Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site 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 2013 (FY13). 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 Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site 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
FY13: 123 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>30%</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>

FY13 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities: 93%

Average evaluation score: 4.5
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>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 FY13. 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
Report regarding the Returned general opportunities, survey. The Rating opinions of the "value for fee paid", which is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.2, can be summarized in this data report. A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on the survey will also help the BLM better serve the public. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data during the period.

Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing useful maps and brochures</th>
<th>Providing useful information on the Internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13: 124 respondents</td>
<td>FY13: 104 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction measure: 87%</td>
<td>Satisfaction measure: 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average evaluation score: 4.3</td>
<td>Average evaluation score: 4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation</th>
<th>FY13: 147 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction measure: 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average evaluation score: 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Managing the appropriate resources, services, and other support during the past fiscal year.
Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY13: 154 respondents

- Very good: 68%
- Good: 27%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY13: 108 respondents

- Very good: 49%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 86%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Maintaining a clean site
FY13: 153 respondents

- Very good: 73%
- Good: 24%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY13: 146 respondents

- Very good: 80%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 1%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY13: 151 respondents

- Very good: 59%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY13: 148 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 58%
- Good: 34%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY13: 144 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 51%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 5%
- Very poor: 1%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY13: 142 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 56%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 1%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 88%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management
FY13: 146 respondents

Rating

- Very good: 56%
- Good: 39%
- Average: 5%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Each site's performance related to BLM GPRA Goal 3.1 - "good" percentages due to rounding).

A survey will also help the BLM better serve the public. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data including access, and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources on DOI managed and partnered lands and...
Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area

FY13: 104 respondents
- Very good: 69%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Staff treated me courteously

FY13: 132 respondents
- Very good: 78%
- Good: 18%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

FY13: 118 respondents
- Very good: 74%
- Good: 23%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

FY13: 126 respondents
- Very good: 76%
- Good: 18%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.7
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

- **FY13:** 81 respondents

  - Very good: 31%
  - Good: 48%
  - Average: 22%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%

*FY13: Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4.1*

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

- **FY13:** 95 respondents

  - Very good: 33%
  - Good: 44%
  - Average: 19%
  - Poor: 4%
  - Very poor: 0%

*FY13: Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4.1*

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

- **FY13:** 82 respondents

  - Very good: 29%
  - Good: 48%
  - Average: 24%
  - Poor: 0%
  - Very poor: 0%

*FY13: Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4*

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

- **FY13:** 99 respondents

  - Very good: 29%
  - Good: 48%
  - Average: 20%
  - Poor: 2%
  - Very poor: 0%

*FY13: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.1*
Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site Fees

Total fees paid
FY13: 154 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount spent</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - $50</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY13: 130 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too high</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY13: 128 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services
FY13: 59 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>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY13 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Staff demonstrated knowledge about the resources at this site during the 2013 season.

**Primary activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/rafting</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicles</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</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**

<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>50%</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>

FY13: 10 respondents

**CAUTION!**

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site Demographics

Visitor group composition
FY13: 112 groups
- Adults (18 and over): 75%
- Teenagers (13-17): 6%
- Children (under 12): 17%

Number of adults
(18 and over) in group
FY13: 112 groups
- 6 and more: 37%
- 3-6: 29%
- 1-2: 30%

Number of teenagers
(13-17) in group
FY13: 112 groups
- 6 and more: 0%
- 3-5: 8%
- 1-2: 17%
- none: 75%

Number of children
(under 12) in group
FY13: 112 groups
- 6 and more: 0%
- 3-5: 14%
- 1-2: 24%
- none: 58%

Respondent age
FY12: 134 respondents
- 71 and over: 9%
- 61-70: 19%
- 51-60: 22%
- 41-50: 25%
- 31-40: 19%
- 22-30: 5%
- 18-21: 1%

Gender
FY13: 117 respondents
- Male: 68%
- Female: 32%
Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Access Site
Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities

Ability to adequately use the facilities
FY13: 32 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 94%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY13: 23 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Ability to understand the messages
FY13: 28 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ability to use the services in this area
FY13: 30 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY13: Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.5