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Report Summary

• This report presents the results of a visitor study at Bandelier National Monument July 7-13, 1995. A total of 519 questionnaires were distributed and 422 returned, an 81% response rate.

• This report profiles Bandelier visitors. A separate appendix contains visitors' comments about their visit. This report and the appendix contain summaries of visitor comments.

• Forty-four percent of visitors were between 36 and 55 years old. More than two-thirds of visitors (73%) were on their first visit to Bandelier National Monument. Ninety-four percent were from the United States: the highest proportions were from New Mexico (21%), Texas (16%) and California (10%). International visitors (6%) were from France, Germany and 19 other countries.

• Sixty-four percent of visitors were part of a family group. The average group size was 3.7 people.

• Eighty-seven percent of visitors stayed less than 24 hours at Bandelier. Fifty-five percent of the day visitors stayed 3 or 4 hours. The most visited sites included the visitor center (91%), the Ruins Trail (91%) and the Ceremonial Cave (63%).

• The activities visitors participated in most frequently were visiting the ruins (96%) and viewing museum exhibits (70%). Ninety-four percent of visitors used the visitor center and 73% used the Ruins Trail Guide. The restrooms (94%) and the Ruins Trail (92%) were the most commonly used park facilities.

• Ninety-one percent of visitors felt that it was never appropriate to collect artifacts. Thirty-four percent of visitors felt that exploring ruins in caves was never appropriate.

• Seventy percent of visitors said they felt somewhat or moderately crowded. Twenty-four percent of the visitors felt not at all crowded.

• Fifty-two percent of visitors stated they would be willing to use a shuttle bus system on a future visit; 19% of visitors claimed they would be willing to pay a modest fee to use the shuttle bus.

• To reduce congestion in Bandelier, 43% of visitors favored adopting a shuttle bus system, and 36% preferred a first come, first served system.

• The most important interpretive or visitor services to visitors included: guided walks (89%), the self-guided Ruins Trail Guide (88%), park personnel (84%) and trail exhibits (84%). The highest very good and good quality ratings were received for campfire programs (91%), guided walks (90%), the self-guided Ruins Trail Guide (89%) and park personnel (88%).

• The most important park facilities to visitors were the Ruins Trail (93%), the campground (92%) and the restrooms (90%). The highest very good and good ratings were received for the Ruins Trail (92%), the Falls Trail (89%) and the Ceremonial Cave (88%).

• Sixty-one percent of visitors rated the overall quality of visitor services at Bandelier as very good and 34% rated them as good.

For more information about the VSP, please contact Dr. Gary E. Machlis, Sociology Project Leader, University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit, College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences, Moscow, Idaho 83844-1133 or call 208-885-7129.
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Introduction

This report describes the results of a study of visitors to Bandelier National Monument (referred to as “Bandelier”). This visitor study was conducted July 7-13, 1995 by the National Park Service (NPS) Visitor Services Project (VSP), part of the Cooperative Park Studies Unit at the University of Idaho.

A Methods section discusses the procedures and limitations of the study. The Results section follows, including a summary of visitor comments. Next, an Additional Analysis page helps managers request additional analyses. The final section has a copy of the Questionnaire. The separate appendix includes comment summaries and the visitors’ unedited comments.

Many of this report’s graphs resemble the example at right. The large numbers refer to explanations below the graph.

1: The figure title describes the graph’s information.
2: Listed above the graph, the ‘N’ shows the number of visitors responding and a description of the chart’s information. Interpret data with an ‘N’ of less than 30 with CAUTION! as the results may be unreliable.
3: Vertical information describes categories.
4: Horizontal information shows the number or proportions in each category.
5: In most graphs, percentages provide additional information.
Methods

General strategy

Interviews were conducted and questionnaires distributed to a sample of visitors visiting Bandelier during July 7-13, 1995. Visitors completed the questionnaire after their visit and returned it by mail.

Questionnaire design and administration

The questionnaire design used the standard format of previous Visitor Services Project studies. See the end of this report (page 67) for a copy of the questionnaire.

Visitors were sampled as they entered the Bandelier main parking lot and were approached after they parked. Visitor groups were greeted, briefly introduced to the purpose of the study and asked to participate. If visitors agreed, the contact interview took approximately two minutes. These interviews included determining group size, group type and the age of the adult who would complete the questionnaire. This individual was asked his or her name, address and telephone number for the mailing of a reminder/thank you postcard.

Two weeks following the survey, a reminder/thank you postcard was mailed to all participants. Replacement questionnaires were mailed to participants who had not returned their questionnaires four weeks after the survey. Eight weeks after the survey, second replacement questionnaires were mailed to visitors who still had not returned their questionnaires.

Data analysis

Returned questionnaires were coded and the information entered into a computer. Frequency distributions and univariate statistics were calculated using a standard statistical software package. Respondents’ answers to open-ended questions were summarized.

Sample size, missing data and reporting errors

This study collected information on both visitor groups and individual group members. Thus, the sample size (“N”), varies from figure to figure. For example, while Figure 1 shows information for 1,319 individuals, Figure 3 presents data for 415 visitor groups.

A note above each figure’s graph
specifies the information illustrated.

Occasionally, a respondent may not have answered all of the questions, or may have answered some incorrectly. Unanswered questions create missing data and cause the number in the sample to vary from figure to figure. For example, although 422 questionnaires were returned by Bandelier visitors, Figure 3 shows data for only 415 respondents.

Questions answered incorrectly due to carelessness, misunderstanding directions and so forth, turn up in the data as reporting errors. These create small data inconsistencies.

**Limitations**

Like all surveys, this study has limitations which should be considered when interpreting the results.

1. It is not possible to know whether visitor responses reflect actual behavior. This disadvantage applies to all such studies and is reduced by having visitors fill out the questionnaire soon after they visit the park.

2. The data reflect visitor use patterns of visitors to the Bandelier parking lot during the study period of July 7-13, 1995. The results do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year or other parts of the monument.

3. Caution is advised when interpreting any data with a sample size of less than 30, as the results may be unreliable. Whenever the sample size is less than 30, the word “CAUTION!” is included in the graph, figure or table.

**Special conditions**

According to Bandelier staff, the summer season at Bandelier is usually very crowded. The monument staff were interested in discovering visitor perceptions of crowding. However, the week of July 7-13, 1995 received lower visitation than expected for that period. Therefore, questions on crowding may not represent typical summer visitation. It was also very hot during the survey period. Temperatures were at or above 100 degrees F. on most of these days.

**Visitors contacted**


Results

Five hundred thirty-one visitor groups were contacted; 98% accepted questionnaires. Four hundred twenty-two visitor groups completed and returned their questionnaires, an 81% response rate.

Table 1 compares information collected from the total sample of visitors contacted and the actual respondents who returned questionnaires. Based on the variables of age and group size, non-response bias was insignificant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Actual Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor age (yrs.)</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visitor Characteristics

**Visitor ages**

Bandelier visitors were asked to report the current age of each person in their group (for up to 7 people). Figure 1 shows that visitor ages ranged from one to 85. The largest cluster of visitors were between 36 and 55 years old (44%). Twenty-one percent of the visitors were 15 or younger.

Figure 1. Visitor ages
Visitor disabilities

Visitors were asked if they, or anyone in their group had any disabilities which limited their visit to Bandelier. Eight percent of the visitor groups reported that a disability did limit their visit. As shown in Figure 2, 85% of visitors with a disability stated that it was due to limited mobility, and 12% reported having a hearing disability.

Figure 2. Disability that limited visit to Bandelier

Ethnic background

Visitors were asked to list the ethnic backgrounds represented by the individuals in their group. Ninety percent of Bandelier visitors were white, not of Hispanic origin (see Figure 3). Hispanic was the second largest group and comprised 8% of the visitors. Five percent of the visitors stated that they did not wish to answer.

Figure 3. Ethnic background of visitors
Visitor residence

Visitors from foreign countries comprised 6% of Bandelier visitors. Table 2 shows that international visitors came from 21 countries, including France (23%), Germany (14%), Australia (7%) and Norway (7%).

Table 2. International visitors by country of residence N=74 individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of visitors</th>
<th>Percent of International visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visitor residence

United States visitors came from New Mexico (21%), Texas (16%), California (10%), 41 other states and Washington, D.C. (see Map 1 and Table 3).

Table 3. United States visitors by state of residence
N=1,183 individuals; percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of visitors</th>
<th>Percent of U.S. visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other states (29) &amp; Washington D.C.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 1. Proportion of United States visitors by state
**Group type**

Sixty-four percent of Bandelier visitors were part of a family group (see Figure 4). Eighteen percent of visitors were with friends. Other group types reported by visitors included youth group, church group, motorcycle group, co-workers, day camp and tour groups.

![Figure 4. Type of visitor group](image)

**Guided tour groups**

Bandelier visitors were asked if they were with a guided tour group. Figure 5 shows that 4% stated that they were with a tour group.

![Figure 5. Guided tour groups](image)
Group size

Forty-two percent of Bandelier visitor groups consisted of two people and 21% were in groups of four, as illustrated in Figure 6. Group size ranged from 1 to 42. The average group size was 3.7 people.

Number of visits

Figure 7 shows that 73% of visitors were visiting Bandelier for the first time. Eighteen percent of visitors had visited between 2 and 4 times.
Trip Characteristics

Length of stay (<24 hours)

Visitors were asked to report the number of hours (if less than 24) or days (if 24 or greater) spent at Bandelier during this visit. Fifty-five percent of Bandelier day visitors stayed 3 or 4 hours at the site (see Figure 8). Twenty-two percent of the day visitors spent from 6 to 23 hours at Bandelier.

Length of stay (days)

Thirteen percent of Bandelier visitors spent 24 or more hours at the site. Seventy-nine percent of these visitors spent 2 or 3 days at Bandelier as shown in Figure 9.

Figure 8. Length of stay (less than 24 hours)

Figure 9. Length of stay (24 hours or more)
**Sites visited**

The most visited sites at Bandelier were the visitor center (91%), the Ruins Trail (91%) and the Ceremonial Cave (63%), as illustrated by Map 2. Approximately one-third of the visitors stopped at the picnic area (35%) or the overlook (30%). The least visited sites were Tsankawi (5%) and the backcountry (4%).

---

**Map 2. Sites visited at Bandelier (N=399 visitor groups)**
Sites visited first

Sixty-one percent of Bandelier visitors stopped at the visitor center first (see Figure 10). The overlook (12%), the campground (10%) and the Ruins Trail (7%) were the first stops for smaller percentages of visitors.

Figure 10. Sites visited first
Visitor Activities

Activities

Visitors were asked to report all of the activities that they or their group participated in during this visit to Bandelier. Most visitors reported visiting the ruins (96%), as shown in Figure 11. Seventy percent of visitors viewed the museum exhibits. A visit to Yapashi/Stone lions (3%) and camping in the wilderness (2%) were activities with the least participation. Ten percent of the visitors reported participating in "other" activities which are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ate lunch/snack bar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hike/backpack</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend ranger talk/tour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Ceremonial Cave</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Tsankwi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waded in stream</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had coffee with ranger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Painted Caves</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Visitor activities
**Use of visitor services**

The most commonly used interpretive or visitor services were the visitor center (94%), the self-guided Ruins Trail Guide (73%) and the museum exhibits (68%), as shown in Figure 12. The least used services were the campfire programs (9%) and the foreign language brochure (1%).

![Figure 12. Use of interpretive or visitor services](image-url)
Use of park facilities

The most commonly used facilities used by Bandelier visitors were the restrooms (94%), the Ruins Trail (92%) and the Ceremonial Cave (61%), as shown in Figure 13. The least used facilities were the backcountry trails (6%) and handicapped access (1%).

Figure 13. Use of park facilities
Visitor Opinions

Appropriate activities

Visitors were asked to rate how appropriate they felt each of six activities were at Bandelier. Figures 14–19 illustrate how visitor groups rated each of the six items. Ninety-one percent of the visitors stated that it was never appropriate to collect artifacts (see Figure 19), 84% felt that it was never appropriate to feed animals (see Figure 18) and 80% felt it was never appropriate to collect plants (see Figure 17). Thirty-four percent of visitors felt that it was never appropriate to explore ruins in caves (see Figure 14).

Figure 14. Appropriateness of exploring ruins in caves

Figure 15. Appropriateness of walking off-trail among the ruins
Appropriate activities

**Figure 16. Appropriateness of walking / sitting on ruin walls**

**Figure 17. Appropriateness of collecting plants**
**Appropriate activities**

**Figure 18. Appropriateness of feeding animals**

**Figure 19. Appropriateness of collecting artifacts**
**Overall crowding**

Visitors were asked "Overall, how crowded did you and your group feel during this visit to Bandelier?" Seventy percent of the visitors felt somewhat crowded or moderately crowded (see Figure 20). Twenty-four percent of the visitors stated that they did not feel at all crowded.

![Figure 20. Overall crowding at Bandelier](image)

**Crowding**

Bandelier visitors were asked how crowded they felt at five different areas of the park. Figures 21–25 illustrate how each of the five areas were rated. Fifty-seven percent of visitors felt "extremely" or "quite" crowded in the parking lot (see Figure 21). The visitor center was rated "somewhat" to "moderately" crowded by 61% of the visitors (see Figure 22). Sixty-one percent of visitors stated that the restrooms were "not at all" crowded (see Figure 25).

![Figure 21. Crowding in parking lot (number of vehicles)](image)
Crowding

Figure 22. Crowding in visitor center

Figure 23. Crowding on Ruins Trail
Crowding

Figure 24. Crowding at Ceremonial Cave

Figure 25. Crowding at restrooms
**Future use of shuttle bus**

Visitors were asked if they would use a shuttle bus system on a future visit to Bandelier. Fifty-two percent said that they would likely use this service (see Figure 26). Twenty-seven percent of visitors said it was unlikely they would use a shuttle, and 21% stated that they were not sure.

![Figure 26. Willing to use a shuttle bus system](image)

**Paying to use shuttle bus**

Forty-two percent of Bandelier visitors claimed that they would not be willing to pay a modest fee to use the shuttle bus (see Figure 27). Nineteen percent of visitors felt they would likely be willing to pay, and 39% of the visitors were not sure.

![Figure 27. Willing to pay a fee to use a shuttle bus](image)
Options for reducing congestion

Visitors preferred either adopting a shuttle bus system (43%) or using a first come, first served option (36%) to reduce visitor congestion at Bandelier (see Figure 28). The least preferred option was raising fees (6%). "Other" suggestions/comments are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We saw no need</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle during peak hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of all methods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of reservation and shuttle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tours</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave it as it is</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestions</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28. Options for reducing congestion
Importance & quality of interpretive or visitor services

Visitors were asked to rate the importance and quality of the interpretive or visitor services that they used during this visit to Bandelier. They were asked to rate 13 items using a five point scale for both importance and quality (see example scales at right).

Figure 29-A, on the next page, shows the average importance and quality scores plotted for each interpretive or visitor service. An average score was determined for each service based on ratings by visitors that used that service. All of the interpretive or visitor services were rated above average in importance and quality.

NOTE: foreign language brochures were not rated by enough visitors to provide reliable information.
Importance & quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 29-A. Average ratings of interpretive or visitor services importance and quality

Figure 29-B. Detail of average ratings of interpretive or visitor services
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figures 30-42 show that several interpretive or visitor services received the highest "very important" to "extremely important" ratings: guided walks (89%), self-guided Ruins Trail Guide (88%), park personnel (84%) and trail exhibits (84%). The highest "not important" rating was for the self-guided Ruins Trail Guide (7%).

Figure 30. Importance of guided walks

Figure 31. Importance of self-guided Ruins Trail Guide
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 32. Importance of park personnel

Figure 33. Importance of trail exhibits
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 34. Importance of visitor center

Figure 35. Importance of information desk service
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 36. Importance of other brochures

Figure 37. Importance of museum exhibits
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 38. Importance of entrance station information/service

Figure 39. Importance of campfire programs
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 40. Importance of foreign language brochure

Figure 41. Importance of slide show/video
Importance of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 42. Importance of book sales area
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figures 43-55 show that several interpretive or visitor services received the highest "good" to "very good" ratings: campfire programs (91%), guided walks (90%), self-guided Ruins Trail Guide (89%) and park personnel (88%). The service receiving the most "very poor" ratings was the slide show/video (6%).

Figure 43. Quality of campfire programs

Figure 44. Quality of guided walks
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 45. Quality of self-guided Ruins Trail Guide

Figure 46. Quality of park personnel
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 47. Quality of information desk service

Figure 48. Quality of visitor center
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 49. Quality of other brochures

Figure 50. Quality of trail exhibits
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 51. Quality of entrance station information

Figure 52. Quality of museum exhibits
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 53. Quality of book sales area

Figure 54. Quality of foreign language brochure
Quality of interpretive or visitor services

Figure 55. Quality of slide show/video
Importance & quality of park facilities

Visitors were asked to rate the importance and quality of the park facilities that they used during this visit to Bandelier. They were asked to rate 11 items using a five point scale for both importance and quality (see example scales at right).

Figure 56-A, on the next page, shows the average importance and quality scores plotted for each park facility. An average score was determined for each facility based on ratings by visitors that used that facility. All of the park facilities were rated above average in importance and quality.

NOTE: backcountry trails and handicapped access were not rated by enough visitors to provide reliable information.
Importance & quality
of park facilities

Figure 56-A. Average ratings of park facilities
importance and quality

Figure 56-B. Detail of average ratings of park facilities
Importance of park facilities

Figures 57–67 show that several park facilities received the highest "very important" to "extremely important" ratings: Ruins Trail (93%), campground (92%) and the restrooms (90%). The facility receiving the highest "not important" rating was the gift shop (8%).

Figure 57. Importance of the Ruins Trail

Figure 58. Importance of the campground
Importance of park facilities

Figure 59. Importance of restrooms

Figure 60. Importance of the Ceremonial Cave
Importance of park facilities

Figure 61. Importance of the Falls Trail

Figure 62. Importance of backcountry trails
**Importance of park facilities**

Figure 63. Importance of park directional signs

Figure 64. Importance of handicapped access
Importance of park facilities

Figure 65. Importance of the picnic area

Figure 66. Importance of concession snack bar
Importance of park facilities

Figure 67. Importance of the gift shop
Quality of park facilities

Figures 68–78 show that several park facilities received the highest "good" to "very good" ratings: Ruins Trail (92%), Falls Trail (89%) and the Ceremonial Cave (88%). The facilities receiving the most "very poor" ratings were the Ruins Trail (3%), the Ceremonial Cave (3%), park directional signs (3%) and the gift shop (3%).

Figure 68. Quality of handicapped access

Figure 69. Quality of Ruins Trail
Quality of park facilities

Figure 70. Quality of Falls Trail

Figure 71. Quality of Ceremonial Cave
Quality of park facilities

Figure 72. Quality of park directional signs

Figure 73. Quality of backcountry trails
Quality of park facilities

Figure 74. Quality of campground

Figure 75. Quality of picnic area
Quality of park facilities

Figure 76. Quality of the gift shop

Figure 77. Quality of restrooms
Quality of park facilities

Figure 78. Quality of the concession snack bar
Overall quality of visitor services

Sixty-one percent of Bandelier visitors rated the overall quality of visitor services as "very good" and 34% rated them as "good" (see Figure 79). Less than 7% of the visitors rated the overall quality of visitor services as "average," "poor," or "very poor."

Figure 79. Overall quality of visitor services
What visitors liked most

Visitors were asked what they liked most about their visit to Bandelier. Eighty-nine percent of the visitor groups (371) provided one or more statements. Many visitors liked the ruins and the Ruins Trail, the beauty and scenery of the area, the Ceremonial Cave and the friendly and helpful park staff (see Table 4).

Table 4. Summary of visitors' likes
N=773 comments from 371 visitor groups; many visitors made more than one comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff friendly/helpful</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide who led tour</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park rangers friendly/helpful/knowledgeable</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins Trail Guide</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center/information provided</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature trail</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campfire program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature trail signs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail guide informative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided trail</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/exhibits</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger talks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/bookstore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee with ranger program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger hike at night</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for/information about American Indians</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins Trail</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground/campsite</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park clean/well maintained</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Trail</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail maintenance</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of ruins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial Cave ladder</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms clean</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of trail</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail well marked</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground clean</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of ruins</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site well designed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlook trail</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of cave dwellings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Summary of visitors' likes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial Cave</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncrowded conditions</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff dwellings</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife sightings</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry/hike</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commercialism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park setting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsankawi ruins</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing bats/bats leaving cave</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiva</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail uncrowded</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/shade</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspoiled site</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroglyphs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls trail uncrowded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves well preserved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Cave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing/seeing coyotes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflowers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Impressions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful/scenery</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful/quiet</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering caves</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing ladders</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing the past</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to go at own pace</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed visit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitude</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual nature of park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring on own</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being outdoors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to visit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What visitors liked least

Visitors were asked what they liked least about their visit to Bandelier. Seventy-one percent of the visitor groups (298) provided one or more statements. Table 5 shows that among visitors' dislikes were the hot temperatures, lack of parking and overcrowding.

Table 5. Summary of visitors' dislikes
N=397 comments from 298 visitor groups; many visitors made more than one comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff not friendly/helpful</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of rangers to enforce rules along trails</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession staff not friendly/helpful/knowledgeable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interpretive signs on trail</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video was broken</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide show was poor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center hours too short</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being told about trail guide</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of warning about trail conditions/safety</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information on various subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long time between video showings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium had no air conditioning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about Anasazi people</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center crowded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No guide available</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins information/Trail Guide should be free</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion on trail/caves/ruins</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of drinking water</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom/outhouse quality poor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of showers at campground</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial Cave ladder/other ladders unsafe</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for restrooms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails poorly marked</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campsites</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No shade trees along trail</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail/cliff dwellings prevent accessibility for some</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail condition poor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of picnic areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of campsites</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long walk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Summary of visitors' dislikes  
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack bar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift shop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack bar food</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift shop expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snacks expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other campers noisy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance fees expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet kennel not provided</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough caves open</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti in caves</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging animals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Impressions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot temperatures/weather</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors who did not respect ruins/vandalism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupervised children</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who disregarded rules about ruins</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who disregard rules</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car accident</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future planning proposals

Visitors were asked, "If you were a manager planning for the future of Bandelier National Monument, what would you propose? Please be specific." Sixty percent of the visitor groups (255) responded to the question. The most frequently listed comments included: use a shuttle bus system, stress preservation of resources, expand the parking area, and provide more information/exhibits at each site. A summary of visitor proposals appears in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of future planning proposals

N=510 comments from 255 visitor groups; many visitors made more than one comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more rangers on trails</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use more volunteers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more information/exhibits at each site</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include more Pueblo Indian information</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more guided tours</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage historical re-enactments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand visitor center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more information in visitor center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the slide show</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add exhibits to visitor center</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase publicity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include more archeology information</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more information on available activities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more ranger-led programs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand interpretive programs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more historical information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve map/guide</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a variety of films</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate visitors about proper behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer self-guided audio tours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarge visitor center auditorium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include information on other Pueblo Indian sites</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more variety in bookstore</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend visitor center hours during summer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer backcountry trips</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more childrens activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce a model of the ruins in the visitor center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand parking area</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide drinking water on trails</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer showers at campground</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build parking lot at entrance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install better directional signs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve picnic areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make more trails</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more restrooms</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve restrooms</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post better safety warnings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more shaded areas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6. Summary of future planning proposals (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase handicap accessibility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to more ruins</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put restrooms on trail</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more benches</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build loop trail to Ceremonial Cave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct more backcountry trails</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve campgrounds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve snack bar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce snack bar/gift shop prices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a restaurant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand gift shop selection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer lodging</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement a shuttle bus system</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase entrance fees</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit number of visitors</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more enforcement on trails</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run shuttle bus only during busy times</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that shuttle bus fee is part of entrance fee</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a reservation system</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase safety awareness at Ceremonial Cave</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not implement a shuttle bus system</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve local community in planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct fund raising events</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not increase entrance fees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress resource preservation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit commercialism</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-introduce wolves</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Impressions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make no changes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not feel crowded</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Additional comments**

Visitors were asked, "Is there anything else you and your group would like to tell us about your visit to Bandelier National Monument?" Forty-one percent of the visitor groups (174) responded to the question. As shown in Table 7, most of the comments were positive statements about the well maintained facilities, the park staff, and general impressions on how visitors enjoyed their visit and plan to return.

**Table 7. Summary of additional comments**

N=311 comments from 174 visitor groups; many visitors made more than one comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/rangers helpful/friendly</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center staff rude at closing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed tour</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked interpretive signs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more cultural information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed night walk tour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked campfire program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park is well maintained</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed backcountry trails</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked hiking trails</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Ceremonial Cave safer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use shuttle bus system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress preservation of resources</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit commercialism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Summary of additional comments
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Impressions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed visit</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We plan to return</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up the great work</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have visited many times</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish we had more time</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park is beautiful</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park is a wonderful place</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children enjoyed park</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight of our vacation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting/educational</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pleasant surprise</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not feel crowded</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of my favorite national parks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good luck</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed by visit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw little impact from crowds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park too crowded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Analysis

Bandelier National Monument

The Visitor Services Project (VSP) offers you the opportunity to learn more from your VSP Visitor Study.

Additional Analysis:
Additional analysis can be requested using the park’s VSP Visitor Study data. Two-way and three-way cross tabulations can be conducted for any of the characteristics, activities and opinions listed below. In your request be as specific as possible — you may select a single program/service/facility instead of all that were listed in the questionnaire. Include your name, address and phone number in the request.

Visitor Characteristics
- Visitor ages
- Visitor disabilities
- Ethnic background
- Visitor residence
- Group type
- Guided tour groups
- Group size
- Number of visits

Trip Characteristics
- Length of stay (<24 hours)
- Length of stay (days)
- Sites visited
- Sites visited first

Visitor Activities
- Activities
- Use of visitor services
- Use of park facilities

Visitor Opinions
- Appropriate activities
- Overall crowding
- Crowding
- Future use of shuttle bus
- Paying to use shuttle bus
- Options for reducing congestion
- Importance of visitor services
- Quality of visitor services
- Importance of park facilities
- Quality of park facilities
- Overall quality of visitor services

VSP Database:
A database is being created containing all of the VSP visitor study results from 1988 to the present. The database became operational in April 1996. To use the database it will be necessary to have a database catalog, which lists the information contained in the VSP Database. Queries to the database will be accepted by phone, mail, cc:mail, e-mail or fax and the same forms of media will be used to return answers to you. Through the database, you can learn how the results of this VSP Visitor Study compare with those across the nation, within a specific region or with other national monuments. Data can also be compared in many other ways. Contact the VSP for details and to receive a catalog.

Phone/send requests to:
Visitor Services Project, CPSU
College of Forestry, Wildlife, and Range Sciences
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho  83844-1133
Phone:  208-885-7863
FAX:   208-885-4261
e-mail:  littlej@uidaho.edu
Visitor Services Project Publications

Reports 1-4 (pilot studies) are available from the University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit. All VSP reports listed below are available from the parks where the studies were conducted.

1985
5. North Cascades National Park Service Complex
6. Crater Lake National Park

1986
7. Gettysburg National Military Park
8. Independence National Historical Park
9. Valley Forge National Historical Park
10. Colonial National Historical Park
11. Grand Teton National Park
12. Harpers Ferry National Historical Park
13. Mesa Verde National Park
14. Shenandoah National Park
15. Yellowstone National Park
16. Independence National Historical Park: Four Seasons Study

1987
17. Glen Canyon National Recreational Area
18. Denali National Park and Preserve
20. Craters of the Moon National Monument

1988
21. Everglades National Park
22. Statue of Liberty National Monument
23. The White House Tours, President's Park (summer)
24. Lincoln Home National Historical Site
25. Yellowstone National Park
26. Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area
27. Muir Woods National Monument

1989
28. Canyonlands National Park
29. White Sands National Monument
30. National Monuments
31. Kenai Fjords National Park
32. Gateway National Recreation Area
33. Petersburg National Battlefield
34. Death Valley National Monument
35. Glacier National Park
36. Scott's Bluff National Monument
37. John Day Fossil Beds National Monument

1990
38. Jean Lafitte National Historical Park
39. Joshua Tree National Monument
40. The White House Tours, President's Park (spring)
41. Natchez Trace Parkway

1991 (continued)
42. Stehekin-North Cascades NP/ Lake Chelan NRA
43. City of Rocks National Reserve
44. The White House Tours, President's Park (fall)

1992
45. Big Bend National Park
46. Frederick Douglass National Historic Site
47. Glen Echo Park
48. Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site
49. Jefferson National Expansion Memorial
50. Zion National Park
51. New River Gorge National River
52. Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park
53. Arlington House-The Robert E. Lee Memorial

1993
54. Belle Haven Park/Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve
55. Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area
56. Whitman Mission National Historic Site
57. Sitka National Historical Park
58. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (summer)
59. Redwood National Park
60. Channel Islands National Park
61. Pecos National Historical Park
62. Canyon de Chelly National Monument
63. Bryce Canyon National Park

1994
64. Death Valley National Monument Backcountry
65. San Antonio Missions National Historical Park
66. Anchorage Alaska Public Lands Information Center
67. Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts
68. Nez Perce National Historical Park
69. Edison National Historic Site
70. San Juan Island National Historical Park
71. Canaveral National Seashore
72. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (fall)
73. Gettysburg National Battlefield

1995
74. Grand Teton National Park (winter)
75. Yellowstone National Park (winter)
76. Bandelier National Monument

For more information about the Visitor Services Project, please contact
Dr. Gary E. Machlis, Sociology Project Leader, University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit,
College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences, Moscow, Idaho 83844-1133 or call (208) 885-7129.