Weston Hills
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 2012 (FY12). 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 Weston Hills 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 100%. 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
FY12: 37 respondents

<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>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:

89%
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.

![Rating Scale]

- 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 FY12. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 100% 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
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Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY12: 35 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 60%
Average evaluation score: 3.6

Providing useful information on the Internet
FY12: 31 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 55%
Average evaluation score: 3.6

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY12: 41 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 71%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation
FY12: 43 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information
FY12: 38 respondents

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 61%
Average evaluation score: 3.7
Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles  
FY12: 43 respondents  
- Very good: 26%  
- Good: 44%  
- Average: 23%  
- Poor: 7%  
- Very poor: 0%  
FY12: Satisfaction measure: 70%  
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Maintaining a clean site  
FY12: 42 respondents  
- Very good: 33%  
- Good: 48%  
- Average: 12%  
- Poor: 2%  
- Very poor: 5%  
FY12: Satisfaction measure: 81%  
Average evaluation score: 4

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use  
FY12: 30 respondents  
- Very good: 17%  
- Good: 47%  
- Average: 23%  
- Poor: 10%  
- Very poor: 3%  
FY12: Satisfaction measure: 63%  
Average evaluation score: 3.6

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities  
FY12: 36 respondents  
- Very good: 19%  
- Good: 50%  
- Average: 17%  
- Poor: 11%  
- Very poor: 5%  
FY12: Satisfaction measure: 69%  
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities  
FY12: 42 respondents  
- Very good: 17%  
- Good: 48%  
- Average: 29%  
- Poor: 5%  
- Very poor: 2%  
FY12: Satisfaction measure: 64%  
Average evaluation score: 3.7
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Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY12: 41 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 29%
- Good: 41%
- Average: 27%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 2%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 71%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Managing the number of people
FY12: 40 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 30%
- Good: 40%
- Average: 28%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 4

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY12: 34 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 24%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 32%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 62%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY12: 39 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 26%
- Good: 41%
- Average: 33%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 67%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY12: 41 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 22%
- Good: 41%
- Average: 34%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 63%
Average evaluation score: 3.8
Adequately protecting the natural resources

FY12: 42 respondents

- Very good: 20%
- Good: 52%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 2%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection

FY12: 37 respondents

- Very good: 24%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 30%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Adequately protecting the cultural resources

FY12: 24 respondents

- Very good: 32%
- Good: 44%
- Average: 24%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

FY12: 40 respondents

- Very good: 39%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 15%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 3%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.1
Staff treated me courteously

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

**Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area**

**Everything considered: performance of BLM staff**

FY12: 34 respondents
Very good 74%
Good 21%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY12: 29 respondents
Very good 80%
Good 10%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY12: 32 respondents
Very good 59%
Good 34%
Average 0%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY12: 33 respondents
Very good 64%
Good 24%
Average 12%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY12:
Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

FY12:
Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

FY12:
Satisfaction measure: 69%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

FY12:
Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

FY12: 36 respondents

- Very good: 19%
- Good: 53%
- Average: 19%
- Poor: 8%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12 Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

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

FY12: 34 respondents

- Very good: 35%
- Good: 41%
- Average: 18%
- Poor: 6%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

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

FY12: 35 respondents

- Very good: 17%
- Good: 48%
- Average: 29%
- Poor: 6%
- Very poor: 3%

FY12 Satisfaction measure: 63%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

FY12: 33 respondents

- Very good: 21%
- Good: 55%
- Average: 18%
- Poor: 6%
- Very poor: 0%

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 3.9
**Weston Hills**

### Fees

**Total fees paid**
FY12: 43 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount spent</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?**
FY12: 7 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
FY12: 1 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
FY12: 43 respondents**

- Camping: 14%
- Fishing: 14%
- Hunting: 21%
- Target shooting: 5%
- Sightseeing: 19%
- Picnicking: 19%
- Hiking/walking: 30%
- Swimming: 2%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 2%
- Horseback riding: 9%
- Rock climbing: 2%
- Driving for pleasure: 16%
- Bicycling: 5%
- Motorized recreation vehicles: 88%
- Education and interpretation: 0%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 9%
- 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
FY12: 4 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.

FY12
Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 4
Weston Hills
Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities

Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY12: 15 respondents

rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 73%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY12: 14 respondents

rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 64%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ability to understand the messages
FY12: 14 respondents

rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 79%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Ability to use the services in this area
FY12: 14 respondents

rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12: Satisfaction measure: 71%
Average evaluation score: 4.2