



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Natural Resource
Manager

National Visitor
Use Monitoring
Program



Last updated:
28 September 2016

Visitor Use Report

Coronado NF

USDA Forest Service

Region 3

National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2007

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Scope and purpose of the National Visitor Use Monitoring program
- 1.2. Methods
- 1.3. Definition of Terms
- 1.4. Limitations of the Results

2. Visitation Estimates

- 2.1 Forest Definition of Site Days
- 2.2. Visitation Estimates

3. Description of the Recreation Visit

- 3.1. Demographics
- 3.2. Visit Descriptions
- 3.3. Activities

4. Economic Information

- 4.1. Spending Segments
- 4.2. Spending Profiles
- 4.3. Total Direct Spending
- 4.4. Other Visit Information
- 4.5. Household Income
- 4.6. Substitute Behavior

5. Satisfaction Information

- 5.1. Crowding
- 5.2. Disabilities

6. Wilderness Visit Demographics

7. Appendix Tables

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Scope and purpose of the National Visitor Use Monitoring program

The National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) program provides reliable information about recreation visitors to national forest system managed lands at the national, regional, and forest level. Information about the quantity and quality of recreation visits is required for national forest plans, Executive Order 12862 (Setting Customer Service Standards), and implementation of the National Recreation Agenda. To improve public service, the agency's Strategic and Annual Performance Plans require measuring trends in user satisfaction and use levels. NVUM information assists Congress, Forest Service leaders, and program managers in making sound decisions that best serve the public and protect valuable natural resources by providing science based, reliable information about the type, quantity, quality and location of recreation use on public lands. The information collected is also important to external customers including state agencies and private industry. NVUM methodology and analysis is explained in detail in the research paper entitled: Forest Service National Visitor Use Monitoring Process: Research Method Documentation; English, Kocis, Zarnoch, and Arnold; Southern Research Station; May 2002 (<http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum>).

In 1998 a team of research scientists and forest staff developed a recreation sampling system (NVUM) that provides statistical recreation use information at the forest, regional, and national level. Several Forest Service staff areas including Recreation, Wilderness, Ecosystem Management, Research and Strategic Planning and Resource Assessment were involved in developing the program. From January 2000 through September 2003 every national forest implemented this methodology and collected visitor use information. This application served to test the method over the full range of forest conditions, and to provide a rough national estimate of visitation. Implementation of the improved method began in October 2004. Once every five years, each National Forest and Grassland has a year of field data collection.

This NVUM data is useful for forest planning and decision making. The description of visitor characteristics (age, race, zip code, activity participation) can help forest staff identify their recreation niche. Satisfaction information can help management decide where best to place limited resources that would result in improved visitor satisfaction. Economic expenditure information can help forests show local communities the employment and income effects of tourism from forest visitors. In addition, the visitation estimates can be helpful in considering visitor capacity issues.

1.2. Methods

To define the sampling frame, staff on each forest classify all recreation sites and areas into five basic categories called "site types": Day Use Developed Sites (DUDS), Overnight Use Developed Sites (OUDS), Designated Wilderness Areas (Wilderness), General Forest Areas (GFA), and View Corridors (VC). Only the first four categories are counted as national forest recreation visits and are included in the visit estimates. The last category is used to track the volume of people who view national forests from nearby roads; since they do not get onto agency lands, they cannot be counted as visits. For the entire sampling year, each day on each site was given a rating of very high, high, medium, low, or no use according to the expected level of recreational visitors who would be

observed leaving that location for the last time (last exiting recreation use) on that day. The combination of a calendar day and a site or area is called a site day. Site days are the basic sampling unit for the NVUM protocol. Results of this forest categorization are shown in Table 1.

In essence, visitation is estimated through a combination of traffic counts and surveys of exiting visitors. Both are obtained on a random sample of locations and days distributed over an entire forest for a year. All of the surveyed recreation visitors are asked about their visit duration, activities, demographics, travel distance, and annual usage. About one-third were also asked a series of questions about satisfaction. Another one-third were asked to provide information about their income, spending while on their trip, and the next best substitute for the visit.

1.3. Definition of Terms

NVUM has standardized measures of visitor use to ensure that all national forest visitor measures are comparable. These definitions are basically the same as established by the Forest Service in the 1970's. Visitors must pursue a recreation activity physically located "on" Forest Service managed land in order to be counted. They cannot be passing through; viewing from non-Forest Service managed roads, or just using restroom facilities. The visitation metrics are ***national forest visits*** and ***site visits***. NVUM provides estimates of both and confidence interval statistics measuring the precision of the estimates. The NVUM methodology categorizes recreation facilities and areas into specific site types and use levels in order to develop the sampling frame. Understanding the definitions of the variables used in the sample design and statistical analysis is important in order to interpret the results.

National forest visit is the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A national forest visit can be composed of multiple site visits. The visit ends when the person leaves the national forest to spend the night somewhere else.

Site visit is the entry of one person onto a national forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. The site visit ends when the person leaves the site or area for the last time on that day.

A ***confidence interval*** is a range of values that is likely to include an unknown population value, where the range is calculated from a given set of sample data. Confidence intervals are always accompanied by a ***confidence level***, which tells the degree of certainty that the value lies in the interval. Used together these two terms define the reliability of the estimate, by defining the range of values that are needed to reach the given confidence level. For example, the 2008 national visitation estimate is 175.6 million visits, with a 90% confidence interval of 3.2%. In other words, given the NVUM data, our best estimate is 175.6 million visits, and given the underlying data, we are 90% certain that the true number is between 170.0 million and 181.2 million.

Recreation trip is the duration of time beginning when the visitor left their home and ending when they return to their home.

Site day - a day that a recreation site or area is open to the public for recreation purposes.

Proxy - information collected at a recreation site or area that is directly related to the amount of

recreation visitation received. The proxy information must pertain to all users of the site and it must be one of the proxy types allowed in the NVUM pre-work directions (fee receipts, fee envelopes, mandatory permits, permanent traffic counters, group reservations, ticket sales, and daily use records).

Nonproxy - a recreation site or area that does not have proxy information. At these sites a 24-hour traffic count is taken to measure total use for one site day at the sample site.

Use level - for each day of the year for each recreation site or area, the site day was categorized as very high, high, medium or low last exiting recreation traffic, or no exiting use. No Use could mean either that the location was administratively closed, or it was open but was expected to have zero last exiting visitors. For example a picnic area may be listed as having no use during winter months (120 days), high last exiting recreation volume on all other weekends (70 days) and medium last exiting recreation use on the remaining midweek days (175 days). This accounts for all 365 days of the year. This process was repeated for every site and area on the forest.

1.4. Limitations of the Results

The information presented here is valid and applicable at the forest, regional, and national level. It is not designed to be accurate at the district or site level. The quality of the visitation estimate is dependent on the sample design development, sampling unit selection, sample size and variability, and survey implementation. First, preliminary work conducted by forests to identify and consistently classify sites and access points according to the type and amount of expected exiting visitation is the key determinant of the validity and magnitude of the visitation estimate. Second, the success of the forest staff in accomplishing its assigned set of sample days, correctly filling out the interview forms, and following the field protocols influence the reliability of the results, variability of the visitation estimate, and validity of the visitation descriptions. Third, the variability of traffic counts within a sampling stratum affects the reliability of the visitation estimates. Fourth, the range of visitors sampled must be representative of the population of all visitors. Finally, the number of visitors sampled must be large enough to adequately control variability. The results and confidence intervals will reflect all these factors.

Confidence intervals indicate the reliability of the visitation estimate, given the underlying data. Large confidence intervals indicate high variability in the national forest visit (NFV), site visit (SV) and Wilderness visit estimates. Variance is caused primarily by a small sample size in number of days or having a few sampled days where the observed exiting visitation volume was very different from the normal range. For example, on a particular National Forest in the General Forest Area low stratum, there were 14 sample days. Of these 14 sample days, 13 days had visitation estimates between zero and twenty. The remaining day had a visitation estimate of 440. So the stratum mean was about 37 per day, standard error was about 116, and the 90% confidence interval width is 400% of the mean. Causes for such outlier observations are not known, but could include a misclassification of the day (a high use day incorrectly categorized as a low use day), unusual weather, malfunctioning traffic counter, or reporting errors. Eliminating the unusual observation from data analysis would reduce the variability. However, unless the NVUM team had reason to suspect the observation was incorrect they did not eliminate these unusual cases.

The descriptive information about national forest visitors is based upon only those visitors that were interviewed. Every effort was made to incorporate distinct seasonal use patterns and activities that

vary greatly by season into the sampling frame. The sampling plan took into account both the spatial and seasonal spread of visitation patterns across the forest. Even so, because of the small sample size of site-days, or because some user groups decline to participate in the survey, it is possible to under-represent certain user groups, particularly for activities that are quite limited in where or when they occur.

Note that the results of the NVUM activity analysis DO NOT identify the types of activities visitors would like to have offered on the national forests. It also does not tell us about displaced forest visitors, those who no longer visit the forest because the activities they desire are not offered.

Some forest visitors were counted and included in the total forest use estimate but were not surveyed. This included visitors to recreation special events and organization camps. Their characteristics are not included in the visit descriptions.

Caution should be used in interpreting any comparisons of these results with those obtained during the 2000 - 2003 period. Differences cannot be interpreted as a trend. Several method changes account for the differences, for both visitation estimates and visit characteristics. One key factor is that the first application of the NVUM process was largely a national beta-test of the method, and significant improvements occurred following it. The NVUM process entailed a completely new method and approach to measuring visitation on National Forest lands. Simply going through the NVUM process for the first time enabled forest staff to do a much better job thereafter in identifying sites, accurately classifying days into use level strata, and ensuring consistency across all locations on the forest. These improvements enhanced the validity of all aspects of the NVUM results. Sampling plans and quality control procedures were also improved.

2. VISITATION ESTIMATES

2.1. Forest Definition of Site Days

The population of site days for sampling was constructed from information provided by forest staff. For each site, each day of the year was given a rating of very high, high, medium, low, or none according to the expected volume of recreation visitors who would be leaving the site or area for the last time (last exiting recreation use). The stratum, a combination of site type and use level, was then used to construct the sampling frame. The results of the recreation site/area stratification and days sampled are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Site Days and Percentage of Days Sampled by Stratum

| Stratum* | | Days Sampled | Site Days# in Use Level/Proxy Population | Sampling Rate (%)& |
|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------|
| Site Type† | Use Level‡ or Proxy Code§ | | | |
| DUDS | VERY HIGH | 9 | 61 | 14.8 |
| DUDS | HIGH | 30 | 358 | 8.4 |
| DUDS | MEDIUM | 18 | 591 | 3.0 |
| DUDS | LOW | 7 | 4,336 | 0.2 |
| OU DS | HIGH | 12 | 71 | 16.9 |
| OU DS | MEDIUM | 8 | 373 | 2.1 |
| OU DS | LOW | 9 | 3,518 | 0.3 |
| OU DS | DUR4 | 11 | 365 | 3.0 |
| OU DS | FR5 | 4 | 55 | 7.3 |
| OU DS | RE4 | 8 | 722 | 1.1 |
| GFA | VERY HIGH | 10 | 70 | 14.3 |
| GFA | HIGH | 27 | 547 | 4.9 |
| GFA | MEDIUM | 23 | 1,039 | 2.2 |
| GFA | LOW | 11 | 9,994 | 0.1 |
| WILDERNESS | HIGH | 25 | 430 | 5.8 |
| WILDERNESS | MEDIUM | 17 | 1,272 | 1.3 |
| WILDERNESS | LOW | 7 | 4,862 | 0.1 |
| Total | | 236 | 28,664 | 0.8 |

* Stratum is the combination of the site type and use level or proxy code. Sample days were independently drawn within each stratum.

† DUDS = Day Use Developed Site, OU DS = Overnight Use Developed Site, GFA = General Forest Area ("Undeveloped Areas"), WILDERNESS = Designated Wilderness

‡ Use level was defined independently by each forest by defining the expected number of recreation visitors that would be last-exiting a site or area on a given day. The forest developed the range for very high, high, medium, and low and then assigned each day of the year to one of the use levels.

§ Proxy Code - If the site or area already had counts of use (such as fee envelopes or ski lift tickets) the site was called a proxy site and sampled independent of nonproxy sites.

Site Days are days that a recreation site or area is open to the public for recreation purposes.

& 0.0 - This value is less than five one-hundredths.

2.2. Visitation Estimates

Visitation estimates are available at the national, regional, and forest level. This document provides only National Forest level data. Other documents may be obtained through the National Visitor Use Monitoring web page: www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum.

When reviewing the results, users should discuss with forest staff if this forest experienced any unusual circumstances such as forest fires, floods, or atypical weather that may have created an unusual recreation use pattern for the year sampled. Table 2 displays the number of national forest visits and site visits by site type for this National Forest.

Table 2. Annual Visitation Estimate

| Visit Type | Visits (1,000s) | 90% Confidence Level (%)# |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Total Estimated Site Visits* | 2,517 | ±16.3 |
| → Day Use Developed Site Visits | 786 | ±20.7 |
| → Overnight Use Developed Site Visits | 275 | ±43.7 |
| → General Forest Area Visits | 924 | ±36.6 |
| → Designated Wilderness Visits† | 532 | ±21.4 |
| Total Estimated National Forest Visits§ | 2,082 | ±15.8 |
| → Special Events and Organized Camp Use‡ | 74 | ±0.0 |

* A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a National Forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time.

† Designated Wilderness visits are included in the Site Visits estimate.

‡ Special events and organizational camp use are not included in the Site Visit estimate, only in the National Forest Visits estimate. Forests reported the total number of participants and observers so this number is not estimated; it is treated as 100% accurate.

§ A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

This value defines the upper and lower bounds of the visitation estimate at the 90% confidence level, for example if the visitation estimate is 100 +/-5%, one would say "at the 90% confidence level visitation is between 95 and 105 visits."

The quality of the use estimate is based in part on how many individuals were contacted during the sample day and how many complete interviews were obtained from which to estimate NVUM numbers and visitor descriptions. Table 3 and Table 4 display the number of visitor contacts, number of completed interviews by site type and survey form type. This information may be useful to managers when assessing how representative of all visitors the information in this report may be.

Table 3. Number of Individuals Contacted by Site Type

| Site Type | Total Individuals Contacted | Individuals Who Agreed to be Interviewed | Recreating Individuals Who Are Leaving for the Last Time That Day |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Day Use Developed Sites | 625 | 507 | 401 |
| Overnight Use Developed Sites | 678 | 520 | 289 |
| Undeveloped Areas (GFAs) | 923 | 757 | 567 |
| Designated Wilderness | 601 | 474 | 462 |
| Total | 2,827 | 2,258 | 1,719 |

Table 4. Number of Complete Interviews* by Site Type and Form Type


| Form Type† | Developed Day Use Site | Developed Overnight | Undeveloped Areas (GFAs) | Wilderness | Total |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Basic | 150 | 113 | 229 | 174 | 666 |
| Economic | 120 | 86 | 156 | 137 | 499 |
| Satisfaction | 131 | 90 | 182 | 151 | 554 |
| Total | 401 | 289 | 567 | 462 | 1,719 |

* Complete interviews are those in which the individual contacted agreed to be interviewed, was recreating on the national forest and was exiting the site or area for the last time that day.

† Form type is the type of interview form administered to the visitor. The Basic form did not ask either economic or satisfaction questions. The Satisfaction form did not ask economic questions and the Economic form did not ask satisfaction questions.

Visitors were interviewed regardless of whether they were recreating at the site or not, however the interview was discontinued after determining that the reason for visiting the site was not recreation. Figure 1 displays the various reasons visitors gave as their purpose for stopping at the sample site.

Figure 1. Purpose of Visit by Visitors Who Agreed to be Interviewed



3. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECREATION VISIT


3.1. Demographics

Descriptions of forest recreational visits were developed based upon the characteristics of interviewed visitors (respondents) and expanded to the national forest visitor population. Basic demographic information helps forest managers identify the profile of the visitors they serve. Management concerns such as providing recreation opportunities for underserved populations may be monitored with this information. Table 5, Table 6 and Table 7 provide basic demographic information about visitors interviewed regarding Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Age, respectively. Table 8 shows the 15 most common reported origins for recreation visitors. A complete list of reported zip codes for respondents is found in Appendix A. Table 9 provides information about self reported travel distance from home to the interview site.

Demographic results for the Coronado show that females comprise nearly 42 percent of visits. Racial and ethnic minorities are not uncommon, especially Hispanics (14 percent) and Native Americans (10 percent). Children under the age of 16 account for 15 percent of visits. People in their fifties and sixties make up over one-third of the visits. Most visits come from local residents – nearly seventy percent live within 50 miles of the forest. However, about one in every 6 visits is made by someone who lives over 500 miles away.

Table 5. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Gender

| Gender | Survey Respondents† | National Forest Visits (%)‡ |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Female | 1,627 | 41.1 |
| Male | 1,945 | 58.9 |
| Total | 3,572 | 100.0 |



* A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.


† Non-respondents to gender questions were excluded from analysis.

‡ Calculations are computed using weights that expand the sample of individuals to the population of National Forest Visits.

Table 6. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Race/Ethnicity

| Race † | Survey Respondents‡ | National Forest Visits (%)§ |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 11 | 9.5 |
| Asian | 5 | 2.0 |
| Black / African American | 6 | 3.2 |
| Hawaiian / Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 |
| White | 178 | 89.7 |
| Total | 200 | 104.4# |

| Ethnicity† | Survey Respondents‡ | National Forest Visits (%)§ |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Hispanic / Latino | 33 | 14.0 |



* A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

Respondents could choose more than one racial group, so the total may be more than 100%.


† Race and Ethnicity were asked as two separate questions.

‡ Non-respondents to race/ethnicity questions were excluded from analysis.

§ Calculations are computed using weights that expand the sample of individuals to the population of National Forest Visits.

Table 7. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Age

| Age Class | National Forest Visits (%)‡ |
|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Under 16 | 14.7 |
| 16-19 | 2.2 |
| 20-29 | 9.4 |
| 30-39 | 14.2 |
| 40-49 | 16.4 |
| 50-59 | 20.2 |
| 60-69 | 16.4 |
| 70+ | 6.4 |
| Total | 99.9 |



* A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

† Non-respondents to age questions were excluded from analysis.

‡ Calculations are computed using weights that expand the sample of individuals to the population of National Forest Visits.

Table 8. Top 15 Most Commonly Reported ZIP Codes, States and Counties of National Forest Survey Respondents

| ZIP Code | State | County | Percent of Respondents | Survey Respondents (n) |
|-----------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 85750 | Arizona | Pima County | 18.0 | 165 |
| 85718 | Arizona | Pima County | 11.0 | 101 |
| 85710 | Arizona | Pima County | 9.2 | 84 |
| 85716 | Arizona | Pima County | 7.4 | 68 |
| 85719 | Arizona | Pima County | 6.6 | 61 |
| 85749 | Arizona | Pima County | 6.6 | 61 |
| 85712 | Arizona | Pima County | 6.1 | 56 |
| Foreign Country | | | 5.4 | 50 |
| 85704 | Arizona | Pima County | 5.1 | 47 |
| 85715 | Arizona | Pima County | 5.0 | 46 |
| 85711 | Arizona | Pima County | 4.5 | 41 |
| 85730 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.9 | 36 |
| 85705 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.8 | 35 |
| 85741 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.7 | 34 |
| 85742 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.6 | 33 |

* Includes respondents reporting no ZIP code or an invalid ZIP code .

Table 9. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Distance Traveled

| Miles from Survey Respondent's Home to Interview Location† | National Forest Visits (%) |
|--|----------------------------|
| 0 - 25 miles | 48.5 |
| 26 - 50 miles | 19.9 |
| 51 - 75 miles | 5.0 |
| 76 - 100 miles | 3.7 |
| 101 - 200 miles | 3.6 |
| 201 - 500 miles | 2.2 |
| Over 500 miles | 17.1 |
| Total | 100.0 |

Note: Blank cells indicate that insufficient data were collected to make inferences .

* National Forest Visits are defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

† Travel distance is self-reported.

3.2. Visit Descriptions

Characteristics of the recreation visit such as length of visit, types of sites visited, activity participation and visitor satisfaction with forest facilities and services help managers understand recreation use patterns and use of facilities. This allows them to plan workforce and facility needs. The average national forest visit length of stay and average site visit length of stay by site type on this forest is displayed in Table 10. Since the average values displayed in Table 10 may be influenced by a few people staying a very long time, the median value is also shown.

Consistent with having a largely local customer base, visit durations on the Coronado are generally short. Half of the visits last three hours or less, and the overall average visit duration is just over 10 hours. The average visit duration to the undeveloped part of the forest lasts less than 5 hours. Fewer than 15 percent of visits include going to multiple locations on the forest for recreation. There do not appear to be many people who visit the forest frequently. Nearly 45 percent of visits come from people who visit the forest not more than five times per year. Only 13 percent of all visits come from people who visit more than 50 times per year.

Table 10. Visit Duration

| Visit Type | Average Duration (hours)‡ | Median Duration (hours)‡ |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Site Visit | 7.5 | 2.5 |
| Day Use Developed | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| Overnight Use Developed | 32.8 | 24.8 |
| Undeveloped Areas | 4.9 | 2.5 |
| Designated Wilderness | 4.8 | 2.6 |
| National Forest Visit | 10.8 | 3.0 |

* A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a national forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. Sites and areas were divided into four site types as listed here.

† A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

‡ If this variable is blank not enough surveys were collected to make inferences.

Many of the respondents on this National Forest went only to the site at which they were interviewed (Table 11). Some visitors went to more than one recreation site or area during their national forest visit and the average site visits per national forest visit is shown below. Also displayed are the average people per vehicle and average axles per vehicle. This information in conjunction with traffic counts was used to expand observations from individual interviews to the full forest population of recreation visitors. This information may be useful to forest engineers and others who use vehicle counters to conduct traffic studies.


During the interview, visitors were asked how often they visit this national forest for all recreational activities, and how often for their primary activity. Table 12 summarizes the percent of visits that are made by those in each frequency category for this National Forest.

Table 11. Group Characteristics

| Characteristic | Average |
|--|---------|
| Percent of visits that were to just one national forest site during the National Forest Visit* | 84.8 |
| Number of national forest sites visited on National Forest Visit* | 1.3 |
| Group Size | 2.2 |
| Axles per Vehicle | 2.0 |

Table 12. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Annual Visit Frequency

| Number of Annual Visits | Visits (%)† | Cumulative Visits (%) |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1 - 5 | 45.1 | 45.1 |
| 6 - 10 | 13.9 | 59.1 |
| 11 - 15 | 7.8 | 66.9 |
| 16 - 20 | 4.6 | 71.5 |
| 21 - 25 | 3.9 | 75.4 |
| 26 - 30 | 3.4 | 78.8 |
| 31 - 35 | 0.4 | 79.2 |
| 36 - 40 | 3.6 | 82.8 |
| 41 - 50 | 4.2 | 87.0 |
| 51 - 100 | 7.2 | 94.2 |
| 101 - 200 | 4.1 | 98.3 |
| 201 - 300 | 1.4 | 99.7 |
| Over 300 | 0.3 | 100.0 |



* A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

† The first row indicates the percent of National Forest Visits made by persons who visit 1 to 5 times per year. The last row indicates the percent of National Forest Visits made by persons who visit more than 300 times per year.

3.3. Activities

After identifying their main recreational activity, visitors were asked how many hours they spent participating in that main activity during this national forest visit. Some caution is needed when using this information. Because most national forest visitors participate in several recreation activities during each visit, it is more than likely that other visitors also participated in this activity, but did not identify it as their main activity. For example, on one national forest 63 % of visitors identified viewing wildlife as a recreational activity that they participated in during this visit, however only 3% identified that activity as their main recreational activity. The information on average hours viewing wildlife is only for the 3% who reported it as a main activity.

Hiking / walking is by far the most common primary activity. Over half of all visits to the Coronado report this as their main reason for visiting. The next most common primary activities are viewing natural features (9%) and driving for pleasure (6%). On about three-fourths of all visits, people participate in hiking or walking; participation in the two viewing activities occurs on about two-thirds of all visits.


Use of Constructed Facilities and Designated Areas

About one-third of recreation visitors interviewed were asked about whether they made use of a targeted set of facilities and special designated areas during their visit. These results are displayed in Table 14.

Table 13. Activity Participation

| Activity | % Participation* | % Main Activity‡ | Avg Hours Doing Main Activity |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Hiking / Walking | 76.4 | 53.5 | 2.7 |
| Viewing Natural Features | 67.6 | 8.8 | 2.6 |
| Viewing Wildlife | 65.9 | 4.4 | 3.2 |
| Relaxing | 47.0 | 5.0 | 7.1 |
| Driving for Pleasure | 22.8 | 5.5 | 2.8 |
| Nature Center Activities | 16.9 | 0.7 | 1.8 |
| Nature Study | 15.9 | 0.8 | 2.1 |
| Picnicking | 13.2 | 3.3 | 3.9 |
| Visiting Historic Sites | 8.4 | 0.5 | 2.5 |
| Developed Camping | 7.3 | 4.4 | 30.7 |
| Some Other Activity | 7.1 | 4.5 | 2.9 |
| OHV Use | 4.3 | 1.0 | 3.8 |
| Fishing | 3.2 | 2.0 | 6.6 |
| Hunting | 3.1 | 2.9 | 12.6 |
| Motorized Trail Activity | 3.0 | 1.2 | 2.2 |
| Primitive Camping | 2.9 | 0.7 | 23.5 |
| Gathering Forest Products | 2.6 | 0.2 | 3.0 |
| Bicycling | 1.8 | 1.0 | 4.4 |
| Backpacking | 0.9 | 0.1 | 69.4 |
| Other Non-motorized | 0.8 | 0.2 | 12.0 |
| Non-motorized Water | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Resort Use | 0.5 | 0.0 | 30.0 |
| Other Motorized Activity | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| Horseback Riding | 0.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| No Activity Reported | 0.0 | 0.1 | |
| Snowmobiling | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Motorized Water Activities | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Downhill Skiing | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cross-country Skiing | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

% Main Activity



* Survey respondents could select multiple activities so this column may total more than 100%.

† Survey respondents were asked to select just one of their activities as their main reason for the forest visit. Some respondents selected more than one, so this column may total more than 100%.

Table 14. Percent of National Forest Visits* Indicating Use of Special Facilities or Areas

| Special Facility or Area | % of National Forest Visits† |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Developed Swimming Site | 3.8 |
| Scenic Byway | 24.1 |
| Visitor Center or Museum | 23.9 |
| Designated ORV Area | 7.3 |
| Forest Roads | 8.6 |
| Interpretive Displays | 12.9 |
| Information Sites | 9.2 |
| Developed Fishing Site | 4.3 |
| Motorized Single Track Trails | 3.7 |
| Motorized Dual Track Trails | 6.8 |
| None of these Facilities | 47.8 |

* A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

† Survey respondents could select as many or as few special facilities or areas as appropriate.

4. ECONOMIC INFORMATION

Forest managers are usually very interested in the impact of National Forest recreation visits on the local economy. As commodity production of timber and other resources has declined, local communities look increasingly to tourism to support their communities. When considering recreation-related visitor spending managers are often interested both in identifying the average spending of individual visitors (or types of visitors) and the total spending associated with all recreation use. Spending averages for visitors or visitor parties can be estimated using data collected from a statistically valid visitor sampling program such as NVUM. To estimate the total spending associated with recreation use, three pieces of information are needed: an overall visitation estimate, the proportion of visits in the visitor types, and the average spending profiles for each of the visitor types. Multiplying the three gives a total amount of spending by a particular type of visitor. Summing over all visitor types gives total spending.

About one-third of the NVUM surveys included questions about trip-related spending within 50 miles of the site visited. Spending data collected from 2000 to 2003 were analyzed at Michigan State University by Dr. Daniel Stynes and Dr. Eric White. A description of that analysis and the results are in the report "Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors: NVUM four-year report", available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/NVUM4YrSpending.pdf>. Analysis of spending data for the 2005 - 2009 data collection periods was completed in summer of 2010.

4.1. Spending Segments

The spending that occurs on a recreation trip is greatly influenced by the type of recreation trip taken. For example, visitors on overnight trips away from home typically have to pay for some form of lodging (e.g., hotel/motel rooms, fees in a developed campground, etc.) while those on day trips do not. In addition, visitors on overnight trips will generally have to purchase more food during their trip (in restaurants or grocery stores) than visitors on day trips. Visitors who have not traveled far from home to the recreation location usually spend less than visitors traveling longer distances, especially on items such as fuel and food. Analysis of spending patterns has shown that a good way to construct segments of the visitor market with consistent spending patterns is the following seven groupings:

1. local visitors on day trips,
2. local visitors on overnight trips staying in lodging on the national forest,
3. local visitors on overnight trips staying in lodging off the national forest, and
4. non-local visitors on day trips,
5. non-local visitors on overnight trips staying in lodging on the national forest,
6. non-local visitors on overnight trips staying in lodging off the forest,
7. non-primary visitors.

Local visitors are those who travel less than 50 road miles from home to the recreation site visited and non-local visitors are those who travel greater than 50 road miles to the recreation site visited. Non-primary visitors are those for whom the primary purpose of their trip is something other than recreating on that national forest. Table 15 shows the distribution of visits by spending segment.


Nearly 65 percent of visits are made by local area resident on day trips away from home. Another

five percent are day trips made by non-local residents, and almost 17 percent of recreation visits to the Coronado are people whose primary recreation destination is somewhere else. A slightly larger percent of visits come from households who make over \$150,000 per year (10.7%) than from households that make less than \$25,000 (9%).

Table 15. Distribution of National Forest Visits* by Market Segment†

| | Non-Local Segments | | | Local Segments | | | Non-Primary‡ | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|
| | Day | Overnight on NF | Overnight off NF | Day | Overnight on NF | Overnight off NF | | |
| Number of National Forest Visits | 104,103 | 83,282 | 83,282 | 1,353,336 | 83,282 | 20,821 | 353,949 | 2,082,055 |
| Percent of National Forest Visits | 5 | 4 | 4 | 65 | 4 | 1 | 17 | 100 |

Percent of National Forest Visits



* A National Forest Visit is defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

† The market segments shown here relate to the type of recreation trip taken. A recreation trip is defined as the duration of time beginning when the visitor left their home and ending when they got back to their home. “Non-local” trips are those where the individual(s) traveled greater than approximately 50 miles from home to the site visited. “Day” trips do not involve an overnight stay outside the home, “overnight on-forest” trips are those with an overnight stay outside the home on National Forest System (NFS) land, and “overnight off-forest” trips are those with an overnight stay outside the home off National Forest System land.

‡ “Non-primary” trips are those where the primary recreation destination of the trip was somewhere other than the national forest under consideration.

Individuals are urged to consult an economist when interpreting the NVUM economic tables.

4.2. Spending Profiles

Spending profiles for each segment for this forest can be found in the Stynes and White report noted above. Appendix Table A-1 in that report identifies whether the forest has a high-spending profile (Table 7 of Stynes and White), an average profile (Table 5), or a low-spending profile (Table 8). It is essential to note that these spending profiles are in dollars spent per **party**. Obtaining per-visit spending is accomplished by dividing the spending for each segment by the average people per party for the forest and segment found in Appendix Table A-3 of that report.

4.3. Total Direct Spending


Total direct spending made within 50 miles of the forest and associated with national forest recreation is calculated by combining estimates of per-visit spending averages from the spending profiles with estimates of the number of national forest visits in the segment. The number of visits in the segment equals the percentage in Table 15 times the number of National Forest visits reported in Table 2.

4.4. Other Visit Information

There are several other important aspects of the trips on which the recreation visits to the forest are made. These are summarized in Table 16. The first aspect relates to total amount spent by the recreating party on the trip. This includes spending not just within 50 miles of the forest, but anywhere. The table shows both the average and the median. Another set describes the overall length of the trips on which the visits are made. The table shows the percent of the visits that were made on trips where the person stayed away from home overnight (even though the forest visit may be just a day visit), and the average total nights away from home and nights spent within 50 miles of the forest. For those spending one or more nights in or near the forest, the table shows the percentage that selected each of a series of lodging options. Together, these results help show the context of overall trip length and lodging patterns for visitors to the forest.

Table 16. Trip Spending and Lodging Usage

| Trip Spending | Value |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Average Total Trip Spending per Party | \$511 |
| Median Total Trip Spending per Party | \$45 |
| % NF Visits made on trip with overnight stay away from home | 28.5% |
| % NF Visits with overnight stay within 50 miles of NF | 25.8% |
| Mean nights/visit within 50 miles of NF | 12.5 |
| Area Lodging Use | % Visits with Nights Near Forest |
| NFS Campground on this NF | 24.9% |
| Undeveloped Camping in this NF | 8.2% |
| NFS Cabin | 5.2% |
| Other Public Campground | 1.4% |
| Private Campground | 2.0% |
| Rented Private Home | 32.8% |
| Home of Friends/Family | 20.7% |
| Own Home | 7.8% |
| Other Lodging | 2.6% |



4.5. Household Income

Visitors were asked to report a general category for their total household income. Only very general categories were used, to minimize the intrusive nature of the question. Results help indicate the overall socio-economic status of visitors to the forest, and are found in Table 17.

Table 17. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Annual Household Income

| Annual Household Income Category | National Forest Visits (%) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Under \$25,000 | 9.1 |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999 | 20.5 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 28.4 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 17.4 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 13.5 |
| \$150,000 and up | 11.1 |
| Total | 100.0 |

* National Forest Visits are defined as the entry of one person upon a national forest to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time. A National Forest Visit can be composed of multiple Site Visits.

4.6. Substitute Behavior

Visitors were asked to select one of several substitute choices, if for some reason they were unable to visit this national forest (Figure 3). Choices included going somewhere else for the same activity they did on the current trip, coming back to this forest for the same activity at some later time, going someplace else for a different activity, staying at home and not making a recreation trip, going to work instead of recreating, and a residual 'other' category. On most forests, the majority of visitors indicate that their substitute behavior choice is activity driven (going elsewhere for same activity) and a smaller percentage indicate they would come back later to this national forest for the same activity. For those visitors who said they would have gone somewhere else for recreation they were asked how far from their home this alternate destination was. These results are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 3. Substitute Behavior Choices





Figure 4. Reported Distance Visitors Would Travel to Alternate Location



5. SATISFACTION INFORMATION

An important element of outdoor recreation program delivery is evaluating customer satisfaction with the recreation setting, facilities, and services provided. Satisfaction information helps managers decide where to invest in resources and to allocate resources more efficiently toward improving customer satisfaction. Satisfaction is a core piece of data for national- and forest-level performance measures. To describe customer satisfaction, several different measures are used. Recreation visitors were asked to provide an overall rating of their visit to the national forest, on a 5-point Likert scale. About one-third of visitors interviewed on the forest rated their satisfaction with fourteen elements related to recreation facilities and services, and the importance of those elements to their recreation experience. Visitors were asked to rate the specific site or area at which they were interviewed. Visitors rated both the importance and performance (satisfaction with) of these elements using a 5-point scale. The Likert scale for importance ranged from not important to very important. The Likert scale for performance ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Although the satisfaction ratings specifically referenced the area where the visitor was interviewed, the survey design does not usually have enough responses for any individual site or area on the forest to present information at a site level. Rather, the information is generalized to overall satisfaction within the three site types: Day Use Developed (DUDS), Overnight Use Developed (OUDS), General Forest Areas, and on the forest as a whole.

The satisfaction responses are analyzed in several ways. First, a graph of overall satisfaction is presented in Figure 5. Next, two aggregate measures were calculated from the set of individual elements. The satisfaction elements most readily controlled by managers were aggregated into four categories: developed facilities, access, services, and visitor safety. The site types sampled were aggregated into three groups: developed sites (includes both day use and overnight developed sites), dispersed areas, and designated Wilderness. The first aggregate measure is called “Percent Satisfied Index (PSI)”, which is the proportion of all ratings for the elements in the category where the satisfaction ratings had a numerical rating of 4 or 5. Conceptually, the PSI indicator shows the percent of all recreation customers who are satisfied with agency performance. The agency’s national target for this measure is 85%. It is usually difficult to consistently have a higher satisfaction score than 85% since given tradeoffs among user groups and other factors. Table 18 displays the aggregate PSI scores for this forest.

Another aggregate measure of satisfaction is called “Percent Meet Expectations (PME)”. This is the proportion of satisfaction ratings in which the numerical satisfaction rating for a particular element is equal to or greater than the importance rating for that element. This indicator tracks the congruence between the agency’s performance and customer evaluations of importance. The idea behind this measure is that those elements with higher importance levels must have higher performance levels. Figure 6 displays the PME scores by type of site. Lower scores indicate a gap between desires and performance.

An Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) (Hudson, et al, Feb 2004) was calculated for the importance and satisfaction scores. A target level of importance and performance divides the possible set of score pairs into four quadrants. For this work, the target level of both was a numerical score of 4.0. Each quadrant has a title that helps in interpreting responses that fall into it, and that provides some general guidance for management. These can be described as:

1. Importance at or above 4.0, Satisfaction at or above 4.0: **Keep up the good work**. These are items that are important to visitors and ones that the forest is performing quite well;
2. Importance at or above 4.0, Satisfaction under 4.0: **Concentrate here**. These are important items to the public, but performance is not where it needs to be. Increasing effort here is likely to have the greatest payoff in overall customer satisfaction;
3. Importance below 4.0, Satisfaction above 4.0: **Possible overkill**. These are items that are not highly important to visitors, but the forest's performance is quite good. It may be possible to reduce effort here without greatly harming overall satisfaction;
4. Importance below 4.0; Satisfaction below 4.0: **Low Priority**. These are items where performance is not very good, but neither are they important to visitors. Focusing effort here is unlikely to have a great impact.

We present tables that show the I-P rating title for each satisfaction element. Each sitetype is presented in a separate table. Results are presented in Tables 19 - 22.

The numerical scores for visitor satisfaction and importance for each element by site type, and the sample sizes for each are presented in Appendix B (Tables B1 - B4). Most managers find it difficult to discern meaning from these raw tables; however they may wish to examine specific elements once they have reviewed the other satisfaction information presented in this section. Note that if an element had fewer than 10 responses no analyses are performed, as there are too few responses to provide reliable information. Finally, visitors were asked about their overall satisfaction with and the importance of road condition and the adequacy of signage. Figure 7a and Figure 7b show the results.

The overall satisfaction ratings for the Coronado are exceptionally high. For ninety-seven percent of visits, the overall rating was either somewhat or very satisfied. The composite satisfaction indices were not quite as high, but still very good. For all types of sites and for each rating composite, the satisfaction rating was over 80 percent. For both developed facility and safety composites, the ratings for all site types were above the national target (85%).

Figure 5. Percent of National Forest Visits by Overall Satisfaction Rating





Table 18. Percent Satisfied Index† Scores for Aggregate Categories

| Satisfaction Element | Satisfied Survey Respondents (%) | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Developed Sites‡ | Undeveloped Areas (GFAs) | Designated Wilderness |
| Developed Facilities | 85.6 | 88.1 | 94.2 |
| Access | 86.2 | 88.1 | 92.0 |
| Services | 84.0 | 80.8 | 81.7 |
| Feeling of Safety | 95.2 | 88.6 | 94.0 |

† This is a composite rating. It is the proportion of satisfaction ratings scored by visitors as good (4) or very good (5). Computed as the percentage of all ratings for the elements within the sub grouping that are at or above the target level, and indicates the percent of all visitors that are reasonably well satisfied with agency performance.

‡ This category includes both Day Use and Overnight Use Developed Sites .

Figure 6. Percent Meets Expectations Scores*



* “Percent Meet Expectations (PME)” is the proportion of satisfaction ratings in which the numerical satisfaction rating for a particular element is equal to or greater than the importance rating for that element. This indicator tracks the congruence between the agency’s performance and customer evaluations of importance . The idea behind this measure is that those elements with higher importance levels must have higher performance levels. Lower scores indicate a gap between desires and performance.

‡ This category includes both Day Use and Overnight Use Developed Sites .

Table 19. Importance-Performance Ratings for Day Use Developed Sites

| Satisfaction Element | Importance-Performance Rating |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Restroom Cleanliness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Developed Facilities | Keep up the Good Work |
| Condition of Environment | Keep up the Good Work |
| Employee Helpfulness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Interpretive Displays | Keep up the Good Work |
| Parking Availability | Keep up the Good Work |
| Parking Lot Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Rec. Info. Availability | Keep up the Good Work |
| Road Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Feeling of Safety | Keep up the Good Work |
| Scenery | Keep up the Good Work |
| Signage Adequacy | Keep up the Good Work |
| Trail Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Value for Fee Paid | Keep up the Good Work |

Table 20. Importance-Performance Ratings for Overnight Developed Sites

| Satisfaction Element | Importance-Performance Rating |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Restroom Cleanliness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Developed Facilities | Keep up the Good Work |
| Condition of Environment | Keep up the Good Work |
| Employee Helpfulness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Interpretive Displays | Possible Overkill |
| Parking Availability | Keep up the Good Work |
| Parking Lot Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Rec. Info. Availability | Keep up the Good Work |
| Road Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Feeling of Safety | Keep up the Good Work |
| Scenery | Keep up the Good Work |
| Signage Adequacy | Keep up the Good Work |
| Trail Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Value for Fee Paid | Keep up the Good Work |

Table 21. Importance-Performance Ratings for Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)

| Satisfaction Element | Importance-Performance Rating |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Restroom Cleanliness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Developed Facilities | Keep up the Good Work |
| Condition of Environment | Keep up the Good Work |
| Employee Helpfulness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Interpretive Displays | Possible Overkill |
| Parking Availability | Possible Overkill |
| Parking Lot Condition | Possible Overkill |
| Rec. Info. Availability | Possible Overkill |
| Road Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Feeling of Satefy | Keep up the Good Work |
| Scenery | Keep up the Good Work |
| Signage Adequacy | Keep up the Good Work |
| Trail Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Value for Fee Paid | Keep up the Good Work |

Table 22. Importance-Performance Ratings for Designated Wilderness

| Satisfaction Element | Importance-Performance Rating |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Restroom Cleanliness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Developed Facilities | Keep up the Good Work |
| Condition of Environment | Keep up the Good Work |
| Employee Helpfulness | Keep up the Good Work |
| Interpretive Displays | Possible Overkill |
| Parking Availability | Keep up the Good Work |
| Parking Lot Condition | Possible Overkill |
| Rec. Info. Availability | Keep up the Good Work |
| Road Condition | Possible Overkill |
| Feeling of Satefy | Keep up the Good Work |
| Scenery | Keep up the Good Work |
| Signage Adequacy | Keep up the Good Work |
| Trail Condition | Keep up the Good Work |
| Value for Fee Paid | Keep up the Good Work |

Figure 7a. Satisfaction with Forest-wide Road Conditions & Signage Adequacy





Figure 7b. Importance of Forest-wide Road Conditions & Signage Adequacy




5.1. Crowding

Visitors rated their perception of how crowded the recreation site or area felt to them. This information is useful when looking at the type of site the visitor was using since someone visiting a designated Wilderness may think 5 people is too many while someone visiting a developed campground may think 200 people is about right. Table 23 shows the distribution of responses for each site type. Crowding was reported on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 denotes hardly anyone was there, and a 10 indicates the area was perceived as overcrowded.


Table 23. Percent of Site Visits* by Crowding Rating and Site Type

| Crowding Rating† | Site Types (% of Site Visits) | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Day Use Developed Sites | Overnight Use Developed Sites | Undeveloped Areas (GFAs) | Designated Wilderness |
| 10 - Overcrowded | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 0.2 |
| 9 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 5.9 | 6.3 |
| 8 | 8.3 | 3.1 | 10.5 | 4.6 |
| 7 | 3.4 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 6.9 |
| 6 | 27.5 | 23.5 | 17.5 | 15.1 |
| 5 | 11.6 | 18.4 | 8.5 | 15.4 |
| 4 | 15.2 | 17.7 | 17.3 | 14.7 |
| 3 | 20.2 | 2.5 | 15.9 | 14.5 |
| 2 | 7.3 | 19.7 | 11.2 | 21.7 |
| 1 - Hardly anyone there | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Average Rating | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 4.6 |


Day Use Developed Sites




Overnight Use Developed Sites



Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)



Designated Wilderness



* A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a national forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time.

† Survey respondents rated how crowded the site or area they were interviewed at was using a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 meant hardly anyone was there and 10 meant the site or area was overcrowded.

5.2. Disabilities

Providing barrier-free facilities for recreation visitors is an important part of facility and service planning and development. One question asked if anyone in their group had a disability. If so, the visitor was then asked if the facilities at the sites they visited were accessible for this person (Table 24).

Table 24. Accessibility of National Forest Facilities by Persons with Disabilities


| Item | Percent |
|--|---------|
| % of visits that include a group member with a disability | 12.0 |
| Of this group, percent who said facilities at site visited were accessible | 82.0 |

6. WILDERNESS VISIT DEMOGRAPHICS

Visits to Wilderness are sometimes made by a particular subset of the overall visitor population. In this chapter, tables are presented that describe the demographic characteristics of those who visit designated wilderness on this forest. Table 25 shows the gender breakdown, Table 26 the racial and ethnicity distribution, and the Table 27 age composition. In Table 28, a frequency analysis of Zip Codes obtained from respondents is presented, to give a rough idea of the common origins of Wilderness visitors.

Table 25. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits* by Gender

| Gender | Survey Respondents† | Wilderness Site Visits (%)‡ |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Female | 441 | 38.3 |
| Male | 523 | 61.7 |
| Total | 964 | 100.0 |



* A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a National Forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time.


† Non-respondents to gender questions were excluded from analysis.

‡ Calculations are computed using weights that expand the sample of individuals to the population of Wilderness Site Visits.

Table 26. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits* by Race/Ethnicity

| Race † | Survey Respondents‡ | Wilderness Site Visits (%)§ |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 |
| Asian | 1 | 11.0 |
| Black / African American | 0 | 0.0 |
| Hawaiian / Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 |
| White | 18 | 89.0 |
| Total | 19 | 100.0# |

| Ethnicity† | Survey Respondents‡ | Wilderness Site Visits (%)§ |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Hispanic / Latino | 0 | 0.0 |



* A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a National Forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time.

Respondents could choose more than one racial group, so the total may be more than 100%.


† Race and Ethnicity were asked as two separate questions.

‡ Non-respondents to race/ethnicity questions were excluded from analysis.

§ Calculations are computed using weights that expand the sample of individuals to the population of Wilderness Site Visits.

Table 27. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits* by Age

| Age Class | Wilderness Site Visits (%)‡ |
|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Under 16 | 7.4 |
| 16-19 | 1.4 |
| 20-29 | 9.7 |
| 30-39 | 14.2 |
| 40-49 | 17.7 |
| 50-59 | 23.6 |
| 60-69 | 18.2 |
| 70+ | 7.8 |
| Total | 100.0 |



* A Site Visit is the entry of one person onto a National Forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time.

† Non-respondents to age questions were excluded from analysis.

‡ Calculations are computed using weights that expand the sample of individuals to the population of Wilderness Site Visits.

Table 28. Top 15 Most Commonly Reported ZIP Codes, States and Counties of Wilderness Survey Respondents

| ZIP Code | State | County | Percent of Respondents | Survey Respondents (n) |
|-----------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 85718 | Arizona | Pima County | 14.6 | 37 |
| 85704 | Arizona | Pima County | 12.2 | 31 |
| 85750 | Arizona | Pima County | 10.2 | 26 |
| 85716 | Arizona | Pima County | 9.8 | 25 |
| 85719 | Arizona | Pima County | 9.8 | 25 |
| 85710 | Arizona | Pima County | 7.5 | 19 |
| 85712 | Arizona | Pima County | 7.1 | 18 |
| 85737 | Arizona | Pima County | 4.3 | 11 |
| 85749 | Arizona | Pima County | 4.3 | 11 |
| 85742 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.9 | 10 |
| 85745 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.9 | 10 |
| 85741 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.5 | 9 |
| Foreign Country | | | 3.1 | 8 |
| 85715 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.8 | 7 |
| 85711 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.8 | 7 |

* Includes respondents reporting no ZIP code or an invalid ZIP code .

7. APPENDIX TABLES

APPENDIX A - Complete List of ZIP Codes

Table A-1. ZIP Codes, States and Counties of National Forest Survey Respondents

| ZIP Code | State | County | Percent of Respondents | Survey Respondents (n) |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 85750 | Arizona | Pima County | 9.6 | 165 |
| 85718 | Arizona | Pima County | 5.9 | 101 |
| 85710 | Arizona | Pima County | 4.9 | 84 |
| 85716 | Arizona | Pima County | 4.0 | 68 |
| 85719 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.5 | 61 |
| 85749 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.5 | 61 |
| 85712 | Arizona | Pima County | 3.3 | 56 |
| Foreign Country | | | 2.9 | 50 |
| 85704 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.7 | 47 |
| 85715 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.7 | 46 |
| 85711 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.4 | 41 |
| 85730 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.1 | 36 |
| 85705 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.0 | 35 |
| 85741 | Arizona | Pima County | 2.0 | 34 |
| 85742 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.9 | 33 |
| 85748 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.6 | 28 |
| 85737 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.6 | 28 |
| 85745 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.3 | 23 |
| Unknown Origin* | | | 1.3 | 22 |
| 85739 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.3 | 22 |
| 85755 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.2 | 21 |
| 85743 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.1 | 19 |
| 85614 | Arizona | Pima County | 1.0 | 18 |
| 85747 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.9 | 16 |
| 85746 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.8 | 14 |
| 85706 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.8 | 13 |
| 85713 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.6 | 11 |
| 85653 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.6 | 10 |
| 85629 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.5 | 9 |
| 85623 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.5 | 8 |
| 85641 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.5 | 8 |
| 85701 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.5 | 8 |
| 85714 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.3 | 6 |
| 85222 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.3 | 6 |
| 85635 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.3 | 5 |
| 85615 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.3 | 5 |
| 85621 | Arizona | Santa Cruz County | 0.3 | 5 |
| 85014 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.2 | 4 |
| 85757 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 55902 | Minnesota | Olmsted County | 0.2 | 3 |

| | | | | |
|-------|--------------|-------------------|-----|---|
| 97302 | Oregon | Marion County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85650 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 86004 | Arizona | Coconino County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85249 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85207 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85281 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85735 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85257 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 97520 | Oregon | Jackson County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85602 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85736 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.2 | 3 |
| 85703 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 87111 | New Mexico | Bernalillo County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85020 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85546 | Arizona | Graham County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 16803 | Pennsylvania | Centre County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 60610 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85624 | Arizona | Santa Cruz County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 92024 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 97439 | Oregon | Lane County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 16509 | Pennsylvania | Erie County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 60062 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85259 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 97530 | Oregon | Jackson County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85648 | Arizona | Santa Cruz County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 81301 | Colorado | La Plata County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85234 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85282 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 97702 | Oregon | Deschutes County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 78070 | Texas | Comal County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85224 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85248 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 85652 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 55317 | Minnesota | Carver County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 10023 | New York | New York County | 0.1 | 2 |
| 43219 | Ohio | Franklin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 44121 | Ohio | Cuyahoga County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85708 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12833 | New York | Saratoga County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85085 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85015 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81615 | Colorado | Pitkin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 50265 | Iowa | Polk County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 47331 | Indiana | Fayette County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85309 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92113 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10512 | New York | Putnam County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46168 | Indiana | Hendricks County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 39090 | Mississippi | Attala County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 78705 | Texas | Travis County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98290 | Washington | Snohomish County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------|---------------------|-----|---|
| 19010 | Pennsylvania | Delaware County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91901 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85032 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 14120 | New York | Niagara County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85622 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95023 | California | San Benito County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85637 | Arizona | Santa Cruz County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 45242 | Ohio | Hamilton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 37122 | Tennessee | Wilson County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 72758 | Arkansas | Benton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98802 | Washington | Douglas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19970 | Delaware | Sussex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 72631 | Arkansas | Carroll County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98040 | Washington | King County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55057 | Minnesota | Rice County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 11201 | New York | Kings County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 77057 | Texas | Harris County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60502 | Illinois | DuPage County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 45244 | Ohio | Hamilton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80303 | Colorado | Boulder County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 93514 | California | Inyo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 50226 | Iowa | Polk County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85206 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94404 | California | San Mateo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 96106 | California | Plumas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19103 | Pennsylvania | Philadelphia County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85205 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 06880 | Connecticut | Fairfield County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46614 | Indiana | St. Joseph County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 33436 | Florida | Palm Beach County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12308 | New York | Schenectady County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 68178 | Nebraska | Douglas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85223 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85374 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55344 | Minnesota | Hennepin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85283 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 04607 | Maine | Hancock County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 02141 | Massachusetts | Middlesex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85007 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98329 | Washington | Pierce County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 33761 | Florida | Pinellas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90019 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90254 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90732 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55343 | Minnesota | Hennepin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53125 | Wisconsin | Walworth County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55437 | Minnesota | Hennepin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 87801 | New Mexico | Socorro County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85740 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 45502 | Ohio | Clark County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60050 | Illinois | McHenry County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------|---------------------------|-----|---|
| 01267 | Massachusetts | Berkshire County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19085 | Pennsylvania | Delaware County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 29412 | South Carolina | Charleston County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 43324 | Ohio | Logan County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 30269 | Georgia | Fayette County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 48104 | Michigan | Washtenaw County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95687 | California | Solano County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60477 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55418 | Minnesota | Hennepin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80305 | Colorado | Boulder County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 93041 | California | Ventura County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 29631 | South Carolina | Pickens County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85373 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97701 | Oregon | Deschutes County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91355 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85717 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 33617 | Florida | Hillsborough County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98030 | Washington | King County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85308 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 93612 | California | Fresno County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 56572 | Minnesota | Otter Tail County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46304 | Indiana | Porter County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 51001 | Iowa | Plymouth County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85618 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85365 | Arizona | Yuma County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53405 | Wisconsin | Racine County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 02051 | Massachusetts | Plymouth County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 49449 | Michigan | Oceana County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 61571 | Illinois | Tazewell County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97403 | Oregon | Lane County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53963 | Wisconsin | Dodge County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12514 | New York | Dutchess County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85225 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19086 | Pennsylvania | Delaware County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 48302 | Michigan | Oakland County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46809 | Indiana | Allen County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 82450 | Wyoming | Park County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94549 | California | Contra Costa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 30909 | Georgia | Richmond County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 27330 | North Carolina | Lee County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60641 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 45822 | Ohio | Mercer County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94591 | California | Solano County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 35055 | Alabama | Cullman County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10032 | New York | New York County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 17050 | Pennsylvania | Cumberland County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53534 | Wisconsin | Rock County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 99683 | Alaska | Matanuska-Susitna Borough | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85544 | Arizona | Gila County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 57702 | South Dakota | Pennington County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85732 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------------------|-----|---|
| 91941 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90026 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60068 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 05468 | Vermont | Chittenden County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92078 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80512 | Colorado | Larimer County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 43068 | Ohio | Franklin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 14226 | New York | Erie County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81122 | Colorado | La Plata County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 03781 | New Hampshire | Sullivan County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 88011 | New Mexico | Dona Ana County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85752 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53704 | Wisconsin | Dane County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 36580 | Alabama | Baldwin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 29620 | South Carolina | Abbeville County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98532 | Washington | Lewis County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90232 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 72212 | Arkansas | Pulaski County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85202 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83605 | Idaho | Canyon County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85632 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 59759 | Montana | Jefferson County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 16611 | Pennsylvania | Huntingdon County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60614 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85702 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 45424 | Ohio | Montgomery County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 17406 | Pennsylvania | York County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 87047 | New Mexico | Bernalillo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 20769 | Maryland | Prince Georges County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83713 | Idaho | Ada County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98229 | Washington | Whatcom County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 99511 | Alaska | Anchorage Borough | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97303 | Oregon | Marion County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91040 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 75204 | Texas | Dallas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97063 | Oregon | Wasco County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97408 | Oregon | Lane County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 77372 | Texas | Montgomery County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80111 | Colorado | Arapahoe County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 06111 | Connecticut | Hartford County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 02148 | Massachusetts | Middlesex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 06484 | Connecticut | Fairfield County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85242 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 48197 | Michigan | Washtenaw County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85304 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 43082 | Ohio | Delaware County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19020 | Pennsylvania | Bucks County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60098 | Illinois | McHenry County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 52039 | Iowa | Dubuque County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97341 | Oregon | Lincoln County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80016 | Colorado | Arapahoe County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------------------|-----|---|
| 97527 | Oregon | Josephine County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85607 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 01264 | Massachusetts | Berkshire County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85634 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 86305 | Arizona | Yavapai County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 68845 | Nebraska | Buffalo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 48080 | Michigan | Macomb County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94706 | California | Alameda County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 45458 | Ohio | Montgomery County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90710 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80831 | Colorado | El Paso County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 79768 | Texas | Ector County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83013 | Wyoming | Teton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 62208 | Illinois | St. Clair County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92103 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 03603 | New Hampshire | Sullivan County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 16066 | Pennsylvania | Butler County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55436 | Minnesota | Hennepin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 84121 | Utah | Salt Lake County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85045 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19446 | Pennsylvania | Montgomery County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 54755 | Wisconsin | Buffalo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 59859 | Montana | Sanders County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 14424 | New York | Ontario County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10502 | New York | Westchester County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85201 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97131 | Oregon | Tillamook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 04107 | Maine | Cumberland County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95945 | California | Nevada County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91011 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 43560 | Ohio | Lucas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 93560 | California | Kern County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98250 | Washington | San Juan County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92630 | California | Orange County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12571 | New York | Dutchess County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 89712 | Nevada | Carson City | 0.1 | 1 |
| 86401 | Arizona | Mohave County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 89703 | Nevada | Carson City | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10549 | New York | Westchester County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12776 | New York | Sullivan County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 99801 | Alaska | Juneau Borough | 0.1 | 1 |
| 77414 | Texas | Matagorda County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85744 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97321 | Oregon | Linn County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55105 | Minnesota | Ramsey County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46104 | Indiana | Rush County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53150 | Wisconsin | Waukesha County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60611 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81503 | Colorado | Mesa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 05674 | Vermont | Washington County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 05074 | Vermont | Orange County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------------------|-----|---|
| 57016 | South Dakota | Lake County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 75602 | Texas | Gregg County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 32822 | Florida | Orange County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 20740 | Maryland | Prince Georges County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 63017 | Missouri | St. Louis County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95446 | California | Sonoma County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12054 | New York | Albany County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85377 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53528 | Wisconsin | Dane County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 43015 | Ohio | Delaware County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 62801 | Illinois | Marion County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 21228 | Maryland | Baltimore County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91604 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92346 | California | San Bernardino County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80439 | Colorado | Jefferson County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46615 | Indiana | St. Joseph County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95618 | California | Yolo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83301 | Idaho | Twin Falls County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 78745 | Texas | Travis County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 54304 | Wisconsin | Brown County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80517 | Colorado | Larimer County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90293 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55113 | Minnesota | Ramsey County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85278 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95033 | California | Santa Cruz County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85023 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46825 | Indiana | Allen County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 23168 | Virginia | James City County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97404 | Oregon | Lane County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53188 | Wisconsin | Waukesha County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 01966 | Massachusetts | Essex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 27516 | North Carolina | Orange County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 93534 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 99503 | Alaska | Anchorage Borough | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94946 | California | Marin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 06877 | Connecticut | Fairfield County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81611 | Colorado | Pitkin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85345 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 20653 | Maryland | St. Marys County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85707 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 20842 | Maryland | Montgomery County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80031 | Colorado | Adams County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83843 | Idaho | Latah County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97221 | Oregon | Multnomah County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 49740 | Michigan | Emmet County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 48837 | Michigan | Eaton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 33733 | Florida | Pinellas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 34209 | Florida | Manatee County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83602 | Idaho | Boise County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53545 | Wisconsin | Rock County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 32714 | Florida | Seminole County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------|-------------------------|-----|---|
| 02155 | Massachusetts | Middlesex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 49548 | Michigan | Kent County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85364 | Arizona | Yuma County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85603 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 95065 | California | Santa Cruz County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98221 | Washington | Skagit County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 61744 | Illinois | McLean County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12883 | New York | Essex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 01742 | Massachusetts | Middlesex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53590 | Wisconsin | Dane County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 77399 | Texas | Polk County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 22311 | Virginia | Alexandria city | 0.1 | 1 |
| 82055 | Wyoming | Albany County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 52722 | Iowa | Scott County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98136 | Washington | King County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 04079 | Maine | Cumberland County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 82070 | Wyoming | Albany County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97229 | Oregon | Washington County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60004 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 15550 | Pennsylvania | Bedford County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 06378 | Connecticut | New London County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97058 | Oregon | Wasco County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 77551 | Texas | Galveston County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46375 | Indiana | Lake County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 40217 | Kentucky | Jefferson County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12184 | New York | Columbia County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10506 | New York | Westchester County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81220 | Colorado | Montrose County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81435 | Colorado | San Miguel County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98335 | Washington | Pierce County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 06098 | Connecticut | Litchfield County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 31558 | Georgia | Camden County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 51106 | Iowa | Woodbury County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 83814 | Idaho | Kootenai County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94117 | California | San Francisco County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 89052 | Nevada | Clark County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 11758 | New York | Nassau County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 78664 | Texas | Williamson County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 61260 | Illinois | Mercer County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98112 | Washington | King County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 70821 | Louisiana | East Baton Rouge Parish | 0.1 | 1 |
| 21044 | Maryland | Howard County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92107 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94114 | California | San Francisco County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 02492 | Massachusetts | Norfolk County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94937 | California | Marin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 80112 | Colorado | Arapahoe County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 34230 | Florida | Sarasota County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92056 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85937 | Arizona | Navajo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 78726 | Texas | Travis County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------|---------------------|-----|---|
| 85383 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98943 | Washington | Kittitas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46975 | Indiana | Fulton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60659 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85203 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94565 | California | Contra Costa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85613 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 53103 | Wisconsin | Waukesha County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46228 | Indiana | Marion County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 78218 | Texas | Bexar County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81428 | Colorado | Delta County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 01982 | Massachusetts | Essex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 17745 | Pennsylvania | Clinton County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92120 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 30096 | Georgia | Gwinnett County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85021 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 49418 | Michigan | Kent County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 44087 | Ohio | Summit County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10960 | New York | Rockland County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94402 | California | San Mateo County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98006 | Washington | King County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60613 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85644 | Arizona | Cochise County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85226 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 96722 | Hawaii | Kauai County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85239 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 62521 | Illinois | Macon County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85731 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85306 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 97838 | Oregon | Umatilla County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98075 | Washington | King County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85297 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 59865 | Montana | Lake County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 14227 | New York | Erie County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 22314 | Virginia | Alexandria city | 0.1 | 1 |
| 12997 | New York | Essex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 23030 | Virginia | Charles City County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94903 | California | Marin County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 56482 | Minnesota | Wadena County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94609 | California | Alameda County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19382 | Pennsylvania | Chester County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 72034 | Arkansas | Faulkner County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 15731 | Pennsylvania | Indiana County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 27332 | North Carolina | Lee County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 77450 | Texas | Harris County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98501 | Washington | Thurston County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81147 | Colorado | Archuleta County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60657 | Illinois | Cook County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 52761 | Iowa | Muscatine County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 93023 | California | Ventura County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 90001 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------------------|-----|---|
| 93902 | California | Monterey County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 48382 | Michigan | Oakland County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85351 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 98548 | Washington | Mason County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91942 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 55769 | Minnesota | Itasca County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85220 | Arizona | Pinal County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 11797 | New York | Nassau County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60031 | Illinois | Lake County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 94568 | California | Alameda County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 54521 | Wisconsin | Vilas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 47032 | Indiana | Dearborn County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60585 | Illinois | Will County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81427 | Colorado | Ouray County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 19464 | Pennsylvania | Montgomery County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 92130 | California | San Diego County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 91025 | California | Los Angeles County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 32189 | Florida | Putnam County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 59634 | Montana | Jefferson County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 56465 | Minnesota | Crow Wing County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 54880 | Wisconsin | Douglas County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 60532 | Illinois | DuPage County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85658 | Arizona | Pima County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85254 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 57579 | South Dakota | Mellette County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 13850 | New York | Broome County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 10003 | New York | New York County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 46064 | Indiana | Madison County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 81432 | Colorado | Ouray County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 71129 | Louisiana | Caddo Parish | 0.1 | 1 |
| 01951 | Massachusetts | Essex County | 0.1 | 1 |
| 85013 | Arizona | Maricopa County | 0.1 | 1 |

* Includes respondents reporting no ZIP code or an invalid ZIP code .

APPENDIX B - Detailed Satisfaction Results

Table B-1. Satisfaction for Visits to Day Use Developed Sites

| Satisfaction Element | Percent Rating Satisfaction as: | | | | | Mean Rating§ | Mean Importance† | No. Obs‡ |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied | | | |
| Restroom Cleanliness | 2.6 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 25.2 | 59.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 104 |
| Developed Facilities | 0.4 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 23.7 | 61.8 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 118 |
| Condition of Environment | 0.7 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 20.6 | 74.2 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 129 |
| Employee Helpfulness | 0.6 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 9.8 | 82.1 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 87 |
| Interpretive Displays | 0.0 | 2.3 | 20.3 | 19.7 | 57.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 104 |
| Parking Availability | 0.0 | 1.1 | 6.6 | 13.4 | 79.0 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 128 |
| Parking Lot Condition | 0.0 | 1.4 | 6.8 | 16.4 | 75.4 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 130 |
| Rec. Info. Availability | 0.4 | 2.3 | 15.1 | 19.2 | 63.0 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 116 |
| Road Condition | 1.3 | 14.2 | 13.0 | 24.4 | 47.2 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 99 |
| Feeling of Safety | 0.0 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 14.5 | 79.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 129 |
| Scenery | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 94.8 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 130 |
| Signage Adequacy | 0.0 | 1.9 | 10.9 | 19.3 | 68.0 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 123 |
| Trail Condition | 1.5 | 2.4 | 13.8 | 33.0 | 49.3 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 99 |
| Value for Fee Paid | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 14.6 | 81.8 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 115 |

NOTE: The data was not reported for items with fewer than 10 responses. Satisfaction and Importance were asked as two separate questions so one of these may have 10 responses even though the other does not.

§ Scale: Very Dissatisfied = 1, Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied = 3, Somewhat Satisfied = 4, Very Satisfied = 5

† Scale: Not Important = 1, Somewhat Important = 2, Moderately Important = 3, Important = 4, Very Important = 5

‡ No. Obs is the number of survey respondents who responded to this item.

Table B-2. Satisfaction for Visits to Overnight Developed Sites

| Satisfaction Element | Percent Rating Satisfaction as: | | | | | Mean Rating§ | Mean Importance† | No. Obs‡ |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied | | | |
| Restroom Cleanliness | 0.5 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 27.6 | 53.0 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 78 |
| Developed Facilities | 0.0 | 0.5 | 7.0 | 32.8 | 59.7 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 84 |
| Condition of Environment | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 25.5 | 70.8 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 89 |
| Employee Helpfulness | 7.3 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 14.6 | 69.4 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 72 |
| Interpretive Displays | 0.7 | 0.4 | 30.9 | 12.8 | 55.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 63 |
| Parking Availability | 0.0 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 79.2 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 88 |
| Parking Lot Condition | 0.5 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 16.4 | 75.4 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 85 |
| Rec. Info. Availability | 0.0 | 7.8 | 14.5 | 23.8 | 53.8 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 76 |
| Road Condition | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.2 | 35.1 | 50.6 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 77 |
| Feeling of Safety | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 10.2 | 88.2 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 87 |
| Scenery | 0.0 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 2.1 | 92.3 | 4.9 | 4.4 | 89 |
| Signage Adequacy | 0.2 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 20.0 | 75.7 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 89 |
| Trail Condition | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 23.0 | 69.0 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 72 |
| Value for Fee Paid | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 22.8 | 71.3 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 83 |

NOTE: The data was not reported for items with fewer than 10 responses. Satisfaction and Importance were asked as two separate questions so one of these may have 10 responses even though the other does not.

§ Scale: Very Dissatisfied = 1, Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied = 3, Somewhat Satisfied = 4, Very Satisfied = 5

† Scale: Not Important = 1, Somewhat Important = 2, Moderately Important = 3, Important = 4, Very Important = 5

‡ No. Obs is the number of survey respondents who responded to this item.

Table B-3. Satisfaction for Visits to Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)

| Satisfaction Element | Percent Rating Satisfaction as: | | | | | Mean Rating§ | Mean Importance† | No. Obs‡ |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied | | | |
| Restroom Cleanliness | 3.8 | 2.7 | 8.6 | 17.0 | 68.0 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 112 |
| Developed Facilities | 1.2 | 1.1 | 6.8 | 24.8 | 66.1 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 125 |
| Condition of Environment | 1.2 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 23.3 | 65.4 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 169 |
| Employee Helpfulness | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 18.0 | 73.9 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 93 |
| Interpretive Displays | 1.3 | 1.9 | 18.5 | 24.1 | 54.3 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 113 |
| Parking Availability | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 22.8 | 70.7 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 153 |
| Parking Lot Condition | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.9 | 17.1 | 76.6 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 144 |
| Rec. Info. Availability | 2.4 | 7.3 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 55.6 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 146 |
| Road Condition | 2.4 | 5.3 | 11.8 | 27.6 | 53.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 149 |
| Feeling of Safety | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 16.5 | 72.1 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 171 |
| Scenery | 0.4 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 90.7 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 172 |
| Signage Adequacy | 1.7 | 3.5 | 10.8 | 28.8 | 55.2 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 153 |
| Trail Condition | 1.0 | 1.2 | 12.5 | 28.9 | 56.5 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 121 |
| Value for Fee Paid | 0.6 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 19.2 | 75.4 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 109 |

NOTE: The data was not reported for items with fewer than 10 responses. Satisfaction and Importance were asked as two separate questions so one of these may have 10 responses even though the other does not.

§ Scale: Very Dissatisfied = 1, Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied = 3, Somewhat Satisfied = 4, Very Satisfied = 5

† Scale: Not Important = 1, Somewhat Important = 2, Moderately Important = 3, Important = 4, Very Important = 5

‡ No. Obs is the number of survey respondents who responded to this item.

Table B-4. Satisfaction for Visits to Designated Wilderness*

| Satisfaction Element | Percent Rating Satisfaction as: | | | | | Mean Rating§ | Mean Importance† | No. Obs‡ |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied | | | |
| Restroom Cleanliness | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 17.0 | 81.7 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 36 |
| Developed Facilities | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 77.3 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 33 |
| Condition of Environment | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 18.1 | 78.7 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 150 |
| Employee Helpfulness | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 7.0 | 77.6 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 35 |
| Interpretive Displays | 0.4 | 1.8 | 23.8 | 21.0 | 53.1 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 92 |
| Parking Availability | 0.2 | 1.5 | 4.7 | 15.8 | 77.8 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 143 |
| Parking Lot Condition | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 13.4 | 82.9 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 142 |
| Rec. Info. Availability | 0.8 | 1.7 | 13.2 | 20.5 | 63.8 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 113 |
| Road Condition | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 22.4 | 57.5 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 43 |
| Feeling of Safety | 0.2 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 18.6 | 75.4 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 148 |
| Scenery | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 7.1 | 92.7 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 150 |
| Signage Adequacy | 2.7 | 0.7 | 13.0 | 23.2 | 60.4 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 135 |
| Trail Condition | 0.4 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 31.3 | 60.3 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 149 |
| Value for Fee Paid | 0.5 | 0.5 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 92.3 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 55 |

NOTE: The data was not reported for items with fewer than 10 responses. Satisfaction and Importance were asked as two separate questions so one of these may have 10 responses even though the other does not.

§ Scale: Very Dissatisfied = 1, Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied = 3, Somewhat Satisfied = 4, Very Satisfied = 5

† Scale: Not Important = 1, Somewhat Important = 2, Moderately Important = 3, Important = 4, Very Important = 5

‡ No. Obs is the number of survey respondents who responded to this item.

* Data supplied is for all Designated Wilderness on the forest combined. Data was not collected for satisfaction for each individual Wilderness on the forest.