Priest Hole Camp 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 Priest Hole Camp 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 96%. 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: 70 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</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:

87%
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.

```
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- 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 96% 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
Priest Hole Camp Area
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY11: 54 respondents

- Very good: 22%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 30%
- Poor: 7%
- Very poor: 4%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 59%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY11: 69 respondents

- Very good: 30%
- Good: 43%
- Average: 20%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 0%

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

Providing useful information on the Internet
FY11: 39 respondents

- Very good: 20%
- Good: 46%
- Average: 21%
- Poor: 8%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY11: 71 respondents

- Very good: 21%
- Good: 39%
- Average: 27%
- Poor: 13%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 61%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY11: 69 respondents

- Very good: 26%
- Good: 46%
- Average: 23%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9
In order for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the Federal Management Performance and Review Council (FMPCR) guidelines, the BLM has established performance measures. These measures include responses to the BLM’s Public Use Survey, which is designed to reflect visitor activities, fees, and the condition of the BLM’s recreation sites.

### Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles

**FY11:** 72 respondents

- **Very good:** 29%
- **Good:** 30%
- **Average:** 25%
- **Poor:** 11%
- **Very poor:** 1%

**FY11:** Satisfaction measure: 63%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

### Maintaining trails for non-motorized use

**FY11:** 46 respondents

- **Very good:** 30%
- **Good:** 46%
- **Average:** 22%
- **Poor:** 0%
- **Very poor:** 2%

**FY11:** Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4

### Maintaining a clean site

**FY11:** 71 respondents

- **Very good:** 41%
- **Good:** 34%
- **Average:** 17%
- **Poor:** 4%
- **Very poor:** 4%

**FY11:** Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 4

### Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities

**FY11:** 63 respondents

- **Very good:** 43%
- **Good:** 48%
- **Average:** 10%
- **Poor:** 2%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY11:** Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

### Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities

**FY11:** 69 respondents

- **Very good:** 29%
- **Good:** 52%
- **Average:** 14%
- **Poor:** 0%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY11:** Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Priest Hole Camp Area
Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY11: 61 respondents
Very good: 20%
Good: 51%
Average: 26%
Poor: 2%
Very poor: 3%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Managing the number of people
FY11: 60 respondents
Very good: 30%
Good: 50%
Average: 13%
Poor: 5%
Very poor: 2%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY11: 63 respondents
Very good: 40%
Good: 43%
Average: 16%
Poor: 2%
Very poor: 0%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY11: 54 respondents
Very good: 35%
Good: 37%
Average: 13%
Poor: 9%
Very poor: 6%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY11: 64 respondents
Very good: 28%
Good: 48%
Average: 22%
Poor: 5%
Very poor: 2%
FY11: Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4
Each indicator regarding inside visitors’ opinions of the “value for fee paid”, which is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.2, can be.

The data report. A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on the next page. Below including access, and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources on DOI managed and partnered lands and services, 

Providing useful information for direction and orientation.

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms.

Adequately protecting the natural resources

<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>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13%</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: 4.1

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Staff treated me courteously

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: 60 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22%</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>

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

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: 51 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: 53 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6%</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: 4.5

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY11: 60 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Providing **quality** educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

*FY11: 53 respondents*

- **Very good**: 11%
- **Good**: 62%
- **Average**: 11%
- ** Poor**: 13%
- **Very poor**: 2%

**FY11**

Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

---

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

*FY11: 60 respondents*

- **Very good**: 30%
- **Good**: 42%
- **Average**: 20%
- **Poor**: 5%
- **Very poor**: 3%

**FY11**

Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

---

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

*FY11: 54 respondents*

- **Very good**: 9%
- **Good**: 56%
- **Average**: 19%
- ** Poor**: 13%
- **Very poor**: 4%

**FY11**

Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.5

---

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

*FY11: 60 respondents*

- **Very good**: 17%
- **Good**: 53%
- **Average**: 15%
- **Poor**: 13%
- **Very poor**: 2%

**FY11**

Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.7
**Priest Hole Camp Area**

**Fees**

**Total fees paid**

FY11: 72 respondents

- No fees: 67%
- Under $25: 9%
- $25 - $50: 0%
- > $50: 0%

Amount spent

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

Proportion of respondents

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

FY11: 7 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.

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

FY11: 6 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.

---

**Commercial Recreation Operations**

**Quality of Commercial Services**

FY11: 8 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.
Primary activities
FY11: 76 respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/rafting</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicles</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** 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: 9 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: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Priest Hole Camp Area
Demographics

**Visitor group composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>FY11: 56 groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 and over)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (13-17)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 12)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of adults**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>FY11: 56 groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of teenagers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>FY11: 56 groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>FY11: 56 groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 and more</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>FY11: 71 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 and over</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>FY11: 70 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priest Hole Camp Area
Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities

Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY11: 11 respondents

Rating

Very good 55%
Good 27%
Average 18%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY11: 10 respondents

Rating

Very good 40%
Good 30%
Average 20%
Poor 10%
Very poor 0%

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 4

Ability to understand the messages
FY11: 9 respondents

Rating

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: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ability to use the services in this area
FY11: 9 respondents

Rating

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: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.2