


Priest Hole Camp 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 24 BLM recreation sites in 13 states during fiscal year 2011 (FY11). The survey was developed to measure each site's performance related to BLM GPRA Goal 3.1 - *Provide for a quality recreation experience, including access, and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources on DOI managed and partnered lands and waters*; and Goal 3.2 - *Provide for and receive fair value in recreation*. The information collected during the survey will also help the BLM better serve the public. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data regarding visitor information (i.e., use of maps, signs, brochures), developed facilities, managing recreation use, resource management, BLM staff and customer service, and educational and interpretive materials.

The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Priest Hole Camp Area are summarized in this data report. A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on the next page. Below (left) is a graph summarizing visitor opinions of the "overall quality of recreation experience." The satisfaction measure next to this graph is a combined percentage of "good" and "very good" responses. This is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.1 and should be used for reporting performance for this goal (NOTE: the satisfaction measure may not equal the sum of "very good" and "good" percentages due to rounding).

The response rate for this site survey was 96%. The graph and satisfaction measure summarizing visitor opinions of the "value for fee paid", which is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.2, can be found on page 9.



FY11 Satisfaction measure: 87%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

**FY11 GPRA
Satisfaction Measure**
Percentage of site visitors satisfied
overall with appropriate facilities,
services, and recreational opportunities:

87%



Priest Hole Camp Area Research Methods




Understanding the Results

Inside this report are graphs that illustrate the survey results. The report contains 8 categories of data regarding BLM amenities, staff, and services plus selected demographics. Within these categories are graphs for each indicator evaluated by site visitors. For example, the Visitor Information category includes indicators such as “providing useful maps and brochures,” “adequate signs on site for direction,” and so forth. In each category there is a graph entitled “Everything Considered”. This graph is the basis for determining visitor satisfaction for each category and GPRA reporting numbers.

Each graph includes the following information:

- The number of visitor responses for the indicator;
- The percentage of responses which were "very good," "good," "average," "poor," and "very poor;"
- A "satisfaction measure" that combines the percentage of total responses which were "very good" or "good;" and
- An average evaluation score (mean score) based on the following values: very poor= 1, poor= 2, average= 3, good= 4, very good= 5.



- The higher the average evaluation score, the more positive the visitor response
- Graph percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding

Research Methods

Surveys were distributed to a random sample of visitors at this site during a selected period in FY11. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 96% of those randomly sampled responded to the survey. The data reflect visitor opinions about this site's facilities, management, services, educational opportunities, and fees during the survey period. Visitor activities and selected demographics were also captured. A representative sample of the general visitor population were surveyed at selected locations. The results do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year, or visitors who did not visit the survey locations on site.

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

All percentage calculations were rounded to the nearest percent.

The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report. The sample size (n) varies from figure to figure, depending on the number of responses.

Caution is advised when interpreting any data with a sample size of less than 30. In such cases, the word “CAUTION!” is included in the graph. This report excludes any indicator with less than 10 responses.

For most indicators, the survey data are expected to be accurate with in $\pm 6\%$ with 95% confidence. This means that if different samples had been drawn, the results would have been similar ($\pm 6\%$) 95 out of 100 times.


For more information about this survey, contact Jennifer Hoyer Russell, BLM Survey Project Coordinator at the University of Idaho Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806



Priest Hole Camp Area Visitor Information

Providing useful maps and brochures


FY11: 54 respondents



FY11 Satisfaction measure: 59%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Providing useful information on the Internet


FY11: 39 respondents



FY11: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations


FY11: 69 respondents



FY11 Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation


FY11: 71 respondents



FY11: Satisfaction measure: 61%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information

FY11: 69 respondents




FY11: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Priest Hole Camp Area Developed Facilities



Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles

FY11: 72 respondents




FY11

Satisfaction measure: 63%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

Maintaining a clean site

FY11: 71 respondents




FY11:

Satisfaction measure: 75%
Average evaluation score: 4

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use

FY11: 46 respondents




FY11

Satisfaction measure: 76%
Average evaluation score: 4

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities

FY11: 63 respondents




FY11:

Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities

FY11: 69 respondents



FY11:


Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1



Priest Hole Camp Area Managing Visitor and Recreation Use

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles

FY11: 61 respondents




FY11

Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.8

Managing the number of people

FY11: 60 respondents




FY11:

Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4

Keeping noise at appropriate levels

FY11: 63 respondents




FY11

Satisfaction measure: 83%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Providing sufficient law enforcement presence to prevent crime

FY11: 54 respondents




FY11:

Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

FY11: 64 respondents



FY11:


Satisfaction measure: 77%
Average evaluation score: 4

Priest Hole Camp Area Resource Management



Adequately protecting the natural resources


FY11: 68 respondents



FY11 Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection


FY11: 64 respondents



FY11: Satisfaction measure: 80%
Average evaluation score: 4.1

Adequately protecting the cultural resources


FY11: 58 respondents



FY11 Satisfaction measure: 84%
Average evaluation score: 4.2

Everything considered: BLM protection of natural and cultural resources

FY11: 69 respondents




FY11: Satisfaction measure: 81%
Average evaluation score: 4.1



Priest Hole Camp Area BLM Staff and Service

Staff treated me courteously

FY11: 60 respondents




FY11

Satisfaction measure: 97%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area

FY11: 51 respondents




FY11:

Satisfaction measure: 92%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area

FY11: 53 respondents




FY11

Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff

FY11: 60 respondents



FY11:


Satisfaction measure: 95%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Priest Hole Camp Area

Providing Educational and Interpretive Material




Providing *quality* educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site




FY11: Satisfaction measure: 74%
Average evaluation score: 3.7

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




FY11: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 3.9

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



FY11: Satisfaction measure: 65%
Average evaluation score: 3.5

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program




FY11: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 3.7



Priest Hole Camp Area Fees

Total fees paid

FY11: 72 respondents



How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?

FY11: 7 respondents

Rating

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.

FY11: 6 respondents

Rating

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

Commercial Recreation Operations

Quality of Commercial Services

FY11: 8 respondents

Rating


The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

Priest Hole Camp Area Primary Activities at this Site/Area



Primary activities

FY11: 70 respondents**



** Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.

Programs (interpretive, walk, tour, exhibit, presentations, etc.)

Quality of program(s) attended

FY11: 9 respondents

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.


FY11

Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.6




Priest Hole Camp Area Demographics


Visitor group composition




Number of adults (18 and over) in group




Number of teenagers (13-17) in group




Number of children (under 12) in group



Respondent age



Gender




Priest Hole Camp Area Accessibility to Visitors with Disabilities



Ability to adequately use the facilities


FY11: 11 respondents



FY11: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

Ability to access exhibits, waysides, etc.

FY11: 10 respondents



FY11: Satisfaction measure: 70%
Average evaluation score: 4

Ability to understand the messages

FY11: 9 respondents

Rating

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Ability to use the services in this area

FY11: 9 respondents

Rating

The chart for this question has been excluded because there were fewer than 10 responses. See page 2 for discussion regarding the required minimum response count.

FY11: Satisfaction measure: 78%
Average evaluation score: 4.2