

## 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     | 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         |

### Selected Regions:

Northern Region (R1) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Rocky Mountain Region (R2) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Southwest Region (R3) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Intermountain Region (R4) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Pacific Southwest Region (R5) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Pacific Northwest Region (R6) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Southern Region (R8) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Eastern Region (R9) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)  
 Alaska Region (R10) (FY 2015, FY 2016, FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019)

## Importance-Performance Ratings for Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)

| Satisfaction Element | Importance-Performance Rating |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
|----------------------|-------------------------------|

An Importance-Performance Analysis was calculated from the average importance and satisfaction scores. A target level of importance and performance divides the possible set of score pairs into four quadrants. Here, 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.