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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 2016 (FY16). Of the 24 units conducting the survey this year, 24 units successfully administered the survey. 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, recreation use management, resource management, BLM staff and service, programs, commercial recreation operations, educational and interpretive materials, fees, accessibility for visitors with disabilities, activities, and demographics.

The combined results of the visitor satisfaction surveys conducted in FY16 are summarized in this data report. A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on page two. Below (left) is a graph summarizing visitor opinions regarding the overall quality of their experience at this site. The satisfaction measure below (right) is a combined proportion of "good" and "very good" responses. This is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.1 and should be used when reporting performance for this goal. (NOTE: the satisfaction measure may not equal the sum of "very good" and "good" proportions due to rounding.)

The response rates for the BLM units surveyed ranged from 33% to 100%. The graph 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 experience
FY16: 3398 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

Proportion of site visitors satisfied overall with visitor information, facilities, management, interpretation/education, staff services, and programs:

91%
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Understanding the Results

Inside this report are graphs that illustrate the survey results. The report contains ten 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," "providing useful information on the internet," 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 GFRA reporting numbers.

All graphs include the following information:

- The number of visitor responses for the indicator;
- The proportion of responses for each answer choice;

Graphs for quality indicators also include:

- A "satisfaction measure" that combines the proportion of total responses which were "Very good" or "Good;"
- An average (mean) evaluation score where a number closer to five reflects a more positive visitor response;
- Quality indicators are based on the following scale:

  "Very poor" = 1, "Poor" = 2, "Average" = 3, "Good" = 4, "Very good" = 5;

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE Graph proportions may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Procedure

A representative sample of the general visitor population were surveyed at 24 units in FY16. The data reflect visitor opinions about these sites's facilities, management, services, educational opportunities, and fees during the survey period. Visitor activities and selected demographics were also captured.

Returned surveys were electronically scanned and the data analyzed. Frequency distributions were calculated for each indicator and category.

The number of respondents for each indicator is reported at the top of each figure. All proportions are reported as whole percentages while averages are rounded to the nearest tenth.

Caution is advised when interpreting any data with fewer than 30 responses. When this occurs, the word "CAUTION!" is included above the graph. This report excludes any graphs or calculations for questions with fewer than 10 responses. "NA" has been inserted in place of excluded satisfaction and evaluation calculations.

For most indicators, the survey data are expected to be accurate within ±6% of the population 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 the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center at Washington State University (509) 335-1511 | sesrc@wsu.edu
2016 BLM Visitor Survey
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY16: 3044 Respondents
Very good: 45%
Good: 33%
Average: 14%
Poor: 4%
Very poor: 3%
Proportion of Respondents

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY16: 3295 Respondents
Very good: 46%
Good: 37%
Average: 13%
Poor: 2%
Very poor: 1%
Proportion of Respondents

Providing adequate signs on-site for direction and orientation
FY16: 3381 Respondents
Very good: 53%
Good: 31%
Average: 11%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 2%
Proportion of Respondents

Everything considered: Quality of BLM visitor information
FY16: 3383 Respondents
Very good: 48%
Good: 37%
Average: 12%
Poor: 2%
Very poor: 1%
Proportion of Respondents

FY16
Satisfaction measure: 79%
Mean score: 4.1

FY16
Satisfaction measure: 83%
Mean score: 4.2

FY16
Satisfaction measure: 84%
Mean score: 4.3

FY16
Satisfaction measure: 85%
Mean score: 4.3
2016 BLM Visitor Survey
Developed Facilities

Condition of roads for motorized vehicles
FY16: 3485 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>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 83%
Mean score: 4.3

Cleanliness of site
FY16: 3527 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>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 87%
Mean score: 4.4

Condition of trails for non-motorized use
FY16: 2991 Respondents

<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>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3

Cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY16: 3024 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 80%
Mean score: 4.4

Everything considered: Overall condition of developed facilities
FY16: 3488 Respondents

<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>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 88%
Mean score: 4.4
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY16: 3080 Respondents
Very good 44%
Good 41%
Average 12%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3

Managing the number of people
FY16: 3117 Respondents
Very good 46%
Good 36%
Average 14%
Poor 3%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 82%
Mean score: 4.2

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY16: 3145 Respondents
Very good 49%
Good 35%
Average 13%
Poor 3%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 84%
Mean score: 4.3

Providing a sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY16: 2317 Respondents
Very good 42%
Good 33%
Average 18%
Poor 5%
Very poor 2%
Proportion of Respondents
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 75%
Mean score: 4.1

Everything considered: Visitor and recreation management
FY16: 3314 Respondents
Very good 45%
Good 38%
Average 14%
Poor 2%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 83%
Mean score: 4.3
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Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY16: 3392 Respondents

- Very good: 51%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 
Satisfaction measure: 89%
Mean score: 4.4

Ensuring that visitor activities do not interfere with resource protection
FY16: 3197 Respondents

- Very good: 48%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%

FY16 
Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY16: 3134 Respondents

- Very good: 55%
- Good: 34%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 
Satisfaction measure: 89%
Mean score: 4.4

Everything considered: BLM Protection of natural and cultural resources
FY16: 3369 Respondents

- Very good: 50%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 
Satisfaction measure: 88%
Mean score: 4.4
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BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY16: 2645 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 99%
Mean score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about natural and cultural resources
FY16: 2260 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Mean score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities
FY16: 2334 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Mean score: 4.8

Everything considered: Performance of BLM staff
FY16: 2592 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Mean score: 4.8
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources

FY16: 2747 Respondents

<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>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 83%
Mean score: 4.2

Providing stewardship information on protecting cultural and natural resources

FY16: 2683 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 80%
Mean score: 4.2

Providing sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources

FY16: 2677 Respondents

<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>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 81%
Mean score: 4.2

Everything considered: BLM interpretive and educational program

FY16: 2831 Respondents

<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>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 82%
Mean score: 4.2
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Programs & Fees

Quality of program(s) attended
FY16: 526 Respondents

Very good 80%
Good 15%
Rating Average 4%
Poor 1%
Very poor 0%

FY16
Satisfaction measure: 95%
Mean score: 4.7

Total fees paid
FY16: 3328 Respondents

No fee 63%
Under $25 28%
$25-$50 5%
>$50 4%

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY16: 1248 Respondents

Far too low 5%
Too low 5%
Rating About right 83%
Too high 6%
Far too high 1%

The value of recreation opportunity and services was at least equal to the fee asked to pay
FY16: 1165 Respondents

Strongly agree 48%
Agree 39%
Rating Not sure 9%
Disagree 2%
Strongly disagree 1%
Quality of Commercial Services
FY16: 669 Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 94%
Mean score: 4.7

Activities
FY16: 3263 Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target shooting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picknicking</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/rafting</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding/Driving OHVs</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each respondent could rate up to three services.
**Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents could select more than one activity.
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Accessibility for Visitors with Disabilities

**Ability to adequately use facilities**
FY16: 327 Respondents
- Very good: 56%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 85%
Mean score: 4.4

**Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.**
FY16: 306 Respondents
- Very good: 58%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 1%
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 82%
Mean score: 4.3

**Ability to understand messages**
FY16: 315 Respondents
- Very good: 61%
- Good: 30%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 2%
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 90%
Mean score: 4.5

**Ability to use services**
FY16: 322 Respondents
- Very good: 62%
- Good: 25%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 2%
FY16 Satisfaction measure: 87%
Mean score: 4.4