Salt Lick Trail
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 Salt Lick Trail during fiscal year 2016. The survey was developed to measure a 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 results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Salt Lick Trail 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 rate for this survey site was 86%. This indicates that 86% of those randomly sampled completed the survey. 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 graph]

FY16 GPRA Satisfaction Measure

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

98%

Mean score: 4.6

Report prepared by the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
For the Bureau of Land Management, US Department of the Interior
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 2 3 4 5 Good
```

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

Procedure

Surveys were distributed to a random sample of visitors at this site during a selected period in FY16. 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.

The survey response rate is described on page one of this report. 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
Salt Lick Trail
Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures
FY16: 47 Respondents

Rating
Very good 57%
Good 40%
Average 0%
Poor 2%
Very poor 0%

Providing useful information on the Internet
FY16: 20 Respondents

Rating
Very good 50%
Good 25%
Average 15%
Poor 10%
Very poor 0%

CAUTION!

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Mean score: 4.5

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations
FY16: 46 Respondents

Rating
Very good 39%
Good 46%
Average 13%
Poor 2%
Very poor 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 85%
Mean score: 4.2

Providing adequate signs on-site for direction and orientation
FY16: 48 Respondents

Rating
Very good 46%
Good 46%
Average 8%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Mean score: 4.4

Everything considered: Quality of BLM visitor information
FY16: 45 Respondents

Rating
Very good 51%
Good 38%
Average 11%
Poor 0%
Very poor 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 89%
Mean score: 4.4
Salt Lick Trail
Developed Facilities

Condition of roads for motorized vehicles
FY16: 49 Respondents

- Very good: 39%
- Good: 51%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 90%
Mean score: 4.3

Condition of trails for non-motorized use
FY16: 45 Respondents

- Very good: 36%
- Good: 56%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 91%
Mean score: 4.2

Cleanliness of site
FY16: 47 Respondents

- Very good: 66%
- Good: 32%
- Average: 2%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 98%
Mean score: 4.6

Cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY16: 46 Respondents

- Very good: 72%
- Good: 22%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 93%
Mean score: 4.7

Everything considered: Overall condition of developed facilities
FY16: 49 Respondents

- Very good: 67%
- Good: 29%
- Average: 4%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 96%
Mean score: 4.6
Salt Lick Trail
Recreation Use Management

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY16: 36 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 89%
Mean score: 4.2

Managing the number of people
FY16: 29 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>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 93%
Mean score: 4.4

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY16: 30 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>40%</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>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Mean score: 4.5

Providing a sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY16: 28 Respondents

<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>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 82%
Mean score: 3.9

Everything considered: Visitor and recreation management
FY16: 34 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44%</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>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 79%
Mean score: 4.1
Salt Lick Trail
Resource Management

Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY16: 47 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 96%
Mean score: 4.3

Ensuring that visitor activities do not interfere with resource protection
FY16: 44 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 84%
Mean score: 4.1

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY16: 37 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Mean score: 4.2

Everything considered: BLM Protection of natural and cultural resources
FY16: 46 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 93%
Mean score: 4.3
Staff treated me courteously
FY16: 34 Respondents

- Very good: 88%
- Good: 9%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 97%
Mean score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about natural and cultural resources
FY16: 29 Respondents

- Very good: 79%
- Good: 21%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Mean score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities
FY16: 31 Respondents

- Very good: 84%
- Good: 16%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Mean score: 4.8

Everything considered:
Performance of BLM staff
FY16: 33 Respondents

- Very good: 85%
- Good: 15%
- Average: 0%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: 100%
Mean score: 4.8
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources

**FY16: 36 Respondents**

- **Very good:** 28%
- **Good:** 47%
- **Average:** 25%
- **Poor:** 0%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY16**

Satisfaction measure: 75%
Mean score: 4

Providing stewardship information on protecting cultural and natural resources

**FY16: 37 Respondents**

- **Very good:** 32%
- **Good:** 57%
- **Average:** 8%
- **Poor:** 3%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY16**

Satisfaction measure: 89%
Mean score: 4.2

Providing sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources

**FY16: 37 Respondents**

- **Very good:** 22%
- **Good:** 59%
- **Average:** 19%
- **Poor:** 0%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY16**

Satisfaction measure: 81%
Mean score: 4

Everything considered: BLM interpretive and educational program

**FY16: 38 Respondents**

- **Very good:** 24%
- **Good:** 61%
- **Average:** 16%
- **Poor:** 0%
- **Very poor:** 0%

**FY16**

Satisfaction measure: 84%
Mean score: 4.1
Salt Lick Trail
Programs & Fees

Quality of program(s) attended
FY16: 1 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum number of responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16 Satisfaction measure: NA
Mean score: NA

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY16: 1 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far too low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too high</td>
<td></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 number of responses.

Total fees paid
FY16: 46 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fee</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>

The value of recreation opportunity and services was at least equal to the fee asked to pay
FY16: 1 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum number of responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salt Lick Trail
Commercial Recreation Operations & Activities

Quality of Commercial Services

FY16: 5 Responses*

- Very good
- Good
- Average
- Poor
- Very poor

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses.

See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum number of responses.

FY16
Satisfaction measure: NA
Mean score: NA

Activities

FY16: 44 Respondents**

- Camping 11%
- Fishing 7%
- Hunting 7%
- Target shooting 2%
- Sightseeing 48%
- Picnicking 16%
- Hiking/walking 84%
- Swimming 0%
- Motorized boating 2%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting 0%
- Horseback riding 9%
- Rock climbing 11%
- Driving for pleasure 11%
- Bicycling 2%
- Riding/Driving OHVs 2%
- Education and interpretation 2%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing 18%
- Other 11%

*Each respondent could rate up to three services.

**Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents could select more than one activity.
Salt Lick Trail
Demographics

Visitor age groups
FY16: 133 Visitors

Age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Adults (18 and over) in group
FY16: 40 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults in group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group
FY16: 41 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teenagers in group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of children (under 12) in group
FY16: 41 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent age
FY16: 40 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 and over</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent gender
FY16: 40 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salt Lick Trail
Accessibility for Visitors with Disabilities

Ability to adequately use facilities
FY16: 2 Respondents

Rating | Proportion of Respondents
-------|-------------------------
Very good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Average | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Very poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: NA
Mean score: NA

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.
FY16: 2 Respondents

Rating | Proportion of Respondents
-------|-------------------------
Very good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Average | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Very poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: NA
Mean score: NA

Ability to understand messages
FY16: 3 Respondents

Rating | Proportion of Respondents
-------|-------------------------
Very good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Average | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Very poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: NA
Mean score: NA

Ability to use services
FY16: 4 Respondents

Rating | Proportion of Respondents
-------|-------------------------
Very good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Good | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Average | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
Very poor | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

FY16 Satisfaction measure: NA
Mean score: NA