



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Natural Resource
Manager

National Visitor
Use Monitoring
Program



Last updated:
28 January 2024

Visitor Use Report

Flathead NF

USDA Forest Service Region 1

National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2015

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	12	35	34.3
DUDS	HIGH	10	45	22.2
DUDS	MEDIUM	9	139	6.5
DUDS	LOW	17	1,105	1.5
DUDS	FE3	18	693	2.6
DUDS	SV1	12	212	5.7
OUDS	LOW	13	1,766	0.7
OUDS	FE3	8	138	5.8
OUDS	FE4	17	1,567	1.1
OUDS	RE2	17	3,353	0.5
OUDS	RE4	8	494	1.6
GFA	HIGH	16	262	6.1
GFA	MEDIUM	28	1,413	2.0
GFA	LOW	83	13,073	0.6
WILDERNESS	MEDIUM	10	379	2.6
WILDERNESS	LOW	28	4,439	0.6
Total		306	29,113	1.1

* 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, OUDS = 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*	1,206	±9.6
→ Day Use Developed Site Visits	573	±9.0
→ Overnight Use Developed Site Visits	120	±35.0
→ General Forest Area Visits	459	±20.2
→ Designated Wilderness Visits†	54	±34.7
Total Estimated National Forest Visits§	1,098	±9.4
→ Special Events and Organized Camp Use‡	1	±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	843	688	482
Overnight Use Developed Sites	255	218	104
Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)	744	607	318
Designated Wilderness	63	53	38
Total	1,905	1,566	942

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	155	41	121	10	327
Economic	155	33	83	10	281
Satisfaction	172	30	114	18	334
Total	482	104	318	38	942

* 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 show that about 37% of visits to the Flathead NF are made by females. Among racial and ethnic minorities, the most commonly encountered are American Indian/Alaskan Native (3%). The age distribution shows that about 19% visits are children under age 16. People over the age of 60 account for about 20% of visits. The majority of visits are from those living in the local area: nearly 74% of visits come from people who live within 50 miles. About 14% of visits come from those living more than 200 miles away.

Table 5. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Gender

Gender	Survey Respondents†	National Forest Visits (%)‡
Female	897	37.3
Male	1,147	62.7
Total	2,044	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	19	2.8
Asian	11	0.4
Black / African American	1	0.0
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	6	0.4
White	831	97.6
Total	868	101.2

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	National Forest Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	20	1.8



* 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.

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	18.9
16-19	3.0
20-29	12.6
30-39	18.3
40-49	15.3
50-59	13.1
60-69	14.0
70+	4.8
Total	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 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)
59901	Montana	Flathead County	25.6	151
59937	Montana	Flathead County	16.1	95
59912	Montana	Flathead County	14.9	88
59911	Montana	Flathead County	10.4	61
Foreign Country			10.4	61
59922	Montana	Flathead County	4.4	26
59919	Montana	Flathead County	4.1	24
59801	Montana	Missoula County	2.4	14
59860	Montana	Lake County	2.0	12
59802	Montana	Missoula County	1.9	11
59913	Montana	Flathead County	1.9	11
59808	Montana	Missoula County	1.5	9
Unknown Origin*			1.5	9
59926	Montana	Flathead County	1.5	9
59601	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	1.4	8

* 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	48.9
26 - 50 miles	25.1
51 - 75 miles	4.5
76 - 100 miles	4.3
101 - 200 miles	2.9
201 - 500 miles	4.4
Over 500 miles	9.9
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.

More than 48% of visits to this forest last at most 6 hours, although the average duration is about 30 hours because of long stays of those using overnight use sites. The median length of visit to overnight sites is about 48 hours, indicating a two night stay. About 70% of visits come from people who visit at most 5 times per year. Very frequent visitors are fairly rare, about 7% of visits are made by people who visit more than 50 times per year.

Table 10. Visit Duration

Visit Type	Average Duration (hours)‡	Median Duration (hours)‡
Site Visit	10.1	3.1
Day Use Developed	2.7	2.5
Overnight Use Developed	41.9	41.2
Undeveloped Areas	7.1	3.3
Designated Wilderness	39.9	8.4
National Forest Visit	13.0	4.8

* 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*	91.1
Number of national forest sites visited on National Forest Visit*	1.1
Group size	2.5
Axles per vehicle	2.2

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

Number of Annual Visits	Visits (%)†	Cumulative Visits (%)
1 - 5	30.9	30.9
6 - 10	5.7	36.6
11 - 15	8.5	45.1
16 - 20	4.8	49.8
21 - 25	4.2	54.0
26 - 30	7.2	61.2
31 - 35	1.6	62.8
36 - 40	5.3	68.1
41 - 50	9.8	77.9
51 - 100	15.3	93.1
101 - 200	4.1	97.2
201 - 300	1.5	98.7
Over 300	1.3	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.

The most frequently reported primary activity is downhill skiing (37%), followed by hiking/walking (11%).


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
Downhill Skiing	37.7	37.2	5.4
Viewing Natural Features	31.8	9.1	5.1
Hiking / Walking	26.5	11.1	4.4
Viewing Wildlife	21.7	3.6	2.9
Relaxing	20.4	2.6	8.8
Driving for Pleasure	11.9	2.8	2.7
Fishing	9.3	6.1	5.7
Developed Camping	8.7	4.9	28.7
Hunting	6.7	5.8	15.5
Other Non-motorized	5.8	1.8	2.3
Non-motorized Water	5.7	3.8	4.3
Some Other Activity	4.3	3.1	2.8
Gathering Forest Products	4.2	1.2	3.9
Snowmobiling	3.7	2.3	4.5
Picnicking	3.7	0.5	4.1
Bicycling	2.8	1.5	4.5
Motorized Water Activities	2.3	2.0	6.4
Nature Study	2.2	0.2	3.5
Nature Center Activities	2.0	0.2	1.0
Horseback Riding	1.8	0.3	6.0
OHV Use	1.8	1.8	3.6
Resort Use	1.7	0.3	29.4
Cross-country Skiing	1.6	1.2	3.7
Primitive Camping	1.3	0.4	47.8
Motorized Trail Activity	0.9	0.1	7.0
Backpacking	0.9	0.1	11.1
Visiting Historic Sites	0.7	0.0	2.0
Other Motorized Activity	0.4	0.0	0.0
No Activity Reported	0.0	0.7	

% 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%.

Special Facility Use

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	10.3
Scenic Byway	3.7
Visitor Center or Museum	7.3
Designated ORV Area	4.3
Forest Roads	3.2
Interpretive Displays	2.5
Information Sites	4.8
Developed Fishing Site	6.6
Motorized Single Track Trails	2.5
Motorized Dual Track Trails	2.4
None of these Facilities	73.5

* 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. Analysis of spending data included identification of the primary visitor segments that have distinct spending profiles as well as estimation of the average spending per party per visit. Results from the FY2005 through FY2009 period are available in a report: <https://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/43869>. Results from the FY2010 through FY2014 period are in the publication process.

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. The distribution of visits by spending segment is not displayed in this report. See the appendix tables in the spending analysis report cited above for spending segment distributions.

For more than 72% of visits, the trip to the Beaverhead-Deerlodge is a day trip from home rather than a trip that includes an overnight stay. The income distribution results show a concentration in the lower and middle range: more than 65% of visits are from households making between \$25,000 and \$100,000.

Table 15 is no longer displayed here

4.2. Spending Profiles

Spending profiles for each segment are contained in the spending analysis report, as are tables that identify whether visitors to a particular forest are in a higher or lower than average range. It is essential to note that the spending profiles are in dollars per party per visit. Obtaining per visit spending is accomplished by dividing the spending for each segment by the average people per party for the forest and spending segment. These data are in the appendix of the 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 party spending averages with the number of party trips in the segment. The number of party-trips in the segment equals the number of National Forest visits reported in table 2, times the percentage of visits in each spending segment, and divided by the average people per party.

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	\$238
Median Total Trip Spending per Party	\$55
% NF Visits made on trip with overnight stay away from home	23.2%
% NF Visits with overnight stay within 50 miles of NF	19.1%
Mean nights/visit within 50 miles of NF	6.0
Area Lodging Use	% Visits with Nights Near Forest
NFS Campground on this NF	29.5%
Undeveloped Camping in this NF	8.3%
NFS Cabin	9.0%
Other Public Campground	6.0%
Private Campground	4.6%
Rented Private Home	28.8%
Home of Friends/Family	12.8%
Own Home	3.2%
Other Lodging	2.1%

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	12.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	15.1
\$50,000 to \$74,999	24.5
\$75,000 to \$99,999	25.2
\$100,000 to \$149,999	14.3
\$150,000 and up	9.0
Total	100.1

* 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 (DUUDS), Overnight Use Developed (OUUDS), 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 results are quite good. About 75% of people visiting indicated they were very satisfied with their overall recreation experience; another 20% were somewhat satisfied. The results for the composite indices were also very good. Satisfaction ratings for perception of safety were over 89% for all types of sites. Ratings for the other composites were 83% or higher in developed sites.

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	95.9	79.2	78.3
Access	86.2	83.9	84.5
Services	83.6	82.1	73.7
Feeling of Safety	95.4	96.4	88.9

† 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	Concentrate Here
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	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 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	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Lot Condition	Possible Overkill
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 22. Importance-Performance Ratings for Designated Wilderness

Satisfaction Element	Importance-Performance Rating
Restroom Cleanliness	Possible Overkill
Developed Facilities	*
Condition of Environment	Keep up the Good Work
Employee Helpfulness	*
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 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	*

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

Road Conditions & Signage

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	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	1.0	12.1	3.4	5.6
8	8.8	2.9	1.7	16.7
7	5.1	12.1	3.7	11.1
6	18.8	19.4	7.5	22.2
5	14.3	12.1	10.5	0.0
4	22.0	9.9	12.6	11.1
3	13.2	8.6	14.4	11.1
2	16.5	23.0	46.2	22.2
1 - Hardly anyone there	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average Rating	4.6	5.0	3.5	5.2


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	9.7
Of this group, percent who said facilities at site visited were accessible	96.4

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	15	17.8
Male	48	82.2
Total	63	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	0	0.0
Black / African American	0	0.0
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1	2.7
White	36	97.3
Total	37	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	6.0
16-19	0.0
20-29	12.8
30-39	29.7
40-49	8.7
50-59	26.8
60-69	13.6
70+	2.5
Total	100.1



* 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)
59804	Montana	Missoula County	13.0	3
59912	Montana	Flathead County	8.7	2
59860	Montana	Lake County	8.7	2
Unknown Origin*			8.7	2
59911	Montana	Flathead County	8.7	2
59601	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	8.7	2
59901	Montana	Flathead County	8.7	2
59913	Montana	Flathead County	4.3	1
59930	Montana	Lincoln County	4.3	1
87505	New Mexico	Santa Fe County	4.3	1
80209	Colorado	Denver County	4.3	1
59701	Montana	Silver Bow County	4.3	1
59602	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	4.3	1
59868	Montana	Missoula County	4.3	1
11232	New York	Kings County	4.3	1

* 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)
59901	Montana	Flathead County	16.0	151
59937	Montana	Flathead County	10.1	95
59912	Montana	Flathead County	9.3	88
59911	Montana	Flathead County	6.5	61
Foreign Country			6.5	61
59922	Montana	Flathead County	2.8	26
59919	Montana	Flathead County	2.5	24
59801	Montana	Missoula County	1.5	14
59860	Montana	Lake County	1.3	12
59802	Montana	Missoula County	1.2	11
59913	Montana	Flathead County	1.2	11
59808	Montana	Missoula County	1.0	9
Unknown Origin*			1.0	9
59926	Montana	Flathead County	1.0	9
59601	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	0.8	8
59917	Montana	Lincoln County	0.7	7
59903	Montana	Flathead County	0.7	7
59868	Montana	Missoula County	0.7	7
59932	Montana	Flathead County	0.6	6
59803	Montana	Missoula County	0.6	6
59920	Montana	Flathead County	0.6	6
59804	Montana	Missoula County	0.5	5
98115	Washington	King County	0.4	4
59914	Montana	Lake County	0.4	4
59501	Montana	Hill County	0.4	4
59928	Montana	Flathead County	0.4	4
59904	Montana	Flathead County	0.4	4
59847	Montana	Missoula County	0.4	4
59715	Montana	Gallatin County	0.3	3
99201	Washington	Spokane County	0.3	3
59936	Montana	Flathead County	0.3	3
83864	Idaho	Bonner County	0.3	3
59826	Montana	Missoula County	0.3	3
59923	Montana	Lincoln County	0.3	3
59845	Montana	Sanders County	0.3	3
59864	Montana	Lake County	0.2	2
59806	Montana	Missoula County	0.2	2
59602	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	0.2	2
87505	New Mexico	Santa Fe County	0.2	2
99223	Washington	Spokane County	0.2	2

55424	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.2	2
59221	Montana	Richland County	0.2	2
59047	Montana	Park County	0.2	2
59427	Montana	Glacier County	0.2	2
59925	Montana	Flathead County	0.2	2
90020	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
08723	New Jersey	Ocean County	0.1	1
12804	New York	Warren County	0.1	1
75219	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
95404	California	Sonoma County	0.1	1
59854	Montana	Powell County	0.1	1
55901	Minnesota	Olmsted County	0.1	1
56078	Minnesota	Blue Earth County	0.1	1
92120	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
77041	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
82718	Wyoming	Campbell County	0.1	1
85018	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85020	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
98665	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
94122	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
65804	Missouri	Greene County	0.1	1
97361	Oregon	Polk County	0.1	1
02135	Massachusetts	Suffolk County	0.1	1
37919	Tennessee	Knox County	0.1	1
78731	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
85260	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
83646	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
95041	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
92108	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
77477	Texas	Fort Bend County	0.1	1
71269	Louisiana	Richland Parish	0.1	1
61073	Illinois	Winnebago County	0.1	1
01073	Massachusetts	Hampshire County	0.1	1
76801	Texas	Brown County	0.1	1
85284	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
83805	Idaho	Boundary County	0.1	1
54425	Wisconsin	Clark County	0.1	1
59405	Montana	Cascade County	0.1	1
95247	California	Calaveras County	0.1	1
85375	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
59848	Montana	Sanders County	0.1	1
55316	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
79029	Texas	Moore County	0.1	1
66226	Kansas	Johnson County	0.1	1
32256	Florida	Duval County	0.1	1
75227	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
75025	Texas	Collin County	0.1	1
75762	Texas	Smith County	0.1	1
95831	California	Sacramento County	0.1	1
58801	North Dakota	Williams County	0.1	1
55408	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1

98602	Washington	Klickitat County	0.1	1
14469	New York	Ontario County	0.1	1
83816	Idaho	Kootenai County	0.1	1
73044	Oklahoma	Logan County	0.1	1
33852	Florida	Highlands County	0.1	1
64055	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
44024	Ohio	Geauga County	0.1	1
85710	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
33406	Florida	Palm Beach County	0.1	1
98121	Washington	King County	0.1	1
83462	Idaho	Lemhi County	0.1	1
55446	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
98020	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
98034	Washington	King County	0.1	1
94561	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
97211	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
77807	Texas	Brazos County	0.1	1
22192	Virginia	Prince William County	0.1	1
59102	Montana	Yellowstone County	0.1	1
84010	Utah	Davis County	0.1	1
98155	Washington	King County	0.1	1
95953	California	Sutter County	0.1	1
30305	Georgia	Fulton County	0.1	1
59915	Montana	Lake County	0.1	1
46237	Indiana	Marion County	0.1	1
99603	Alaska	Kenai Peninsula Borough	0.1	1
58501	North Dakota	Burleigh County	0.1	1
95117	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
94704	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
80025	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
94123	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
60187	Illinois	DuPage County	0.1	1
29708	South Carolina	York County	0.1	1
53532	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
97002	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
85249	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
96763	Hawaii	Mauai County	0.1	1
05733	Vermont	Rutland County	0.1	1
32952	Florida	Brevard County	0.1	1
59106	Montana	Yellowstone County	0.1	1
94546	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
59870	Montana	Ravalli County	0.1	1
33767	Florida	Pinellas County	0.1	1
80023	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
98109	Washington	King County	0.1	1
94065	California	San Mateo County	0.1	1
66208	Kansas	Johnson County	0.1	1
95018	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
93612	California	Fresno County	0.1	1
67230	Kansas	Sedgwick County	0.1	1
53081	Wisconsin	Sheboygan County	0.1	1

59401	Montana	Cascade County	0.1	1
88318	New Mexico	Lincoln County	0.1	1
59718	Montana	Gallatin County	0.1	1
26559	West Virginia	Marion County	0.1	1
59101	Montana	Yellowstone County	0.1	1
92882	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
59634	Montana	Jefferson County	0.1	1
59930	Montana	Lincoln County	0.1	1
05071	Vermont	Windsor County	0.1	1
80602	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
05301	Vermont	Windham County	0.1	1
96740	Hawaii	Hawaii County	0.1	1
65049	Missouri	Camden County	0.1	1
80209	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
86404	Arizona	Mohave County	0.1	1
55369	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
80122	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
97034	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
59823	Montana	Missoula County	0.1	1
98229	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
28729	North Carolina	Henderson County	0.1	1
59301	Montana	Custer County	0.1	1
15243	Pennsylvania	Allegheny County	0.1	1
89084	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
70808	Louisiana	East Baton Rouge Parish	0.1	1
88011	New Mexico	Dona Ana County	0.1	1
59701	Montana	Silver Bow County	0.1	1
40489	Kentucky	Lincoln County	0.1	1
91403	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
89129	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
95448	California	Sonoma County	0.1	1
66614	Kansas	Shawnee County	0.1	1
84117	Utah	Salt Lake County	0.1	1
98862	Washington	Okanogan County	0.1	1
85220	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
83703	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
78746	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
48312	Michigan	Macomb County	0.1	1
92037	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
81328	Colorado	Montezuma County	0.1	1
20009	District of Columbia	District of Columbia	0.1	1
92122	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
41010	Kentucky	Grant County	0.1	1
54729	Wisconsin	Chippewa County	0.1	1
98251	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
31763	Georgia	Lee County	0.1	1
85262	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
32754	Florida	Brevard County	0.1	1
01720	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
59824	Montana	Lake County	0.1	1
97801	Oregon	Umatilla County	0.1	1

60544	Illinois	Will County	0.1	1
59468	Montana	Teton County	0.1	1
78063	Texas	Bandera County	0.1	1
83406	Idaho	Bonneville County	0.1	1
52136	Iowa	Howard County	0.1	1
59807	Montana	Missoula County	0.1	1
19073	Pennsylvania	Delaware County	0.1	1
85715	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
92806	California	Orange County	0.1	1
11232	New York	Kings County	0.1	1
39071	Mississippi	Madison County	0.1	1
96790	Hawaii	Maui County	0.1	1
27410	North Carolina	Guilford County	0.1	1
56377	Minnesota	Stearns County	0.1	1
54930	Wisconsin	Waushara County	0.1	1
42724	Kentucky	Hardin County	0.1	1
59410	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	0.1	1
32259	Florida	St. Johns County	0.1	1
10011	New York	New York County	0.1	1
76513	Texas	Bell County	0.1	1
59875	Montana	Ravalli County	0.1	1
45208	Ohio	Hamilton County	0.1	1
77657	Texas	Hardin County	0.1	1
55410	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
55318	Minnesota	Carver County	0.1	1
96744	Hawaii	Honolulu County	0.1	1
68114	Nebraska	Douglas County	0.1	1
80127	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
83401	Idaho	Bonneville County	0.1	1
80504	Colorado	Weld County	0.1	1
38139	Tennessee	Shelby County	0.1	1
92023	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
55118	Minnesota	Dakota County	0.1	1
62223	Illinois	St. Clair County	0.1	1
59037	Montana	Yellowstone County	0.1	1
59902	Montana	Flathead County	0.1	1
13605	New York	Jefferson County	0.1	1
98248	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
59457	Montana	Fergus County	0.1	1
89029	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
59714	Montana	Gallatin County	0.1	1
30306	Georgia	Fulton County	0.1	1
92651	California	Orange County	0.1	1
33309	Florida	Broward County	0.1	1
85248	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
37920	Tennessee	Knox County	0.1	1
53085	Wisconsin	Sheboygan County	0.1	1
99216	Washington	Spokane County	0.1	1
94510	California	Solano County	0.1	1
55080	Minnesota	Isanti County	0.1	1
10024	New York	New York County	0.1	1

95030	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
98239	Washington	Island County	0.1	1
22719	Virginia	Madison County	0.1	1
59865	Montana	Lake County	0.1	1
59632	Montana	Jefferson County	0.1	1
80013	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
38117	Tennessee	Shelby County	0.1	1
98606	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
97501	Oregon	Jackson County	0.1	1
99004	Washington	Spokane County	0.1	1
98501	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	1
90815	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
99208	Washington	Spokane County	0.1	1
90048	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
98902	Washington	Yakima County	0.1	1
90660	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
98036	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
75146	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
98403	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
89169	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
53555	Wisconsin	Columbia County	0.1	1
83634	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
55426	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
98508	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	1
22637	Virginia	Frederick County	0.1	1
95629	California	Amador County	0.1	1
95521	California	Humboldt County	0.1	1
83236	Idaho	Bingham County	0.1	1
27511	North Carolina	Wake County	0.1	1
58041	North Dakota	Richland County	0.1	1
77379	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
97424	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
49444	Michigan	Muskegon County	0.1	1
59105	Montana	Yellowstone County	0.1	1
32792	Florida	Orange County	0.1	1
44026	Ohio	Geauga County	0.1	1
98033	Washington	King County	0.1	1
85050	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
30144	Georgia	Cobb County	0.1	1
35226	Alabama	Jefferson County	0.1	1
96753	Hawaii	Maui County	0.1	1
97405	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
84003	Utah	Utah County	0.1	1
78620	Texas	Hays County	0.1	1
34685	Florida	Pinellas 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	0.0	1.0	3.7	18.4	76.9	4.7	4.4	132
Developed Facilities	0.3	0.8	1.3	22.0	75.5	4.7	4.3	144
Condition of Environment	0.5	0.7	5.1	34.9	58.9	4.5	4.5	165
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.3	1.8	15.4	82.5	4.8	4.6	118
Interpretive Displays	5.4	20.7	23.5	28.1	22.3	3.4	4.0	136
Parking Availability	0.3	0.9	9.4	31.5	58.0	4.5	4.3	163
Parking Lot Condition	0.3	4.2	1.9	36.7	56.9	4.5	4.0	161
Rec. Info. Availability	1.3	0.7	4.7	38.8	54.5	4.4	4.2	153
Road Condition	0.0	1.3	24.9	39.3	34.5	4.1	4.0	143
Feeling of Safety	0.3	0.1	4.6	9.3	85.7	4.8	4.1	164
Scenery	0.1	0.4	0.9	10.6	88.0	4.9	4.5	164
Signage Adequacy	0.8	3.4	8.8	41.5	45.5	4.3	4.2	163
Trail Condition	3.0	2.7	4.6	11.4	78.2	4.6	4.1	81
Value for Fee Paid	0.6	0.7	1.7	41.4	55.6	4.5	4.6	125

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	0.0	3.3	5.6	20.6	70.5	4.6	4.4	21
Developed Facilities	0.0	7.7	0.0	38.3	54.0	4.4	4.3	19
Condition of Environment	0.0	3.1	6.4	37.6	52.9	4.4	4.7	25
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.2	75.8	4.8	4.5	18
Interpretive Displays	0.0	11.0	14.6	50.0	24.3	3.9	3.8	13
Parking Availability	0.0	5.2	3.1	25.8	65.9	4.5	4.2	24
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.1	60.9	4.6	4.5	19
Rec. Info. Availability	9.0	0.0	25.3	35.0	30.7	3.8	4.3	19
Road Condition	10.2	3.7	6.9	48.2	31.1	3.9	4.3	24
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	2.1	14.2	83.7	4.8	4.6	25
Scenery	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.7	76.3	4.8	4.9	25
Signage Adequacy	0.0	3.4	10.9	24.8	60.9	4.4	4.3	23
Trail Condition	0.0	0.0	39.3	23.4	37.2	4.0	4.6	11
Value for Fee Paid	0.0	0.0	16.8	36.2	47.0	4.3	4.5	16

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	0.0	6.4	6.4	7.7	79.6	4.6	4.3	22
Developed Facilities	4.2	12.6	9.3	22.9	50.9	4.0	4.3	30
Condition of Environment	1.8	9.5	5.3	27.8	55.7	4.3	4.7	72
Employee Helpfulness	1.2	0.0	5.5	10.9	82.4	4.7	4.6	23
Interpretive Displays	3.0	3.0	7.3	38.8	48.0	4.3	4.2	39
Parking Availability	0.0	2.7	4.8	18.8	73.7	4.6	4.3	60
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	3.8	8.3	25.0	62.9	4.5	3.9	36
Rec. Info. Availability	2.3	9.7	10.2	18.1	59.7	4.2	4.3	56
Road Condition	0.0	6.8	22.1	34.1	37.0	4.0	4.3	64
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	3.6	13.2	83.2	4.8	4.4	71
Scenery	0.0	3.5	7.4	19.3	69.9	4.6	4.7	72
Signage Adequacy	2.3	2.3	16.5	36.6	42.3	4.1	4.2	67
Trail Condition	3.6	3.6	3.6	29.6	59.6	4.4	4.5	34
Value for Fee Paid	2.2	0.0	2.2	10.1	85.5	4.8	4.6	13

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	8.3	25.0	8.3	58.3	4.2	3.9	12
Developed Facilities	9.1	0.0	0.0	27.3	63.6	4.4		11
Condition of Environment	5.6	0.0	5.6	16.7	72.2	4.5	4.9	18
Employee Helpfulness								8
Interpretive Displays	7.1	7.1	21.4	35.7	28.6	3.7	2.9	14
Parking Availability	11.1	0.0	0.0	5.6	83.3	4.5	4.3	18
Parking Lot Condition	5.6	5.6	0.0	22.2	66.7	4.4	4.1	18
Rec. Info. Availability	5.9	5.9	17.6	29.4	41.2	3.9	4.2	17
Road Condition	16.7	5.6	5.6	16.7	55.6	3.9	4.5	18
Feeling of Safety	5.6	0.0	5.6	11.1	77.8	4.6	4.5	18
Scenery	5.6	0.0	5.6	11.1	77.8	4.6	4.6	18
Signage Adequacy	5.6	0.0	16.7	27.8	50.0	4.2	4.0	18
Trail Condition	5.9	5.9	0.0	23.5	64.7	4.4	4.8	17
Value for Fee Paid								3

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.