Dumont Dunes OHV 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 Dumont Dunes OHV Area during fiscal year 2017. 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 Dumont Dunes OHV Area 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
FY17: 232 Respondents

Rating

Very good
Good
Average
Poor
Very poor

Proportion of Respondents

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 90%
Mean score: 4.4

FY17 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Proportion of site visitors satisfied overall with visitor information, facilities, management, interpretation/education, staff services, and programs:

90%
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;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 FY17. 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.
Providing useful maps and brochures

FY17: 228 Respondents

- Very good: 50%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 2%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 80%
Mean score: 4.2

Providing useful information on the Internet

FY17: 208 Respondents

- Very good: 50%
- Good: 28%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 1%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 79%
Mean score: 4.2

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations

FY17: 236 Respondents

- Very good: 46%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 5%
- Very poor: 2%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 77%
Mean score: 4.1

Providing adequate signs on-site for direction and orientation

FY17: 240 Respondents

- Very good: 44%
- Good: 29%
- Average: 19%
- Poor: 5%
- Very poor: 3%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 73%
Mean score: 4.1

Everything considered: Quality of BLM visitor information

FY17: 240 Respondents

- Very good: 47%
- Good: 34%
- Average: 16%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 1%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 81%
Mean score: 4.2
Dumont Dunes OHV Area
Developed Facilities

Condition of roads for motorized vehicles
FY17: 255 Respondents

- Very good: 42%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 15%
- Poor: 8%
- Very poor: 2%

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 75%
Mean score: 4

Cleanliness of site
FY17: 249 Respondents

- Very good: 55%
- Good: 31%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 1%

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3

Condition of trails for non-motorized use
FY17: 206 Respondents

- Very good: 49%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 82%
Mean score: 4.3

Cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY17: 210 Respondents

- Very good: 44%
- Good: 34%
- Average: 17%
- Poor: 4%
- Very poor: 1%

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 78%
Mean score: 4.3

Everything considered: Overall condition of developed facilities
FY17: 249 Respondents

- Very good: 45%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 15%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 82%
Mean score: 4.2
Managing the appropriate use of vehicles
FY17: 245 Respondents

- Very good: 50%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 11%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 87%
Mean score: 4.4

Managing the number of people
FY17: 228 Respondents

- Very good: 45%
- Good: 41%
- Average: 13%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3

Keeping noise at appropriate levels
FY17: 240 Respondents

- Very good: 42%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 15%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 3%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 80%
Mean score: 4.1

Providing a sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime
FY17: 247 Respondents

- Very good: 53%
- Good: 32%
- Average: 12%
- Poor: 2%
- Very poor: 1%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 85%
Mean score: 4.3

Everything considered: Visitor and recreation management
FY17: 248 Respondents

- Very good: 48%
- Good: 40%
- Average: 10%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 88%
Mean score: 4.3
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY17: 230 Respondents

Proportion of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</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>

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 95%
Mean score: 4.5

Ensuring that visitor activities do not interfere with resource protection
FY17: 224 Respondents

Proportion of 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>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Mean score: 4.4

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY17: 215 Respondents

Proportion of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Mean score: 4.5

Everything considered: BLM Protection of natural and cultural resources
FY17: 232 Respondents

Proportion of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35%</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>

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 92%
Mean score: 4.5
Dumont Dunes OHV Area
BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously
FY17: 226 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 97%
Mean score: 4.8

Staff demonstrated knowledge about natural and cultural resources
FY17: 203 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>14%</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>

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 95%
Mean score: 4.7

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities
FY17: 216 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 97%
Mean score: 4.7

Everything considered: Performance of BLM staff
FY17: 223 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY17  Satisfaction measure: 96%
Mean score: 4.7
Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources
FY17: 200 Respondents
Rating
Very good 47%
Good 39%
Average 12%
Poor 1%
Very poor 2%
Proportion of Respondents

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3

Providing stewardship information on protecting cultural and natural resources
FY17: 208 Respondents
Rating
Very good 50%
Good 35%
Average 12%
Poor 2%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 85%
Mean score: 4.3

Providing sufficient quantity of educational and interpretive materials about the resources
FY17: 201 Respondents
Rating
Very good 45%
Good 36%
Average 14%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 83%
Mean score: 4.2

Everything considered: BLM interpretive and educational program
FY17: 206 Respondents
Rating
Very good 49%
Good 37%
Average 12%
Poor 1%
Very poor 1%
Proportion of Respondents

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 86%
Mean score: 4.3
Dumont Dunes OHV Area
Programs & Fees

Quality of program(s) attended
FY17: 34 Respondents

- Very good: 71%
- Good: 24%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

Proportion of Respondents

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 94%
Mean score: 4.6

Total fees paid
FY17: 238 Respondents

- No fee: 6%
- Under $25: 0%
- $25-$50: 66%
- $50: 27%

Proportion of Respondents

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY17: 216 Respondents

- Far too low: 1%
- Too low: 1%
- About right: 69%
- Too high: 21%
- Far too high: 7%

Proportion of Respondents

The value of recreation opportunity and services was at least equal to the fee asked to pay
FY17: 197 Respondents

- Strongly agree: 28%
- Agree: 39%
- Not sure: 16%
- Disagree: 12%
- Strongly disagree: 5%

Proportion of Respondents

DUDU17 9
Dumont Dunes OHV Area
Commercial Recreation Operations & Activities

Quality of Commercial Services
FY17: 68 Responses*

- Very good: 74%
- Good: 24%
- Average: 1%
- Poor: 1%
- Very poor: 0%

Proportion of Responses

FY17
Satisfaction measure: 98%
Mean score: 4.7

Activities
FY17: 293 Respondents**

- Camping: 6%
- Fishing: 1%
- Hunting: 0%
- Target shooting: 1%
- Sightseeing: 33%
- Picnicking: 13%
- Hiking/walking: 82%
- Swimming: 1%
- Motorized boating: 0%
- Non-motorized boating/rafting: 0%
- Horseback riding: 2%
- Rock climbing: 17%
- Driving for pleasure: 15%
- Bicycling: 7%
- Riding/Driving OHVs: 0%
- Education and interpretation: 5%
- Birdwatching/wildlife viewing: 13%
- Other: 5%

Proportion of Respondents

*Each respondent could rate up to three services.
**Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents could select more than one activity.
Visitor age groups

FY17: 3813 Visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of teenagers (13-17) in group

FY17: 246 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teenagers</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of children (under 12) in group

FY17: 246 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent age

FY17: 244 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 and over</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent gender

FY17: 241 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California visitors came from 26 different counties.

FY17: 182 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other counties</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitors came from 4 states across the country

FY17: 262 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dumont Dunes OHV Area
Accessibility for Visitors with Disabilities

**Ability to adequately use facilities**
FY17: 33 Respondents

- Very good: 61%
- Good: 33%
- Average: 3%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 94%
Mean score: 4.5

**Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.**
FY17: 32 Respondents

- Very good: 53%
- Good: 38%
- Average: 6%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 91%
Mean score: 4.4

**Ability to understand messages**
FY17: 33 Respondents

- Very good: 55%
- Good: 36%
- Average: 9%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 91%
Mean score: 4.5

**Ability to use services**
FY17: 30 Respondents

- Very good: 53%
- Good: 37%
- Average: 7%
- Poor: 3%
- Very poor: 0%

FY17 Satisfaction measure: 90%
Mean score: 4.4