



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Natural Resource
Manager

National Visitor
Use Monitoring
Program



Last updated:
28 September 2016

Visitor Use Report

Pike-San Isabel NF

USDA Forest Service Region 2

National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2011

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	6	78	7.7
DUDS	HIGH	16	332	4.8
DUDS	MEDIUM	24	2,514	1.0
DUDS	LOW	33	9,009	0.4
DUDS	FE3	5	2,825	0.2
DUDS	SV1	6	271	2.2
OU DS	MEDIUM	10	137	7.3
OU DS	LOW	18	1,197	1.5
OU DS	DUR4	9	13,398	0.1
OU DS	DUR5	5	208	2.4
OU DS	FR2	2	820	0.2
OU DS	RE1	4	753	0.5
OU DS	RE2	3	1,189	0.3
GFA	VERY HIGH	24	1,467	1.6
GFA	HIGH	27	6,225	0.4
GFA	MEDIUM	32	29,763	0.1
GFA	LOW	76	67,457	0.1
GFA	TB1	6	625	1.0
WILDERNESS	VERY HIGH	8	110	7.3
WILDERNESS	HIGH	7	562	1.2
WILDERNESS	MEDIUM	11	3,946	0.3
WILDERNESS	LOW	13	12,798	0.1
Total		345	155,684	0.2

* 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*	5,743	±20.4
→ Day Use Developed Site Visits	946	±21.4
→ Overnight Use Developed Site Visits	297	±35.5
→ General Forest Area Visits	4,281	±26.9
→ Designated Wilderness Visits†	220	±33.8
Total Estimated National Forest Visits§	4,328	±20.6
→ Special Events and Organized Camp Use‡	30	±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	844	697	430
Overnight Use Developed Sites	105	90	29
Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)	935	709	398
Designated Wilderness	236	192	151
Total	2,120	1,688	1,008

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	153	6	141	50	350
Economic	138	12	127	50	327
Satisfaction	139	11	130	51	331
Total	430	29	398	151	1,008

* 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.

For the Pike-San Isabel and Grasslands combined, about 30 percent of visits are made by females. Hispanic / latino visitors account for about 4 percent of visits. Children under the age of 16 make up only about 12 percent of visits, but those over age 60 make up nearly 20 percent. More than half of the visits are from people who live within 50 miles, but about 16 percent have traveled more than 500 miles.

Table 5. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Gender

Gender	Survey Respondents†	National Forest Visits (%)‡
Female	903	30.7
Male	1,302	69.3
Total	2,205	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	17	1.2
Asian	12	1.5
Black / African American	10	1.1
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	3	0.7
White	871	95.6
Total	913	100.1#

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	National Forest Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	54	4.2



* 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	12.3
16-19	3.9
20-29	12.2
30-39	15.3
40-49	17.8
50-59	19.0
60-69	14.0
70+	5.4
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)
81201	Colorado	Chaffee County	13.6	35
80863	Colorado	Teller County	10.1	26
81211	Colorado	Chaffee County	9.3	24
80461	Colorado	Lake County	8.5	22
80906	Colorado	El Paso County	7.4	19
Unknown Origin*			6.6	17
80909	Colorado	El Paso County	6.2	16
80919	Colorado	El Paso County	5.8	15
80918	Colorado	El Paso County	5.4	14
81212	Colorado	Fremont County	5.4	14
80904	Colorado	El Paso County	5.0	13
67950	Kansas	Morton County	4.7	12
Foreign Country			4.3	11
80903	Colorado	El Paso County	3.9	10
80911	Colorado	El Paso County	3.9	10

* 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	44.8
26 - 50 miles	13.5
51 - 75 miles	9.0
76 - 100 miles	6.0
101 - 200 miles	9.2
201 - 500 miles	1.7
Over 500 miles	15.7
Total	99.9

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.

Although the average national forest visit duration is about 13 hours, over half of the visits last less than 4 hours. About half of the visits to Wilderness last less than 4 hours. About 60 percent of visits are from people who visit at most 10 times per year. However, almost 15% come from people who visit at least 50 times per year.

Table 10. Visit Duration

Visit Type	Average Duration (hours)‡	Median Duration (hours)‡
Site Visit	8.4	3.0
Day Use Developed	2.0	1.5
Overnight Use Developed	26.5	21.9
Undeveloped Areas	8.3	3.0
Designated Wilderness	11.3	5.2
National Forest Visit	12.4	3.5

* 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*	88.4
Number of national forest sites visited on National Forest Visit*	1.2
Group Size	2.6
Axles per Vehicle	2.1

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

Number of Annual Visits	Visits (%)†	Cumulative Visits (%)
1 - 5	46.0	46.0
6 - 10	15.6	61.6
11 - 15	4.3	65.9
16 - 20	7.0	72.9
21 - 25	2.5	75.4
26 - 30	3.1	78.5
31 - 35	0.1	78.6
36 - 40	1.8	80.4
41 - 50	5.1	85.5
51 - 100	7.8	93.3
101 - 200	4.2	97.5
201 - 300	1.1	98.6
Over 300	1.4	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 (24%), viewing scenery (14%), and driving for pleasure (12%) are the main reasons for visitation. About half of the visits report that they participate in hiking and viewing scenery.


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
Viewing Natural Features	54.9	14.0	2.9
Hiking / Walking	49.1	24.0	3.9
Driving for Pleasure	41.9	12.3	2.6
Viewing Wildlife	38.2	1.2	4.0
Relaxing	37.0	5.9	9.1
OHV Use	10.8	4.9	3.2
Motorized Trail Activity	10.7	1.6	4.5
Picnicking	10.2	0.7	3.1
Hunting	9.5	8.5	20.1
Visiting Historic Sites	8.8	0.5	2.3
Fishing	8.3	3.7	4.0
Some Other Activity	8.3	6.5	3.8
Bicycling	6.2	5.7	3.7
Developed Camping	5.7	2.4	32.5
Nature Study	5.1	0.0	11.8
Nature Center Activities	4.8	0.0	0.0
Downhill Skiing	4.3	4.1	4.6
Gathering Forest Products	4.0	2.7	2.3
Primitive Camping	3.4	1.1	17.5
Backpacking	2.2	0.1	64.3
Cross-country Skiing	1.1	0.2	3.7
Other Motorized Activity	1.0	0.6	3.5
Resort Use	0.8	0.0	0.0
Other Non-motorized	0.4	0.0	1.0
Non-motorized Water	0.3	0.1	5.4
No Activity Reported	0.2	0.3	
Horseback Riding	0.1	0.0	4.8
Motorized Water Activities	0.1	0.0	0.0
Snowmobiling	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	0.4
Scenic Byway	37.8
Visitor Center or Museum	5.4
Designated ORV Area	25.6
Forest Roads	35.1
Interpretive Displays	6.5
Information Sites	7.4
Developed Fishing Site	7.8
Motorized Single Track Trails	5.1
Motorized Dual Track Trails	20.4
None of these Facilities	29.9

* 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.

† 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.

Two-thirds of visits are people on day trips away from home. Another 13 percent are made by

people for whom this forest is a side trip; their main recreation destination is some other place. About a quarter of visits come from households making more than \$100,000 per year; over 35% are from households who earn less than \$50,000 per year.

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								
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	\$801
Median Total Trip Spending per Party	\$80
% NF Visits made on trip with overnight stay away from home	28.7%
% NF Visits with overnight stay within 50 miles of NF	26.8%
Mean nights/visit within 50 miles of NF	4.0
Area Lodging Use	% Visits with Nights Near Forest
NFS Campground on this NF	20.5%
Undeveloped Camping in this NF	17.4%
NFS Cabin	4.0%
Other Public Campground	1.2%
Private Campground	1.4%
Rented Private Home	33.8%
Home of Friends/Family	13.8%
Own Home	8.8%
Other Lodging	1.8%

Area Lodging Use

% Visits with Nights Near Forest



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	14.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	23.7
\$50,000 to \$74,999	19.2
\$75,000 to \$99,999	17.8
\$100,000 to \$149,999	16.0
\$150,000 and up	9.3
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.

More than 90% of the visits are satisfied with their overall recreation experience. All of the satisfaction ratings for perception of safety are over 90%; all of the access composites are over 80%.

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	87.7	73.0	88.1
Access	88.8	81.6	87.4
Services	78.7	74.5	83.6
Feeling of Safety	99.6	91.4	100.0

† 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	Low Priority
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 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 20. Importance-Performance Ratings for Overnight Developed Sites

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

* The data was not reported for items with fewer than 10 responses.

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

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

* The data was not reported for items with fewer than 10 responses.

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	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	1.7	0.0	10.3	5.9
8	3.0	0.0	4.5	2.8
7	7.9	1.9	10.1	7.3
6	10.2	15.8	16.6	6.3
5	18.8	17.0	4.2	2.8
4	8.8	3.8	18.9	13.0
3	9.0	15.4	18.2	13.8
2	37.1	46.2	14.8	34.8
1 - Hardly anyone there	2.0	0.0	2.5	13.2
Average Rating	4.0	3.5	4.8	3.5


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	2.1
Of this group, percent who said facilities at site visited were accessible	64.1

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	128	30.8
Male	194	69.2
Total	322	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	5	4.3
Asian	4	3.0
Black / African American	1	0.2
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1	0.2
White	138	93.2
Total	149	100.9#

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	Wilderness Site Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	5	4.5



* 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	12.8
16-19	1.2
20-29	16.1
30-39	20.0
40-49	20.4
50-59	17.4
60-69	8.6
70+	3.4
Total	99.9



* 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)
81211	Colorado	Chaffee County	20.4	10
80127	Colorado	Jefferson County	12.2	6
80218	Colorado	Denver County	8.2	4
80904	Colorado	El Paso County	6.1	3
80210	Colorado	Denver County	6.1	3
80918	Colorado	El Paso County	6.1	3
80919	Colorado	El Paso County	6.1	3
80305	Colorado	Boulder County	6.1	3
80461	Colorado	Lake County	4.1	2
80134	Colorado	Douglas County	4.1	2
80033	Colorado	Jefferson County	4.1	2
80909	Colorado	El Paso County	4.1	2
80222	Colorado	Denver County	4.1	2
80206	Colorado	Denver County	4.1	2
80920	Colorado	El Paso County	4.1	2

* 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)
81201	Colorado	Chaffee County	3.5	35
80863	Colorado	Teller County	2.6	26
81211	Colorado	Chaffee County	2.4	24
80461	Colorado	Lake County	2.2	22
80906	Colorado	El Paso County	1.9	19
Unknown Origin*			1.7	17
80909	Colorado	El Paso County	1.6	16
80919	Colorado	El Paso County	1.5	15
80918	Colorado	El Paso County	1.4	14
81212	Colorado	Fremont County	1.4	14
80904	Colorado	El Paso County	1.3	13
67950	Kansas	Morton County	1.2	12
Foreign Country			1.1	11
80903	Colorado	El Paso County	1.0	10
80911	Colorado	El Paso County	1.0	10
80916	Colorado	El Paso County	0.9	9
80907	Colorado	El Paso County	0.9	9
80920	Colorado	El Paso County	0.9	9
80127	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.8	8
80831	Colorado	El Paso County	0.8	8
80134	Colorado	Douglas County	0.8	8
81230	Colorado	Gunnison County	0.8	8
80917	Colorado	El Paso County	0.8	8
80829	Colorado	El Paso County	0.7	7
81050	Colorado	Otero County	0.7	7
80013	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.6	6
80439	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.6	6
80210	Colorado	Denver County	0.6	6
81007	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.6	6
80132	Colorado	El Paso County	0.6	6
80227	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.6	6
80421	Colorado	Park County	0.6	6
80130	Colorado	Douglas County	0.6	6
80921	Colorado	El Paso County	0.6	6
81236	Colorado	Chaffee County	0.5	5
81252	Colorado	Custer County	0.5	5
80908	Colorado	El Paso County	0.5	5
80305	Colorado	Boulder County	0.5	5
80922	Colorado	El Paso County	0.5	5
81008	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.5	5

80111	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.5	5
80218	Colorado	Denver County	0.5	5
80123	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.5	5
80440	Colorado	Park County	0.5	5
80923	Colorado	El Paso County	0.5	5
80206	Colorado	Denver County	0.5	5
80014	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.5	5
80129	Colorado	Douglas County	0.5	5
80817	Colorado	El Paso County	0.5	5
80228	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.4	4
80020	Colorado	Broomfield County	0.4	4
81052	Colorado	Prowers County	0.4	4
80403	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.4	4
80212	Colorado	Denver County	0.4	4
80905	Colorado	El Paso County	0.4	4
80526	Colorado	Larimer County	0.4	4
80915	Colorado	El Paso County	0.4	4
80120	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.4	4
80021	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.4	4
81001	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.4	4
80231	Colorado	Denver County	0.4	4
80925	Colorado	El Paso County	0.4	4
81623	Colorado	Garfield County	0.3	3
80110	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.3	3
81003	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.3	3
80121	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.3	3
80027	Colorado	Boulder County	0.3	3
67880	Kansas	Grant County	0.3	3
80449	Colorado	Park County	0.3	3
80016	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.3	3
80128	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.3	3
80465	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.3	3
80602	Colorado	Adams County	0.3	3
80433	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.3	3
80809	Colorado	El Paso County	0.3	3
80015	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.3	3
80002	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.3	3
80814	Colorado	Teller County	0.3	3
80026	Colorado	Boulder County	0.3	3
80104	Colorado	Douglas County	0.3	3
80222	Colorado	Denver County	0.3	3
80211	Colorado	Denver County	0.3	3
80503	Colorado	Boulder County	0.3	3
80304	Colorado	Boulder County	0.3	3
81082	Colorado	Las Animas County	0.3	3
80033	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.3	3
80303	Colorado	Boulder County	0.3	3
80501	Colorado	Boulder County	0.3	3
80122	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.3	3
81073	Colorado	Baca County	0.3	3
67846	Kansas	Finney County	0.3	3

80401	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.3	3
80230	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
81090	Colorado	Baca County	0.2	2
80550	Colorado	Weld County	0.2	2
80402	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.2	2
46373	Indiana	Lake County	0.2	2
80108	Colorado	Douglas County	0.2	2
81005	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.2	2
81004	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.2	2
80106	Colorado	El Paso County	0.2	2
81649	Colorado	Eagle County	0.2	2
80109	Colorado	Douglas County	0.2	2
81019	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.2	2
80010	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.2	2
80209	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
64113	Missouri	Jackson County	0.2	2
78633	Texas	Williamson County	0.2	2
80126	Colorado	Douglas County	0.2	2
80135	Colorado	Douglas County	0.2	2
80246	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
80902	Colorado	El Paso County	0.2	2
80204	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
80470	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.2	2
80214	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.2	2
80640	Colorado	Adams County	0.2	2
67951	Kansas	Stevens County	0.2	2
80226	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.2	2
80819	Colorado	El Paso County	0.2	2
67855	Kansas	Stanton County	0.2	2
80247	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
80205	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
80477	Colorado	Routt County	0.2	2
80003	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.2	2
80011	Colorado	Adams County	0.2	2
80827	Colorado	Park County	0.2	2
70125	Louisiana	Orleans Parish	0.2	2
81055	Colorado	Huerfano County	0.2	2
80004	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.2	2
80926	Colorado	El Paso County	0.2	2
80910	Colorado	El Paso County	0.2	2
80424	Colorado	Summit County	0.2	2
80220	Colorado	Denver County	0.2	2
81637	Colorado	Eagle County	0.2	2
80125	Colorado	Douglas County	0.2	2
80816	Colorado	Teller County	0.2	2
80425	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
22033	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	1
80138	Colorado	Douglas County	0.1	1
33462	Florida	Palm Beach County	0.1	1
80237	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
80802	Colorado	Cheyenne County	0.1	1

57108	South Dakota	Lincoln County	0.1	1
74066	Oklahoma	Creek County	0.1	1
28461	North Carolina	Brunswick County	0.1	1
67954	Kansas	Morton County	0.1	1
80302	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
80224	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
55906	Minnesota	Olmsted County	0.1	1
81631	Colorado	Eagle County	0.1	1
49464	Michigan	Ottawa County	0.1	1
73012	Oklahoma	Stephens County	0.1	1
93010	California	Ventura County	0.1	1
87144	New Mexico	Sandoval County	0.1	1
94302	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
11105	New York	Queens County	0.1	1
74105	Oklahoma	Tulsa County	0.1	1
32210	Florida	Duval County	0.1	1
17601	Pennsylvania	Lancaster County	0.1	1
80239	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
74114	Oklahoma	Tulsa County	0.1	1
87110	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
82070	Wyoming	Albany County	0.1	1
80504	Colorado	Weld County	0.1	1
97403	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
80290	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
81251	Colorado	Lake County	0.1	1
80107	Colorado	Elbert County	0.1	1
75756	Texas	Henderson County	0.1	1
80864	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
67748	Kansas	Logan County	0.1	1
81067	Colorado	Otero County	0.1	1
84029	Utah	Tooele County	0.1	1
98402	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
39560	Mississippi	Harrison County	0.1	1
94010	California	San Mateo County	0.1	1
65653	Missouri	Taney County	0.1	1
99148	Washington	Stevens County	0.1	1
33715	Florida	Pinellas County	0.1	1
85302	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
48121	Michigan	Wayne County	0.1	1
18058	Pennsylvania	Monroe County	0.1	1
87504	New Mexico	Santa Fe County	0.1	1
53717	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
75904	Texas	Angelina County	0.1	1
30317	Georgia	DeKalb County	0.1	1
80456	Colorado	Park County	0.1	1
53189	Wisconsin	Waukesha County	0.1	1
80751	Colorado	Logan County	0.1	1
79118	Texas	Randall County	0.1	1
32333	Florida	Gadsden County	0.1	1
32456	Florida	Gulf County	0.1	1
75217	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1

70560	Louisiana	Iberia Parish	0.1	1
50207	Iowa	Mahaska County	0.1	1
93110	California	Santa Barbara County	0.1	1
55122	Minnesota	Dakota County	0.1	1
60304	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
38671	Mississippi	DeSoto County	0.1	1
80615	Colorado	Weld County	0.1	1
81428	Colorado	Delta County	0.1	1
45732	Ohio	Athens County	0.1	1
34994	Florida	Martin County	0.1	1
80453	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
83805	Idaho	Boundary County	0.1	1
28906	North Carolina	Cherokee County	0.1	1
50109	Iowa	Dallas County	0.1	1
55423	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
64138	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
81432	Colorado	Ouray County	0.1	1
75442	Texas	Collin County	0.1	1
72735	Arkansas	Washington County	0.1	1
93460	California	Santa Barbara County	0.1	1
67953	Kansas	Morton County	0.1	1
80540	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
81620	Colorado	Eagle County	0.1	1
65793	Missouri	Howell County	0.1	1
76034	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
37066	Tennessee	Sumner County	0.1	1
81601	Colorado	Garfield County	0.1	1
33139	Florida	Miami-Dade County	0.1	1
65801	Missouri	Greene County	0.1	1
87185	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
80216	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
80452	Colorado	Clear Creek County	0.1	1
74043	Oklahoma	Tulsa County	0.1	1
73130	Oklahoma	Oklahoma County	0.1	1
74133	Oklahoma	Tulsa County	0.1	1
82414	Wyoming	Park County	0.1	1
64116	Missouri	Clay County	0.1	1
67870	Kansas	Haskell County	0.1	1
75116	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
59501	Montana	Hill County	0.1	1
46254	Indiana	Marion County	0.1	1
74401	Oklahoma	Muskogee County	0.1	1
75752	Texas	Henderson County	0.1	1
87508	New Mexico	Santa Fe County	0.1	1
81089	Colorado	Huerfano County	0.1	1
33408	Florida	Palm Beach County	0.1	1
19977	Delaware	Kent County	0.1	1
73071	Oklahoma	Cleveland County	0.1	1
52241	Iowa	Johnson County	0.1	1
80241	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
78757	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1

80207	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
66606	Kansas	Shawnee County	0.1	1
74058	Oklahoma	Pawnee County	0.1	1
76008	Texas	Parker County	0.1	1
77084	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
80444	Colorado	Clear Creek County	0.1	1
44890	Ohio	Huron County	0.1	1
80840	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
46202	Indiana	Marion County	0.1	1
76692	Texas	Hill County	0.1	1
80225	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
64057	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
44141	Ohio	Cuyahoga County	0.1	1
85383	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
80524	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
80825	Colorado	Cheyenne County	0.1	1
87112	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
81131	Colorado	Saguache County	0.1	1
80017	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
87544	New Mexico	Los Alamos County	0.1	1
98026	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
90717	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
77049	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
64011	Missouri	Lafayette County	0.1	1
94582	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
81049	Colorado	Las Animas County	0.1	1
01845	Massachusetts	Essex County	0.1	1
65707	Missouri	Lawrence County	0.1	1
54701	Wisconsin	Eau Claire County	0.1	1
70762	Louisiana	Pointe Coupee Parish	0.1	1
80420	Colorado	Park County	0.1	1
81621	Colorado	Eagle County	0.1	1
94123	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
80804	Colorado	Lincoln County	0.1	1
81302	Colorado	La Plata County	0.1	1
78728	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
80201	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
81125	Colorado	Rio Grande County	0.1	1
80263	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
77388	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
76011	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
81501	Colorado	Mesa County	0.1	1
37321	Tennessee	Rhea County	0.1	1
33908	Florida	Lee County	0.1	1
67114	Kansas	Harvey County	0.1	1
77389	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
65202	Missouri	Boone County	0.1	1
80521	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
76116	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
66604	Kansas	Shawnee County	0.1	1
91744	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1

52761	Iowa	Muscatine County	0.1	1
77584	Texas	Brazoria County	0.1	1
80202	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
77386	Texas	Montgomery County	0.1	1
30161	Georgia	Floyd County	0.1	1
78253	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
75229	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
47250	Indiana	Jefferson County	0.1	1
71037	Louisiana	Bossier Parish	0.1	1
67226	Kansas	Sedgwick County	0.1	1
66044	Kansas	Douglas County	0.1	1
03839	New Hampshire	Strafford County	0.1	1
28227	North Carolina	Mecklenburg County	0.1	1
80642	Colorado	Weld County	0.1	1
67530	Kansas	Barton County	0.1	1
80549	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
85706	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
02446	Massachusetts	Norfolk County	0.1	1
78702	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
80118	Colorado	Douglas County	0.1	1
66607	Kansas	Shawnee County	0.1	1
70441	Louisiana	St. Helena Parish	0.1	1
77005	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
50619	Iowa	Butler County	0.1	1
80006	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
81029	Colorado	Baca County	0.1	1
23229	Virginia	Henrico County	0.1	1
35763	Alabama	Madison County	0.1	1
79912	Texas	El Paso County	0.1	1
58701	North Dakota	Ward County	0.1	1
77009	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
80538	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
71068	Louisiana	Bienville Parish	0.1	1
76262	Texas	Denton County	0.1	1
28753	North Carolina	Madison County	0.1	1
07030	New Jersey	Hudson County	0.1	1
43125	Ohio	Franklin County	0.1	1
34990	Florida	Martin County	0.1	1
75093	Texas	Collin County	0.1	1
31801	Georgia	Talbot County	0.1	1
78070	Texas	Comal County	0.1	1
30184	Georgia	Bartow County	0.1	1
10280	New York	New York County	0.1	1
94531	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
21702	Maryland	Frederick County	0.1	1
30350	Georgia	DeKalb County	0.1	1
75208	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
64055	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
94526	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
79902	Texas	El Paso County	0.1	1
65203	Missouri	Boone County	0.1	1

81006	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.1	1
50666	Iowa	Bremer County	0.1	1
37307	Tennessee	Polk County	0.1	1
80221	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
08247	New Jersey	Cape May County	0.1	1
80924	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
67037	Kansas	Sedgwick County	0.1	1
67861	Kansas	Wichita County	0.1	1
63011	Missouri	St. Louis County	0.1	1
91384	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
27871	North Carolina	Martin County	0.1	1
68136	Nebraska	Sarpy County	0.1	1
29020	South Carolina	Kershaw County	0.1	1
80005	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
63126	Missouri	St. Louis County	0.1	1
77381	Texas	Montgomery County	0.1	1
58501	North Dakota	Burleigh County	0.1	1
81521	Colorado	Mesa County	0.1	1
39501	Mississippi	Harrison County	0.1	1
93447	California	San Luis Obispo County	0.1	1
87101	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
22309	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	1
31811	Georgia	Harris County	0.1	1
66507	Kansas	Wabaunsee County	0.1	1
81022	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.1	1
97223	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	1
77089	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
65807	Missouri	Greene County	0.1	1
67212	Kansas	Sedgwick County	0.1	1
76020	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
36542	Alabama	Baldwin County	0.1	1
48169	Michigan	Livingston County	0.1	1
36109	Alabama	Montgomery County	0.1	1
26836	West Virginia	Hardy County	0.1	1
80436	Colorado	Clear Creek County	0.1	1
80235	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
29223	South Carolina	Richland County	0.1	1
35473	Alabama	Tuscaloosa County	0.1	1
81415	Colorado	Delta County	0.1	1
71201	Louisiana	Ouachita Parish	0.1	1
81223	Colorado	Fremont County	0.1	1
20815	Maryland	Montgomery County	0.1	1
72113	Arkansas	Pulaski County	0.1	1
64015	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
63021	Missouri	St. Louis County	0.1	1
50702	Iowa	Black Hawk County	0.1	1
87106	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
18812	Pennsylvania	Susquehanna County	0.1	1
80215	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
78006	Texas	Kendall County	0.1	1
94705	California	Alameda County	0.1	1

87048	New Mexico	Sandoval County	0.1	1
80487	Colorado	Routt County	0.1	1
60035	Illinois	Lake County	0.1	1
74966	Oklahoma	Le Flore County	0.1	1
81024	Colorado	Las Animas County	0.1	1
87107	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
81101	Colorado	Alamosa County	0.1	1
60465	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
66112	Kansas	Wyandotte County	0.1	1
78732	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
27410	North Carolina	Guilford County	0.1	1
81132	Colorado	Rio Grande County	0.1	1
66223	Kansas	Johnson County	0.1	1
80229	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
86001	Arizona	Coconino County	0.1	1
80022	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
80901	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
75061	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
80234	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
45053	Ohio	Butler County	0.1	1
80102	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
83832	Idaho	Latah County	0.1	1
92672	California	Orange County	0.1	1
81023	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.1	1
77379	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
76132	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
80233	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
74354	Oklahoma	Ottawa County	0.1	1
73034	Oklahoma	Oklahoma County	0.1	1
80112	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
67147	Kansas	Sedgwick County	0.1	1
67665	Kansas	Russell County	0.1	1
46383	Indiana	Porter County	0.1	1
72205	Arkansas	Pulaski County	0.1	1
81091	Colorado	Las Animas County	0.1	1
72032	Arkansas	Faulkner County	0.1	1
47401	Indiana	Monroe County	0.1	1
54963	Wisconsin	Winnebago County	0.1	1
33138	Florida	Miami-Dade County	0.1	1
49423	Michigan	Ottawa County	0.1	1
79241	Texas	Floyd County	0.1	1
69301	Nebraska	Box Butte County	0.1	1
67204	Kansas	Sedgwick County	0.1	1
81526	Colorado	Mesa County	0.1	1
80203	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
53066	Wisconsin	Waukesha County	0.1	1
44017	Ohio	Cuyahoga County	0.1	1
80432	Colorado	Park County	0.1	1
81240	Colorado	Fremont 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	0.2	2.8	8.9	31.7	56.5	4.4	4.4	96
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.0	17.5	24.2	58.3	4.4	4.2	110
Condition of Environment	0.2	0.5	8.5	11.3	79.5	4.7	4.8	139
Employee Helpfulness	0.6	1.1	4.8	9.9	83.5	4.7	4.3	69
Interpretive Displays	1.1	16.2	12.8	33.3	36.7	3.9	3.9	103
Parking Availability	1.0	0.6	2.7	15.6	80.2	4.7	4.5	137
Parking Lot Condition	0.9	2.8	6.0	17.8	72.6	4.6	4.1	131
Rec. Info. Availability	0.3	18.0	9.2	18.5	54.0	4.1	4.4	115
Road Condition	10.7	3.0	15.0	14.4	56.9	4.0	4.4	83
Feeling of Safety	0.2	0.0	0.4	8.9	90.4	4.9	4.6	137
Scenery	0.2	0.0	0.0	4.6	95.1	4.9	4.7	139
Signage Adequacy	2.4	3.1	29.2	24.8	40.5	4.0	4.5	129
Trail Condition	0.5	0.8	8.7	14.2	75.8	4.6	4.5	89
Value for Fee Paid	0.2	12.6	3.5	4.7	79.0	4.5	4.6	75

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								8
Developed Facilities								9
Condition of Environment	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.3	82.7	4.8	4.8	11
Employee Helpfulness								7
Interpretive Displays								7
Parking Availability	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	96.8	5.0	4.7	10
Parking Lot Condition								6
Rec. Info. Availability	0.0	20.5	20.0	18.6	40.9	3.8	3.9	10
Road Condition							4.3	9
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	96.2	5.0	4.5	11
Scenery	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.6	96.5	4.9	4.9	11
Signage Adequacy	0.0	1.9	1.5	30.8	65.8	4.6	4.7	11
Trail Condition								8
Value for Fee Paid	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.7	80.3	4.8	4.4	10

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	19.3	0.0	16.6	19.0	45.2	3.7	4.0	39
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.0	21.1	19.4	59.5	4.4	4.3	44
Condition of Environment	2.3	0.8	7.8	20.4	68.7	4.5	4.7	114
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	16.2	22.3	61.6	4.5	4.1	50
Interpretive Displays	5.1	10.9	6.8	42.1	35.1	3.9	3.7	58
Parking Availability	5.4	0.2	15.0	28.5	51.0	4.2	4.3	97
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	1.1	11.3	42.5	45.2	4.3	4.1	77
Rec. Info. Availability	5.9	11.6	13.2	29.8	39.5	3.9	4.1	96
Road Condition	5.5	5.4	18.1	37.7	33.2	3.9	4.2	92
Feeling of Safety	0.0	2.6	6.0	23.5	67.9	4.6	4.6	111
Scenery	0.0	0.0	4.6	11.8	83.6	4.8	4.6	114
Signage Adequacy	5.7	2.2	20.3	21.6	50.2	4.1	4.2	106
Trail Condition	0.0	6.0	4.0	32.3	57.7	4.4	4.5	83
Value for Fee Paid	9.5	0.0	1.2	26.6	62.7	4.3	4.3	33

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	4.3	6.7	4.3	43.4	41.3	4.1	4.5	17
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.0	8.4	28.8	62.7	4.5	4.3	19
Condition of Environment	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.4	77.6	4.8	4.8	50
Employee Helpfulness							4.0	8
Interpretive Displays	3.6	0.0	12.0	59.6	24.8	4.0	3.6	31
Parking Availability	0.0	10.0	13.1	16.9	59.9	4.3	3.7	49
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	2.6	13.2	33.1	51.1	4.3	3.4	47
Rec. Info. Availability	8.3	3.9	10.3	19.7	57.8	4.1	4.0	37
Road Condition	0.0	1.0	5.9	52.7	40.4	4.3	3.9	44
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	94.0	4.9	3.9	50
Scenery	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.9	90.1	4.9	4.7	50
Signage Adequacy	6.2	5.1	2.5	26.1	60.0	4.3	4.3	47
Trail Condition	0.0	0.0	2.6	19.1	78.3	4.8	4.3	47
Value for Fee Paid							4.5	8

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.