



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Natural Resource
Manager

National Visitor
Use Monitoring
Program



Last updated:
21 January 2018

Visitor Use Report

Siuslaw NF

USDA Forest Service

Region 6

National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2016

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	20	200	10.0
DUDS	HIGH	20	427	4.7
DUDS	MEDIUM	20	824	2.4
DUDS	LOW	20	3,666	0.5
DUDS	PTC1	6	366	1.6
DUDS	PTC3	6	366	1.6
OU DS	LOW	10	897	1.1
OU DS	DUR4	16	4,977	0.3
OU DS	DUR5	6	284	2.1
OU DS	RE4	6	366	1.6
GFA	VERY HIGH	2	41	4.9
GFA	HIGH	10	402	2.5
GFA	MEDIUM	11	1,459	0.8
GFA	LOW	17	15,801	0.1
GFA	PTC3	24	2,196	1.1
WILDERNESS	HIGH	10	24	41.7
WILDERNESS	MEDIUM	10	166	6.0
WILDERNESS	LOW	10	773	1.3
Total		224	33,235	0.7

* 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*	1,495	±11.2
→ Day Use Developed Site Visits	366	±11.8
→ Overnight Use Developed Site Visits	218	±26.1
→ General Forest Area Visits	906	±16.7
→ Designated Wilderness Visits†	6	±45.4
Total Estimated National Forest Visits§	1,017	±13.2
→ Special Events and Organized Camp Use‡	20	±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	1,318	1,075	756
Overnight Use Developed Sites	204	177	71
Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)	1,050	876	548
Designated Wilderness	61	57	50
Total	2,633	2,185	1,425

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	296	29	191	18	534
Economic	242	17	174	17	450
Satisfaction	218	25	183	15	441
Total	756	71	548	50	1,425

* 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 40 percent of visits to the Siuslaw NF are made by females. Among racial and ethnic minorities, the most commonly encountered are Hispanic/Latinos (4%) and Native Americans (3%). The age distribution shows that only about 14% of visits are children under age 16. People over the age of 60 account for about 25% of visits. About 35% of visits are from those living in the local area within 50 miles of the forest. About 28% of the 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	1,349	41.1
Male	1,542	58.9
Total	2,891	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	38	3.7
Asian	27	1.5
Black / African American	7	0.4
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	4	0.2
White	1,199	96.2
Total	1,275	102.0

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	National Forest Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	48	4.7



* 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	13.6
16-19	2.7
20-29	14.2
30-39	13.5
40-49	13.1
50-59	18.2
60-69	18.2
70+	6.6
Total	100.1



* 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)
Foreign Country			16.2	85
97439	Oregon	Lane County	14.3	75
Unknown Origin*			8.6	45
97420	Oregon	Coos County	8.4	44
97459	Oregon	Coos County	6.5	34
97330	Oregon	Benton County	6.3	33
97405	Oregon	Lane County	6.3	33
97449	Oregon	Coos County	5.9	31
97402	Oregon	Lane County	5.3	28
97467	Oregon	Douglas County	5.0	26
97478	Oregon	Lane County	4.8	25
97471	Oregon	Douglas County	3.2	17
97404	Oregon	Lane County	3.2	17
97333	Oregon	Benton County	3.0	16
97702	Oregon	Deschutes County	3.0	16

* 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	27.7
26 - 50 miles	6.2
51 - 75 miles	10.9
76 - 100 miles	13.2
101 - 200 miles	12.3
201 - 500 miles	13.0
Over 500 miles	16.7
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.

About half of visits last at most 3 hours, and a little more than 20 percent last 3 to 6 hours. Under 6 percent report a visit duration of over 72 hours. About 60 percent of visits come from people who visit at most 5 times per year. Very frequent visitors are not very common: only about 10 percent 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	10.8	2.0
Day Use Developed	1.4	0.8
Overnight Use Developed	42.4	40.3
Undeveloped Areas	5.6	2.0
Designated Wilderness	5.1	3.5
National Forest Visit	17.3	3.0

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

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

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

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


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

Table 11. Group Characteristics

Characteristic	Average
Percent of visits that were to just one national forest site during the National Forest Visit*	86.3
Number of national forest sites visited on National Forest Visit*	1.2
Group size	2.4
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	62.7	62.7
6 - 10	8.8	71.5
11 - 15	6.9	78.4
16 - 20	2.9	81.2
21 - 25	3.1	84.3
26 - 30	1.6	85.9
31 - 35	0.4	86.4
36 - 40	1.6	88.0
41 - 50	1.9	89.9
51 - 100	3.6	93.5
101 - 200	2.5	96.0
201 - 300	2.0	98.1
Over 300	1.9	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 commonly reported primary activities are hiking/walking (26%), viewing natural features (26%) and OHV use (17%).


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	56.9	26.2	1.9
Hiking / Walking	49.5	27.0	1.9
Relaxing	33.3	7.2	14.0
Viewing Wildlife	27.3	1.2	2.4
Driving for Pleasure	23.7	3.1	4.8
OHV Use	18.6	14.2	7.7
Developed Camping	14.0	2.3	38.0
Picnicking	12.1	0.9	1.9
Motorized Trail Activity	11.2	2.6	5.0
Nature Study	6.6	0.2	2.9
Nature Center Activities	5.6	0.5	1.0
Visiting Historic Sites	4.9	0.3	1.8
Other Motorized Activity	4.7	4.4	11.9
Fishing	4.7	2.6	3.1
Some Other Activity	3.6	2.6	1.9
Gathering Forest Products	3.5	1.3	3.5
Other Non-motorized	2.3	1.1	2.0
Primitive Camping	2.0	0.3	23.7
Bicycling	1.7	1.0	5.4
Hunting	0.9	0.7	2.8
Backpacking	0.8	0.0	38.6
Non-motorized Water	0.7	0.2	2.5
Horseback Riding	0.4	0.1	7.0
Resort Use	0.4	0.0	17.8
No Activity Reported	0.2	0.2	
Motorized Water Activities	0.1	0.0	2.0
Snowmobiling	0.0	0.3	5.0
Downhill Skiing	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cross-country Skiing	0.0	0.0	0.0

% Main Activity



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

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

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	2.7
Scenic Byway	60.0
Visitor Center or Museum	14.1
Designated ORV Area	26.5
Forest Roads	4.3
Interpretive Displays	9.7
Information Sites	6.6
Developed Fishing Site	3.9
Motorized Single Track Trails	4.3
Motorized Dual Track Trails	14.7
None of these Facilities	23.1

* 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 about 42 percent of the visits, the trip to the forest is a day trip from home rather than a trip that includes an overnight stay. For about 32 percent of visits, this forest was not the primary destination for the trip from home; rather, it was a side trip. The income distribution is fairly even. About 30% of the visits are from households making more than \$100,000 per year; nearly 33 percent report income under \$50,000.

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	\$719
Median Total Trip Spending per Party	\$100
% NF Visits made on trip with overnight stay away from home	44.7%
% NF Visits with overnight stay within 50 miles of NF	40.6%
Mean nights/visit within 50 miles of NF	4.8
Area Lodging Use	% Visits with Nights Near Forest
NFS Campground on this NF	39.2%
Undeveloped Camping in this NF	5.5%
NFS Cabin	0.5%
Other Public Campground	13.8%
Private Campground	8.3%
Rented Private Home	33.8%
Home of Friends/Family	5.9%
Own Home	1.8%
Other Lodging	0.4%



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	19.5
\$25,000 to \$49,999	15.5
\$50,000 to \$74,999	16.8
\$75,000 to \$99,999	21.1
\$100,000 to \$149,999	20.7
\$150,000 and up	6.4
Total	100.0

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

4.6. Substitute Behavior

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

Figure 3. Substitute Behavior Choices





Figure 4. Reported Distance Visitors Would Travel to Alternate Location



5. SATISFACTION INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The overall satisfaction results are good. About 81% of people visiting indicated they were very satisfied with their overall recreation experience. Another 15% were somewhat satisfied. The results for the composite indices were also very good. Satisfaction ratings for perception of safety were over 95% for all types of sites. Ratings for all other composites were 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	75.1	78.8	100.0
Access	83.5	86.3	86.4
Services	80.5	79.3	67.5
Feeling of Safety	95.9	95.4	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	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Lot Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Rec. Info. Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Road Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Feeling of Safety	Keep up the Good Work
Scenery	Keep up the Good Work
Signage Adequacy	Keep up the Good Work
Trail Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Value for Fee Paid	Keep up the Good Work

Table 20. Importance-Performance Ratings for Overnight Developed Sites

Satisfaction Element	Importance-Performance Rating
Restroom Cleanliness	Concentrate Here
Developed Facilities	Concentrate Here
Condition of Environment	Keep up the Good Work
Employee Helpfulness	Keep up the Good Work
Interpretive Displays	Concentrate Here
Parking Availability	Possible Overkill
Parking Lot Condition	Possible Overkill
Rec. Info. Availability	Possible Overkill
Road Condition	Low Priority
Feeling of Safety	Keep up the Good Work
Scenery	Possible Overkill
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	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 22. Importance-Performance Ratings for Designated Wilderness

Satisfaction Element	Importance-Performance Rating
Restroom Cleanliness	*
Developed Facilities	*
Condition of Environment	Keep up the Good Work
Employee Helpfulness	*
Interpretive Displays	*
Parking Availability	Possible Overkill
Parking Lot Condition	Possible Overkill
Rec. Info. Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Road Condition	Low Priority
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	2.0	0.0	4.4	0.0
8	4.0	2.1	2.5	0.0
7	3.9	0.0	2.9	8.7
6	16.4	52.1	16.9	0.0
5	7.8	4.3	6.7	0.0
4	11.9	20.1	9.9	0.0
3	20.1	1.3	15.8	27.2
2	34.0	13.5	40.1	64.1
1 - Hardly anyone there	0.0	6.4	0.7	0.0
Average Rating	3.9	4.7	3.8	2.7


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	14.3
Of this group, percent who said facilities at site visited were accessible	95.5

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	40	33.2
Male	59	66.8
Total	99	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	3	6.4
Asian	1	3.0
Black / African American	0	0.0
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	48	97.0
Total	52	106.4

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	Wilderness Site Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	2	6.0



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

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


† Race and Ethnicity were asked as two separate questions.

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

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

Table 27. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits* by Age

Age Class	Wilderness Site Visits (%)‡
Under 16	7.4
16-19	0.1
20-29	19.3
30-39	20.4
40-49	24.5
50-59	10.5
60-69	17.8
70+	0.0
Total	100.0



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

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

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

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

ZIP Code	State	County	Percent of Respondents	Survey Respondents (n)
97330	Oregon	Benton County	14.8	4
97498	Oregon	Lincoln County	11.1	3
97405	Oregon	Lane County	11.1	3
97365	Oregon	Lincoln County	11.1	3
97401	Oregon	Lane County	11.1	3
97439	Oregon	Lane County	7.4	2
97380	Oregon	Lincoln County	3.7	1
95945	California	Nevada County	3.7	1
74127	Oklahoma	Tulsa County	3.7	1
55413	Minnesota	Hennepin County	3.7	1
97370	Oregon	Benton County	3.7	1
97367	Oregon	Lincoln County	3.7	1
55418	Minnesota	Hennepin County	3.7	1
97211	Oregon	Multnomah County	3.7	1
97702	Oregon	Deschutes County	3.7	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)
Foreign Country			6.0	85
97439	Oregon	Lane County	5.3	75
Unknown Origin*			3.2	45
97420	Oregon	Coos County	3.1	44
97459	Oregon	Coos County	2.4	34
97330	Oregon	Benton County	2.3	33
97405	Oregon	Lane County	2.3	33
97449	Oregon	Coos County	2.2	31
97402	Oregon	Lane County	2.0	28
97467	Oregon	Douglas County	1.8	26
97478	Oregon	Lane County	1.8	25
97471	Oregon	Douglas County	1.2	17
97404	Oregon	Lane County	1.2	17
97333	Oregon	Benton County	1.1	16
97702	Oregon	Deschutes County	1.1	16
97401	Oregon	Lane County	1.0	14
97477	Oregon	Lane County	0.8	12
97365	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.8	11
97424	Oregon	Lane County	0.8	11
97112	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.6	9
97322	Oregon	Linn County	0.6	9
97370	Oregon	Benton County	0.6	8
97394	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.6	8
97355	Oregon	Linn County	0.5	7
97502	Oregon	Jackson County	0.5	7
97498	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.5	7
97214	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.5	7
97470	Oregon	Douglas County	0.5	7
97426	Oregon	Lane County	0.5	7
97219	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.5	7
97305	Oregon	Marion County	0.4	6
97504	Oregon	Jackson County	0.4	6
97267	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.4	6
97479	Oregon	Douglas County	0.4	5
97603	Oregon	Klamath County	0.4	5
97124	Oregon	Washington County	0.4	5
97304	Oregon	Polk County	0.4	5
97423	Oregon	Coos County	0.4	5
97526	Oregon	Josephine County	0.4	5
97317	Oregon	Marion County	0.3	4

97055	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.3	4
97408	Oregon	Lane County	0.3	4
97367	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.3	4
97211	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.3	4
97321	Oregon	Linn County	0.3	4
97303	Oregon	Marion County	0.3	4
98584	Washington	Mason County	0.3	4
97487	Oregon	Lane County	0.3	4
97520	Oregon	Jackson County	0.3	4
97045	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.3	4
98607	Washington	Clark County	0.3	4
97524	Oregon	Jackson County	0.3	4
97217	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.2	3
97462	Oregon	Douglas County	0.2	3
97224	Oregon	Washington County	0.2	3
97116	Oregon	Washington County	0.2	3
98107	Washington	King County	0.2	3
97419	Oregon	Lane County	0.2	3
97004	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.2	3
97756	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.2	3
97223	Oregon	Washington County	0.2	3
97132	Oregon	Yamhill County	0.2	3
97540	Oregon	Jackson County	0.2	3
97378	Oregon	Yamhill County	0.2	3
97202	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.2	3
97060	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.2	3
97301	Oregon	Marion County	0.2	3
97306	Oregon	Marion County	0.2	3
97338	Oregon	Polk County	0.2	3
97206	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.2	3
97302	Oregon	Marion County	0.2	3
97361	Oregon	Polk County	0.2	3
97005	Oregon	Washington County	0.2	3
97222	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.2	3
97070	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.2	3
98391	Washington	Pierce County	0.2	3
97503	Oregon	Jackson County	0.2	3
97128	Oregon	Yamhill County	0.2	3
97062	Oregon	Washington County	0.2	3
97114	Oregon	Yamhill County	0.2	3
97341	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.2	3
97754	Oregon	Crook County	0.2	3
97056	Oregon	Columbia County	0.2	3
97101	Oregon	Yamhill County	0.2	3
97236	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.2	3
97448	Oregon	Lane County	0.2	3
95616	California	Yolo County	0.2	3
99362	Washington	Walla Walla County	0.1	2
97015	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	2
98603	Washington	Cowlitz County	0.1	2
97383	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	2

98312	Washington	Kitsap County	0.1	2
98683	Washington	Clark County	0.1	2
97071	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	2
98501	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	2
97229	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
97080	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	2
99354	Washington	Benton County	0.1	2
97201	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	2
97013	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	2
97007	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
96001	California	Shasta County	0.1	2
89052	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	2
98208	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	2
97453	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	2
98239	Washington	Island County	0.1	2
97326	Oregon	Benton County	0.1	2
84117	Utah	Salt Lake County	0.1	2
97113	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
97123	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
97759	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.1	2
87043	New Mexico	Sandoval County	0.1	2
96150	California	El Dorado County	0.1	2
97415	Oregon	Curry County	0.1	2
77399	Texas	Polk County	0.1	2
97701	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.1	2
97434	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	2
83646	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	2
97374	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	2
97266	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	2
95519	California	Humboldt County	0.1	2
95501	California	Humboldt County	0.1	2
97006	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
97457	Oregon	Douglas County	0.1	2
97411	Oregon	Coos County	0.1	2
97458	Oregon	Coos County	0.1	2
97239	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	2
98662	Washington	Clark County	0.1	2
97119	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
83687	Idaho	Canyon County	0.1	2
96064	California	Siskiyou County	0.1	2
98837	Washington	Grant County	0.1	2
95531	California	Del Norte County	0.1	2
97525	Oregon	Jackson County	0.1	2
97027	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	2
97148	Oregon	Yamhill County	0.1	2
97107	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	2
98801	Washington	Chelan County	0.1	2
97489	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	2
98020	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	2
83616	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	2
97351	Oregon	Polk County	0.1	2

97386	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	2
94404	California	San Mateo County	0.1	2
98363	Washington	Clallam County	0.1	2
89801	Nevada	Elko County	0.1	2
97051	Oregon	Columbia County	0.1	2
97352	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	2
97141	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	2
97493	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	2
98002	Washington	King County	0.1	2
98685	Washington	Clark County	0.1	2
95608	California	Sacramento County	0.1	2
97048	Oregon	Columbia County	0.1	2
85344	Arizona	La Paz County	0.1	1
98225	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
83638	Idaho	Valley County	0.1	1
97339	Oregon	Benton County	0.1	1
95726	California	El Dorado County	0.1	1
84601	Utah	Utah County	0.1	1
97366	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
97733	Oregon	Klamath County	0.1	1
27503	North Carolina	Durham County	0.1	1
83628	Idaho	Owyhee County	0.1	1
85210	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
21788	Maryland	Frederick County	0.1	1
84770	Utah	Washington County	0.1	1
57042	South Dakota	Lake County	0.1	1
84057	Utah	Utah County	0.1	1
97527	Oregon	Josephine County	0.1	1
89177	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
98671	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
10009	New York	New York County	0.1	1
83704	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
29485	South Carolina	Dorchester County	0.1	1
98579	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	1
58503	North Dakota	Burleigh County	0.1	1
98109	Washington	King County	0.1	1
55428	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
95991	California	Sutter County	0.1	1
97760	Oregon	Jefferson County	0.1	1
40245	Kentucky	Jefferson County	0.1	1
48842	Michigan	Ingham County	0.1	1
85935	Arizona	Navajo County	0.1	1
83706	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
84341	Utah	Cache County	0.1	1
60609	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
97465	Oregon	Curry County	0.1	1
98802	Washington	Douglas County	0.1	1
85295	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
97028	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
98682	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
98642	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1

60189	Illinois	DuPage County	0.1	1
97118	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	1
87114	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
80033	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
15044	Pennsylvania	Allegheny County	0.1	1
63332	Missouri	St. Charles County	0.1	1
85006	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
81647	Colorado	Garfield County	0.1	1
96089	California	Shasta County	0.1	1
06437	Connecticut	New Haven County	0.1	1
34655	Florida	Pasco County	0.1	1
60007	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
89061	Nevada	Nye County	0.1	1
97827	Oregon	Union County	0.1	1
85254	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
30008	Georgia	Cobb County	0.1	1
97122	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	1
22192	Virginia	Prince William County	0.1	1
55113	Minnesota	Ramsey County	0.1	1
32216	Florida	Duval County	0.1	1
27517	North Carolina	Orange County	0.1	1
97438	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
50624	Iowa	Grundy County	0.1	1
98338	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
89511	Nevada	Washoe County	0.1	1
96088	California	Shasta County	0.1	1
98684	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
93933	California	Monterey County	0.1	1
97844	Oregon	Morrow County	0.1	1
62924	Illinois	Jackson County	0.1	1
18644	Pennsylvania	Luzerne County	0.1	1
84109	Utah	Salt Lake County	0.1	1
98260	Washington	Island County	0.1	1
83864	Idaho	Bonner County	0.1	1
87144	New Mexico	Sandoval County	0.1	1
28034	North Carolina	Gaston County	0.1	1
98037	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
97391	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
06512	Connecticut	New Haven County	0.1	1
89508	Nevada	Washoe County	0.1	1
92672	California	Orange County	0.1	1
98226	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
98533	Washington	Lewis County	0.1	1
98053	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97020	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
44147	Ohio	Cuyahoga County	0.1	1
24060	Virginia	Montgomery County	0.1	1
97376	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
85653	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
98248	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
96069	California	Shasta County	0.1	1

19010	Pennsylvania	Delaware County	0.1	1
84088	Utah	Salt Lake County	0.1	1
83402	Idaho	Bonneville County	0.1	1
99336	Washington	Benton County	0.1	1
83642	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
33616	Florida	Hillsborough County	0.1	1
42256	Kentucky	Logan County	0.1	1
97031	Oregon	Hood River County	0.1	1
53809	Wisconsin	Grant County	0.1	1
98660	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
97068	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
97416	Oregon	Douglas County	0.1	1
97601	Oregon	Klamath County	0.1	1
33170	Florida	Miami-Dade County	0.1	1
11743	New York	Suffolk County	0.1	1
98387	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
98133	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97380	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
08904	New Jersey	Middlesex County	0.1	1
97739	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.1	1
98227	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
97403	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
54301	Wisconsin	Brown County	0.1	1
95945	California	Nevada County	0.1	1
08724	New Jersey	Ocean County	0.1	1
74127	Oklahoma	Tulsa County	0.1	1
44830	Ohio	Seneca County	0.1	1
97230	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
71115	Louisiana	Caddo Parish	0.1	1
03301	New Hampshire	Merrimack County	0.1	1
97140	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	1
85284	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
03242	New Hampshire	Merrimack County	0.1	1
80003	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
98672	Washington	Klickitat County	0.1	1
75044	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
94573	California	Napa County	0.1	1
80920	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
85087	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
95618	California	Yolo County	0.1	1
80026	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
98070	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97859	Oregon	Umatilla County	0.1	1
98043	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
85395	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
98661	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
95667	California	El Dorado County	0.1	1
97814	Oregon	Baker County	0.1	1
59601	Montana	Lewis and Clark County	0.1	1
55413	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
97440	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1

97035	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
26502	West Virginia	Monongalia County	0.1	1
97017	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
98674	Washington	Cowlitz County	0.1	1
98112	Washington	King County	0.1	1
54557	Wisconsin	Vilas County	0.1	1
97381	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
89460	Nevada	Douglas County	0.1	1
95631	California	Placer County	0.1	1
61704	Illinois	McLean County	0.1	1
84065	Utah	Salt Lake County	0.1	1
98604	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
98271	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
52241	Iowa	Johnson County	0.1	1
46068	Indiana	Tipton County	0.1	1
93711	California	Fresno County	0.1	1
55418	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
97523	Oregon	Josephine County	0.1	1
60622	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
89436	Nevada	Washoe County	0.1	1
97835	Oregon	Umatilla County	0.1	1
98104	Washington	King County	0.1	1
49306	Michigan	Kent County	0.1	1
98409	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
78641	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
97837	Oregon	Baker County	0.1	1
21113	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	0.1	1
98596	Washington	Lewis County	0.1	1
80303	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
76131	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
53532	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
98027	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97227	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
98126	Washington	King County	0.1	1
99123	Washington	Grant County	0.1	1
97838	Oregon	Umatilla County	0.1	1
22303	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	1
96768	Hawaii	Mauai County	0.1	1
92675	California	Orange County	0.1	1
39180	Mississippi	Warren County	0.1	1
98296	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
97078	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	1
92065	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
99803	Alaska	Juneau Borough	0.1	1
98686	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
39202	Mississippi	Hinds County	0.1	1
98042	Washington	King County	0.1	1
64133	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
32507	Florida	Escambia County	0.1	1
97452	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
90403	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1

98052	Washington	King County	0.1	1
84311	Utah	Box Elder County	0.1	1
83672	Idaho	Washington County	0.1	1
97307	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
97293	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
96543	Military-Alaska and the F		0.1	1
92809	California	Orange County	0.1	1
60625	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
20175	Virginia	Loudoun County	0.1	1
34217	Florida	Manatee County	0.1	1
80005	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
85377	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
55721	Minnesota	Itasca County	0.1	1
85745	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
83631	Idaho	Boise County	0.1	1
92545	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
70809	Louisiana	East Baton Rouge Parish	0.1	1
80424	Colorado	Summit County	0.1	1
97232	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
96740	Hawaii	Hawaii County	0.1	1
84325	Utah	Cache County	0.1	1
89830	Nevada	Elko County	0.1	1
21108	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	0.1	1
80015	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
94507	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
99712	Alaska	Fairbanks North Star Borough	0.1	1
32720	Florida	Volusia County	0.1	1
80023	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
97209	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
78216	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
97442	Oregon	Douglas County	0.1	1
49519	Michigan	Kent County	0.1	1
60462	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
96022	California	Shasta County	0.1	1
32459	Florida	Walton County	0.1	1
95864	California	Sacramento County	0.1	1
48103	Michigan	Washtenaw County	0.1	1
85365	Arizona	Yuma County	0.1	1
80132	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
98580	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
19707	Delaware	New Castle County	0.1	1
43515	Ohio	Fulton County	0.1	1
95008	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
83547	Idaho	Idaho County	0.1	1
97731	Oregon	Klamath County	0.1	1
81623	Colorado	Garfield County	0.1	1
65401	Missouri	Phelps County	0.1	1
48017	Michigan	Oakland County	0.1	1
98065	Washington	King County	0.1	1
80231	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
92127	California	San Diego County	0.1	1

85616	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
97532	Oregon	Josephine County	0.1	1
92220	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
98612	Washington	Wahkiakum County	0.1	1
91911	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
53558	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
97720	Oregon	Harney County	0.1	1
97360	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	1
98591	Washington	Lewis County	0.1	1
19119	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia County	0.1	1
45241	Ohio	Hamilton County	0.1	1
54023	Wisconsin	St. Croix County	0.1	1
81252	Colorado	Custer County	0.1	1
97430	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
98632	Washington	Cowlitz County	0.1	1
81625	Colorado	Moffat County	0.1	1
77518	Texas	Galveston County	0.1	1
85202	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
11223	New York	Kings County	0.1	1
95503	California	Humboldt County	0.1	1
48104	Michigan	Washtenaw County	0.1	1
97325	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
96825	Hawaii	Honolulu County	0.1	1
46214	Indiana	Marion County	0.1	1
21771	Maryland	Frederick County	0.1	1
83539	Idaho	Idaho County	0.1	1
97032	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
03449	New Hampshire	Hillsborough County	0.1	1
98513	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	1
98146	Washington	King County	0.1	1
92549	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
98118	Washington	King County	0.1	1
05461	Vermont	Chittenden County	0.1	1
83712	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
94589	California	Solano County	0.1	1
96007	California	Shasta County	0.1	1
95634	California	El Dorado County	0.1	1
48004	Michigan	St. Clair County	0.1	1
99516	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	1
33556	Florida	Hillsborough County	0.1	1
92373	California	San Bernardino County	0.1	1
96791	Hawaii	Honolulu County	0.1	1
97225	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	1
92625	California	Orange County	0.1	1
96130	California	Lassen County	0.1	1
97413	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
77534	Texas	Brazoria County	0.1	1
68018	Nebraska	Saunders County	0.1	1
97491	Oregon	Curry County	0.1	1
85545	Arizona	Gila County	0.1	1
30075	Georgia	Fulton County	0.1	1

21131	Maryland	Baltimore County	0.1	1
85003	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
97336	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	1
20010	District of Columbia	District of Columbia	0.1	1
98006	Washington	King County	0.1	1
43050	Ohio	Knox County	0.1	1
99514	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	1
94112	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
97882	Oregon	Umatilla County	0.1	1
60634	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
98629	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
98229	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
95445	California	Mendocino County	0.1	1
58239	North Dakota	Cavalier County	0.1	1
97233	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
19335	Pennsylvania	Chester County	0.1	1
55304	Minnesota	Anoka County	0.1	1
49935	Michigan	Iron County	0.1	1
97149	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	1
46536	Indiana	St. Joseph County	0.1	1
33914	Florida	Lee County	0.1	1
21755	Maryland	Frederick County	0.1	1
98045	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97135	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	1
98816	Washington	Chelan County	0.1	1
97064	Oregon	Columbia County	0.1	1
97221	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
95973	California	Butte County	0.1	1
97146	Oregon	Clatsop County	0.1	1
97392	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
97324	Oregon	Benton County	0.1	1
90848	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
95018	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
75098	Texas	Collin County	0.1	1
98117	Washington	King County	0.1	1
68778	Nebraska	Keya Paha County	0.1	1
32548	Florida	Okaloosa County	0.1	1
97390	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
98926	Washington	Kittitas County	0.1	1
95987	California	Colusa County	0.1	1
97205	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
80232	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
08075	New Jersey	Burlington County	0.1	1
97204	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
98119	Washington	King County	0.1	1
98665	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
98611	Washington	Cowlitz County	0.1	1
94534	California	Solano County	0.1	1
45066	Ohio	Warren County	0.1	1
97463	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
95659	California	Sutter County	0.1	1

95901	California	Yuba County	0.1	1
98038	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97327	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	1
86401	Arizona	Mohave County	0.1	1
95678	California	Placer County	0.1	1
01524	Massachusetts	Worcester County	0.1	1
85044	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
37020	Tennessee	Bedford County	0.1	1
86336	Arizona	Yavapai County	0.1	1
95669	California	Amador County	0.1	1
43613	Ohio	Lucas County	0.1	1
14083	New York	Wyoming County	0.1	1
97845	Oregon	Grant County	0.1	1
22307	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	1
97368	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
93614	California	Madera County	0.1	1
29680	South Carolina	Greenville County	0.1	1
29205	South Carolina	Richland County	0.1	1
95820	California	Sacramento County	0.1	1
49019	Michigan	Kalamazoo County	0.1	1
84401	Utah	Weber County	0.1	1
80305	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
98108	Washington	King County	0.1	1
91759	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
93611	California	Fresno County	0.1	1
70357	Louisiana	Lafourche Parish	0.1	1
19525	Pennsylvania	Montgomery County	0.1	1
83321	Idaho	Twin Falls County	0.1	1
97436	Oregon	Douglas County	0.1	1
96114	California	Lassen County	0.1	1
99205	Washington	Spokane County	0.1	1
97023	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
83686	Idaho	Canyon County	0.1	1
95553	California	Humboldt County	0.1	1
07666	New Jersey	Bergen County	0.1	1
18976	Pennsylvania	Bucks County	0.1	1
84014	Utah	Davis County	0.1	1
97220	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
98902	Washington	Yakima County	0.1	1
16442	Pennsylvania	Erie County	0.1	1
77459	Texas	Fort Bend County	0.1	1
98520	Washington	Grays Harbor County	0.1	1
80517	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
98102	Washington	King County	0.1	1
59868	Montana	Missoula County	0.1	1
98026	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
97030	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
94002	California	San Mateo County	0.1	1
23221	Virginia	Richmond city	0.1	1
97869	Oregon	Grant County	0.1	1
21713	Maryland	Washington County	0.1	1

85260	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
95538	California	Del Norte County	0.1	1
97539	Oregon	Jackson County	0.1	1
98583	Washington	Grays Harbor County	0.1	1
97388	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
18632	Pennsylvania	Sullivan County	0.1	1
30305	Georgia	Fulton County	0.1	1
98368	Washington	Jefferson County	0.1	1
89149	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
97446	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	1
94132	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
84003	Utah	Utah County	0.1	1
83814	Idaho	Kootenai County	0.1	1
34990	Florida	Martin County	0.1	1
94706	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
91311	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
98101	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97499	Oregon	Douglas County	0.1	1
80550	Colorado	Weld County	0.1	1
38629	Mississippi	Tippah County	0.1	1
48430	Michigan	Genesee County	0.1	1
48097	Michigan	St. Clair County	0.1	1
08540	New Jersey	Mercer County	0.1	1
97040	Oregon	Wasco County	0.1	1
95031	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
92119	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
98005	Washington	King County	0.1	1
10023	New York	New York County	0.1	1
91709	California	San Bernardino County	0.1	1
97417	Oregon	Douglas County	0.1	1
96019	California	Shasta County	0.1	1
91188	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
29708	South Carolina	York County	0.1	1
72949	Arkansas	Franklin 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	5.1	7.2	8.9	34.5	44.4	4.1	4.4	125
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.4	9.0	20.3	70.2	4.6	4.3	184
Condition of Environment	0.0	1.6	3.8	17.5	77.0	4.7	4.8	209
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.9	7.3	6.6	85.2	4.8	4.6	74
Interpretive Displays	1.0	4.0	11.9	24.4	58.8	4.4	4.1	163
Parking Availability	1.6	4.6	5.7	11.0	77.1	4.6	4.4	206
Parking Lot Condition	1.0	2.7	7.0	10.3	79.0	4.6	4.2	209
Rec. Info. Availability	1.0	6.9	9.0	26.6	56.5	4.3	4.3	160
Road Condition	1.5	3.3	9.7	18.7	66.8	4.5	4.4	132
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.7	1.7	9.1	88.4	4.9	4.7	210
Scenery	0.0	0.0	2.7	9.1	88.2	4.9	4.7	210
Signage Adequacy	3.6	9.4	4.1	22.7	60.1	4.3	4.5	205
Trail Condition	0.0	2.3	3.4	21.7	72.6	4.6	4.6	138
Value for Fee Paid	0.7	1.1	5.8	16.9	75.6	4.7	4.4	167

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	36.5	11.6	5.0	7.4	39.5	3.0	4.8	20
Developed Facilities	15.2	3.2	3.2	55.7	22.6	3.7	4.3	18
Condition of Environment	2.2	2.2	12.4	13.7	69.6	4.5	4.7	22
Employee Helpfulness	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.4	4.5	4.8	20
Interpretive Displays	20.9	2.2	10.4	24.5	42.0	3.6	4.2	21
Parking Availability	8.3	0.0	18.5	3.5	69.8	4.3	3.8	20
Parking Lot Condition	3.7	0.0	24.9	9.4	61.9	4.3	3.2	18
Rec. Info. Availability	0.0	3.3	22.1	22.1	52.5	4.2	3.5	17
Road Condition	11.8	2.5	26.1	17.5	42.0	3.8	3.9	15
Feeling of Safety	2.1	0.0	4.3	30.2	63.4	4.5	4.6	23
Scenery	2.1	0.0	4.3	14.9	78.6	4.7	3.9	23
Signage Adequacy	2.1	10.1	11.4	28.7	47.7	4.1	4.0	23
Trail Condition	0.0	0.0	3.2	52.7	44.0	4.4	4.4	14
Value for Fee Paid	1.3	0.0	4.3	25.3	69.0	4.6	4.6	22

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	6.5	7.0	12.0	25.2	49.4	4.0	4.4	63
Developed Facilities	1.5	1.3	14.9	21.9	60.4	4.4	4.4	82
Condition of Environment	2.9	1.0	2.3	20.6	73.1	4.6	4.7	138
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.9	86.9	4.8	4.8	42
Interpretive Displays	2.2	3.0	23.6	24.5	46.6	4.1	4.2	100
Parking Availability	0.9	2.4	7.0	11.2	78.5	4.6	4.5	133
Parking Lot Condition	2.6	2.5	8.0	14.2	72.6	4.5	4.3	132
Rec. Info. Availability	0.0	5.1	18.1	17.4	59.3	4.3	4.4	109
Road Condition	3.0	6.0	14.1	33.6	43.3	4.1	4.4	101
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	4.6	8.3	87.1	4.8	4.6	138
Scenery	0.7	0.0	3.1	7.3	88.8	4.8	4.7	137
Signage Adequacy	1.9	2.6	12.3	19.0	64.2	4.4	4.5	131
Trail Condition	0.0	2.3	6.0	27.3	64.5	4.5	4.5	87
Value for Fee Paid	0.9	2.1	8.5	15.0	73.6	4.6	4.5	110

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
Developed Facilities								1
Condition of Environment	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.2	72.8	4.7	4.9	15
Employee Helpfulness								0
Interpretive Displays								8
Parking Availability	0.0	0.0	1.1	18.5	80.4	4.8	3.3	15
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	68.7	4.7	3.1	13
Rec. Info. Availability	0.0	0.0	28.8	3.4	67.7	4.4	4.0	10
Road Condition	8.7	8.7	17.4	9.8	55.4	3.9	3.6	15
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	91.3	4.9	4.6	15
Scenery	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	90.2	4.9	5.0	15
Signage Adequacy	0.0	9.5	19.0	29.8	41.7	4.0	4.2	14
Trail Condition	0.0	8.7	8.7	10.9	71.7	4.5	4.5	15
Value for Fee Paid								2

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.