very poor**: 0%

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

### Managing the number of people
**FY11**: 144 respondents
- **Very good**: 69%
- **Good**: 30%
- **Average**: 1%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

**FY11** Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

### Keeping noise at appropriate levels
**FY11**: 156 respondents
- **Very good**: 61%
- **Good**: 35%
- **Average**: 3%
- **Poor**: 1%
- **Very poor**: 0%

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

### Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
**FY11**: 89 respondents
- **Very good**: 62%
- **Good**: 34%
- **Average**: 2%
- **Poor**: 2%
- **Very poor**: 0%

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

### Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
**FY11**: 163 respondents
- **Very good**: 68%
- **Good**: 31%
- **Average**: 1%
- **Poor**: 0%
- **Very poor**: 0%

**FY11** Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Adequately protecting the natural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11 Satisfaction measure: 100%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11 Satisfaction measure: 98%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11 Satisfaction measure: 100%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11 Satisfaction measure: 98%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY11: 160 respondents
- Very good: 87%
- Good: 12%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY11: 132 respondents
- Very good: 78%
- Good: 21%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY11: 127 respondents
- Very good: 30%
- Good: 19%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY11: 159 respondents
- Very good: 78%
- Good: 21%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%
Average evaluation score: 4.8
National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center
Providing Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: Satisfaction measure: 94%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: Satisfaction measure: 99%</th>
<th>Average evaluation score: 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total fees paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount spent</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: 195 respondents

### How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too high</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: 105 respondents

### The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: 101 respondents

### Commercial Recreation Operations

#### Quality of Commercial Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: 20 respondents

Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Programs (interpretive, walk, tour, exhibit, presentations, etc.)

Quality of program(s) attended
FY11: 60 respondents

Rating
Very good 85%
Good 15%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.9
Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY11: 32 respondents

Rating

Very good 50%
Good 47%
Average 3%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY11: 31 respondents

Rating

Very good 55%
Good 40%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ability to understand the messages
FY11: 33 respondents

Rating

Very good 62%
Good 48%
Average 3%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Ability to use the services in this area
FY11: 32 respondents

Rating

Very good 89%
Good 31%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7