



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest Service

Natural Resource  
Manager

National Visitor  
Use Monitoring  
Program



Last updated:  
23 May 2012

# Visitor Use Report

**Coronado NF**

**USDA Forest Service**

**Region 3**

**National Visitor Use Monitoring  
Data collected FY 2007**

# CONTENTS

## **1. Introduction**

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

## **2. Visitation Estimates**

- 2.1 Forest Definition of Site Days
- 2.2 Visitation Estimates

## **3. Description of the Recreation Visit**

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

## **4. Economic Information**

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

## **5. Satisfaction Information**

- 5.1. Crowding
- 5.2. Disabilities

## **6. Wilderness Visit Demographics**

## **7. Appendix Tables**

# 1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

## 1.2. Methods

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

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

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

### 1.3. Definition of Terms

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 1.4. Limitations of the Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2. VISITATION ESTIMATES

### 2.1. Forest Definition of Site Days

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

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

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

\* 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](http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum).



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

**Table 2. Annual Visitation Estimate**

Visit Type	Visits (1,000s)	90% Confidence Level (%)#
Total Estimated Site Visits*	2,793	±15.0
→ Day Use Developed Site Visits	758	±22.1
→ Overnight Use Developed Site Visits	439	±33.7
→ General Forest Area Visits	1,108	±30.8
→ Designated Wilderness Visits†	488	±20.2
Total Estimated National Forest Visits§	2,453	±14.6
→ Special Events and Organized Camp Use‡	74	±0.0

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 3. Number of Individuals Contacted by Site Type**

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

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


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

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

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

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

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



### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECREATION VISIT


#### 3.1. Demographics

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

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

Table 5. Percent of National Forest Visits\* by Gender

Gender	Survey Respondents†	National Forest Visits (%)‡
Female	1,627	41.5
Male	1,945	58.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>100.0</b>



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


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

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

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

Race †	Survey Respondents‡	National Forest Visits (%)§
American Indian / Alaska Native	11	9.9
Asian	5	1.7
Black / African American	6	3.0
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	178	89.6
Total	200	104.2#

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	National Forest Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	33	13.9



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

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


† Race and Ethnicity were asked as two separate questions.

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

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

Table 7. Percent of National Forest Visits\* by Age

Age Class	National Forest Visits (%)‡
Under 16	14.8
16-19	2.2
20-29	9.5
30-39	14.4
40-49	15.9
50-59	20.2
60-69	16.6
70+	6.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>99.9</b>



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Miles from Survey Respondent's Home to Interview Location†	National Forest Visits (%)
0 - 25 miles	48.8
26 - 50 miles	20.7
51 - 75 miles	4.3
76 - 100 miles	3.5
101 - 200 miles	3.7
201 - 500 miles	2.1
Over 500 miles	16.8
Total	99.9

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

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

† Travel distance is self-reported.



### 3.2. Visit Descriptions

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

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

Table 10. Visit Duration

Visit Type	Average Duration (hours)‡	Median Duration (hours)‡
Site Visit	6.7	2.5
Day Use Developed	2.3	1.9
Overnight Use Developed	27.3	21.0
Undeveloped Areas	4.8	2.5
Designated Wilderness	4.8	2.6
National Forest Visit	10.2	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*	85.2
Number of national forest sites visited on National Forest Visit*	1.3
Group Size	2.3
Axles per Vehicle	2.0

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

Number of Annual Visits	Visits (%)†	Cumulative Visits (%)
1 - 5	44.7	44.7
6 - 10	14.2	58.9
11 - 15	7.8	66.8
16 - 20	4.4	71.2
21 - 25	3.8	75.0
26 - 30	3.3	78.3
31 - 35	0.4	78.7
36 - 40	3.9	82.6
41 - 50	4.2	86.8
51 - 100	7.3	94.1
101 - 200	4.2	98.3
201 - 300	1.4	99.7
Over 300	0.3	100.0



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

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

### 3.3. Activities

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

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


### Use of Constructed Facilities and Designated Areas

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

Table 13. Activity Participation

Activity	% Participation*	% Main Activity‡	Avg Hours Doing Main Activity
Hiking / Walking	75.6	52.1	2.7
Viewing Natural Features	67.4	9.3	2.6
Viewing Wildlife	65.9	4.6	2.8
Relaxing	45.9	5.3	7.7
Driving for Pleasure	23.8	6.0	2.8
Nature Center Activities	17.2	0.8	1.7
Nature Study	15.7	0.7	2.1
Picnicking	12.8	3.3	3.4
Visiting Historic Sites	8.5	0.6	2.5
Some Other Activity	6.9	4.5	2.2
Developed Camping	6.4	3.5	29.9
OHV Use	4.5	1.1	3.8
Fishing	3.7	2.5	6.7
Hunting	3.2	3.1	12.4
Motorized Trail Activity	3.2	1.3	2.2
Primitive Camping	3.1	0.7	22.7
Gathering Forest Products	2.7	0.2	3.0
Bicycling	1.9	1.1	4.6
Backpacking	0.9	0.1	73.9
Other Non-motorized	0.7	0.1	8.3
Non-motorized Water	0.5	0.0	0.0
Resort Use	0.5	0.0	30.0
Other Motorized Activity	0.5	0.3	1.1
Horseback Riding	0.1	0.0	2.7
No Activity Reported	0.0	0.1	
Snowmobiling	0.0	0.0	0.0
Motorized Water Activities	0.0	0.0	0.0
Downhill Skiing	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cross-country Skiing	0.0	0.0	0.0

% Main Activity



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

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

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

Special Facility or Area	% of National Forest Visits†
Developed Swimming Site	3.3
Scenic Byway	25.6
Visitor Center or Museum	25.1
Designated ORV Area	7.6
Forest Roads	9.0
Interpretive Displays	13.8
Information Sites	9.7
Developed Fishing Site	4.7
Motorized Single Track Trails	3.8
Motorized Dual Track Trails	7.6
None of these Facilities	44.7

\* 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.

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

## 4. ECONOMIC INFORMATION

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

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

### 4.1. Spending Segments

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

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

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


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

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

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

	Non-Local Segments			Local Segments			Non-Primary‡	Total
	Day	Overnight on NF	Overnight off NF	Day	Overnight on NF	Overnight off NF		
Number of National Forest Visits	122,650	98,120	98,120	1,594,448	98,120	24,530	417,009	2,452,997
Percent of National Forest Visits	5	4	4	65	4	1	17	100

### Percent of National Forest Visits



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

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

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

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



## 4.2. Spending Profiles

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

## 4.3. Total Direct Spending

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

## 4.4. Other Visit Information


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

Table 16. Trip Spending and Lodging Usage

Trip Spending	Value
Average Total Trip Spending per Party	\$518
Median Total Trip Spending per Party	\$50
% NF Visits made on trip with overnight stay away from home	27.4%
% NF Visits with overnight stay within 50 miles of NF	24.6%
Mean nights/visit within 50 miles of NF	12.6
Area Lodging Use	% Visits with Nights Near Forest
NFS Campground on this NF	22.9%
Undeveloped Camping in this NF	9.1%
NFS Cabin	5.0%
Other Public Campground	1.2%
Private Campground	1.9%
Rented Private Home	33.9%
Home of Friends/Family	20.9%
Own Home	7.6%
Other Lodging	2.5%

**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	9.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	20.6
\$50,000 to \$74,999	28.4
\$75,000 to \$99,999	17.9
\$100,000 to \$149,999	13.5
\$150,000 and up	10.6
Total	100.0

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

## 4.6. Substitute Behavior

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

Figure 3. Substitute Behavior Choices





Figure 4. Reported Distance Visitors Would Travel to Alternate Location



## 5. SATISFACTION INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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





Table 18. Percent Satisfied Index† Scores for Aggregate Categories

Satisfaction Element	Satisfied Survey Respondents (%)		
	Developed Sites‡	Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)	Designated Wilderness
Developed Facilities	85.0	88.1	94.1
Access	84.8	88.1	92.0
Services	83.1	80.8	81.6
Feeling of Safety	94.8	88.6	93.9

† 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	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Lot Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Rec. Info. Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Road Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Feeling of Safety	Keep up the Good Work
Scenery	Keep up the Good Work
Signage Adequacy	Keep up the Good Work
Trail Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Value for Fee Paid	Keep up the Good Work

Table 20. Importance-Performance Ratings for Overnight Developed Sites

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



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

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

Table 22. Importance-Performance Ratings for Designated Wilderness

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

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





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




### 5.1. Crowding

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


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

Crowding Rating†	Site Types (% of Site Visits)			
	Day Use Developed Sites	Overnight Use Developed Sites	Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)	Designated Wilderness
10 - Overcrowded	0.0	0.1	2.2	0.2
9	3.3	1.5	5.9	6.3
8	8.4	3.8	10.5	4.7
7	3.8	14.2	10.3	7.0
6	27.3	19.3	17.4	15.3
5	11.9	22.0	8.3	15.3
4	15.3	15.6	17.3	14.8
3	20.1	2.3	15.9	14.4
2	7.1	21.2	11.3	21.5
1 - Hardly anyone there	2.9	0.0	0.8	0.4
<b>Average Rating</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>4.6</b>


**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	11.8
Of this group, percent who said facilities at site visited were accessible	81.7

## 6. WILDERNESS VISIT DEMOGRAPHICS

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

Table 25. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits\* by Gender

Gender	Survey Respondents†	Wilderness Site Visits (%)‡
Female	441	38.5
Male	523	61.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>100.0</b>



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


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

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

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

Race †	Survey Respondents‡	Wilderness Site Visits (%)§
American Indian / Alaska Native	0	0.0
Asian	1	10.9
Black / African American	0	0.0
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	18	89.1
Total	19	100.0#

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



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

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


† Race and Ethnicity were asked as two separate questions.

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

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

Table 27. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits\* by Age

Age Class	Wilderness Site Visits (%)‡
Under 16	7.5
16-19	1.5
20-29	9.7
30-39	14.1
40-49	17.7
50-59	23.6
60-69	18.1
70+	7.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>99.9</b>



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

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

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

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

ZIP Code	State	County	Percent of Respondents	Survey Respondents (n)
85718	Arizona	Pima County	14.6	37
85704	Arizona	Pima County	12.2	31
85750	Arizona	Pima County	10.2	26
85719	Arizona	Pima County	9.8	25
85716	Arizona	Pima County	9.8	25
85710	Arizona	Pima County	7.5	19
85712	Arizona	Pima County	7.1	18
85749	Arizona	Pima County	4.3	11
85737	Arizona	Pima County	4.3	11
85742	Arizona	Pima County	3.9	10
85745	Arizona	Pima County	3.9	10
85741	Arizona	Pima County	3.5	9
Foreign Country			3.1	8
85711	Arizona	Pima County	2.8	7
85705	Arizona	Pima County	2.8	7

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



## 7. APPENDIX TABLES

## APPENDIX A - Complete List of ZIP Codes

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

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

97302	Oregon	Marion County	0.2	3
85207	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85650	Arizona	Cochise County	0.2	3
86004	Arizona	Coconino County	0.2	3
85249	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85281	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85735	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	3
85257	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
97520	Oregon	Jackson County	0.2	3
85736	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	3
85602	Arizona	Cochise County	0.2	3
10023	New York	New York County	0.1	2
55317	Minnesota	Carver County	0.1	2
85546	Arizona	Graham County	0.1	2
16803	Pennsylvania	Centre County	0.1	2
16509	Pennsylvania	Erie County	0.1	2
60610	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	2
92024	California	San Diego County	0.1	2
85624	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	2
97439	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	2
87111	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	2
60062	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	2
97702	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.1	2
85259	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85703	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	2
85648	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	2
85224	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85234	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85282	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
97530	Oregon	Jackson County	0.1	2
78070	Texas	Comal County	0.1	2
81301	Colorado	La Plata County	0.1	2
85248	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85652	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	2
85020	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
12833	New York	Saratoga County	0.1	1
50265	Iowa	Polk County	0.1	1
81615	Colorado	Pitkin County	0.1	1
47331	Indiana	Fayette County	0.1	1
85309	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
92113	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
10512	New York	Putnam County	0.1	1
44121	Ohio	Cuyahoga County	0.1	1
43219	Ohio	Franklin County	0.1	1
85708	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
85085	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85015	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
46168	Indiana	Hendricks County	0.1	1
78705	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
39090	Mississippi	Attala County	0.1	1
19010	Pennsylvania	Delaware County	0.1	1

98290	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
14120	New York	Niagara County	0.1	1
85622	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
91901	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
85032	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
95023	California	San Benito County	0.1	1
85637	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
45242	Ohio	Hamilton County	0.1	1
37122	Tennessee	Wilson County	0.1	1
72758	Arkansas	Benton County	0.1	1
19970	Delaware	Sussex County	0.1	1
98802	Washington	Douglas County	0.1	1
98040	Washington	King County	0.1	1
11201	New York	Kings County	0.1	1
55057	Minnesota	Rice County	0.1	1
80303	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
77057	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
60502	Illinois	DuPage County	0.1	1
45244	Ohio	Hamilton County	0.1	1
72631	Arkansas	Carroll County	0.1	1
96106	California	Plumas County	0.1	1
94404	California	San Mateo County	0.1	1
50226	Iowa	Polk County	0.1	1
93514	California	Inyo County	0.1	1
85206	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85205	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
19103	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia County	0.1	1
06880	Connecticut	Fairfield County	0.1	1
46614	Indiana	St. Joseph County	0.1	1
33436	Florida	Palm Beach County	0.1	1
12308	New York	Schenectady County	0.1	1
55344	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
02141	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
85283	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
68178	Nebraska	Douglas County	0.1	1
85223	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
85374	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
04607	Maine	Hancock County	0.1	1
85007	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
33761	Florida	Pinellas County	0.1	1
98329	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
90732	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
90254	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
53125	Wisconsin	Walworth County	0.1	1
55343	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
90019	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
55437	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
85740	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
45502	Ohio	Clark County	0.1	1
60050	Illinois	McHenry County	0.1	1
87801	New Mexico	Socorro County	0.1	1

01267	Massachusetts	Berkshire County	0.1	1
19085	Pennsylvania	Delaware County	0.1	1
29412	South Carolina	Charleston County	0.1	1
43324	Ohio	Logan County	0.1	1
30269	Georgia	Fayette County	0.1	1
95687	California	Solano County	0.1	1
48104	Michigan	Washtenaw County	0.1	1
60477	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
55418	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
93041	California	Ventura County	0.1	1
29631	South Carolina	Pickens County	0.1	1
85373	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
97701	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.1	1
80305	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
91355	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
98030	Washington	King County	0.1	1
85308	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
56572	Minnesota	Otter Tail County	0.1	1
33617	Florida	Hillsborough County	0.1	1
51001	Iowa	Plymouth County	0.1	1
85717	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
46304	Indiana	Porter County	0.1	1
85618	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
93612	California	Fresno County	0.1	1
53405	Wisconsin	Racine County	0.1	1
02051	Massachusetts	Plymouth County	0.1	1
85365	Arizona	Yuma County	0.1	1
49449	Michigan	Oceana County	0.1	1
61571	Illinois	Tazewell County	0.1	1
53963	Wisconsin	Dodge County	0.1	1
85225	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
12514	New York	Dutchess County	0.1	1
48302	Michigan	Oakland County	0.1	1
97403	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
19086	Pennsylvania	Delaware County	0.1	1
46809	Indiana	Allen County	0.1	1
82450	Wyoming	Park County	0.1	1
94549	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
27330	North Carolina	Lee County	0.1	1
30909	Georgia	Richmond County	0.1	1
60641	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
45822	Ohio	Mercer County	0.1	1
10032	New York	New York County	0.1	1
17050	Pennsylvania	Cumberland County	0.1	1
85544	Arizona	Gila County	0.1	1
99683	Alaska	Matanuska-Susitna Borough	0.1	1
53534	Wisconsin	Rock County	0.1	1
94591	California	Solano County	0.1	1
35055	Alabama	Cullman County	0.1	1
60068	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
57702	South Dakota	Pennington County	0.1	1

85732	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
91941	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
05468	Vermont	Chittenden County	0.1	1
14226	New York	Erie County	0.1	1
80512	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
92078	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
43068	Ohio	Franklin County	0.1	1
90026	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
81122	Colorado	La Plata County	0.1	1
88011	New Mexico	Dona Ana County	0.1	1
85752	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
03781	New Hampshire	Sullivan County	0.1	1
36580	Alabama	Baldwin County	0.1	1
53704	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
98532	Washington	Lewis County	0.1	1
29620	South Carolina	Abbeville County	0.1	1
85202	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
72212	Arkansas	Pulaski County	0.1	1
90232	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
59759	Montana	Jefferson County	0.1	1
83605	Idaho	Canyon County	0.1	1
85702	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
17406	Pennsylvania	York County	0.1	1
60614	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
85632	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
16611	Pennsylvania	Huntingdon County	0.1	1
87047	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
20769	Maryland	Prince Georges County	0.1	1
45424	Ohio	Montgomery County	0.1	1
83713	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
98229	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
97303	Oregon	Marion County	0.1	1
99511	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	1
91040	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
75204	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
97063	Oregon	Wasco County	0.1	1
80111	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
06484	Connecticut	Fairfield County	0.1	1
85242	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
48197	Michigan	Washtenaw County	0.1	1
06111	Connecticut	Hartford County	0.1	1
97408	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
77372	Texas	Montgomery County	0.1	1
02148	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
97341	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
85304	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
19020	Pennsylvania	Bucks County	0.1	1
97527	Oregon	Josephine County	0.1	1
01264	Massachusetts	Berkshire County	0.1	1
86305	Arizona	Yavapai County	0.1	1
60098	Illinois	McHenry County	0.1	1

85607	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
80016	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
43082	Ohio	Delaware County	0.1	1
85634	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
52039	Iowa	Dubuque County	0.1	1
94706	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
68845	Nebraska	Buffalo County	0.1	1
48080	Michigan	Macomb County	0.1	1
45458	Ohio	Montgomery County	0.1	1
90710	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
79768	Texas	Ector County	0.1	1
80831	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
83013	Wyoming	Teton County	0.1	1
54755	Wisconsin	Buffalo County	0.1	1
92103	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
03603	New Hampshire	Sullivan County	0.1	1
16066	Pennsylvania	Butler County	0.1	1
85045	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
62208	Illinois	St. Clair County	0.1	1
59859	Montana	Sanders County	0.1	1
14424	New York	Ontario County	0.1	1
19446	Pennsylvania	Montgomery County	0.1	1
55436	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
84121	Utah	Salt Lake County	0.1	1
10502	New York	Westchester County	0.1	1
04107	Maine	Cumberland County	0.1	1
85201	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
97131	Oregon	Tillamook County	0.1	1
43560	Ohio	Lucas County	0.1	1
93560	California	Kern County	0.1	1
12571	New York	Dutchess County	0.1	1
98250	Washington	San Juan County	0.1	1
91011	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
95945	California	Nevada County	0.1	1
92630	California	Orange County	0.1	1
10549	New York	Westchester County	0.1	1
86401	Arizona	Mohave County	0.1	1
99801	Alaska	Juneau Borough	0.1	1
12776	New York	Sullivan County	0.1	1
89712	Nevada	Carson City	0.1	1
89703	Nevada	Carson City	0.1	1
85744	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
55105	Minnesota	Ramsey County	0.1	1
46104	Indiana	Rush County	0.1	1
97321	Oregon	Linn County	0.1	1
77414	Texas	Matagorda County	0.1	1
60611	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
05674	Vermont	Washington County	0.1	1
05074	Vermont	Orange County	0.1	1
53150	Wisconsin	Waukesha County	0.1	1
81503	Colorado	Mesa County	0.1	1

57016	South Dakota	Lake County	0.1	1
75602	Texas	Gregg County	0.1	1
20740	Maryland	Prince Georges County	0.1	1
32822	Florida	Orange County	0.1	1
63017	Missouri	St. Louis County	0.1	1
85377	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
53528	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
12054	New York	Albany County	0.1	1
95446	California	Sonoma County	0.1	1
62801	Illinois	Marion County	0.1	1
43015	Ohio	Delaware County	0.1	1
21228	Maryland	Baltimore County	0.1	1
91604	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
95618	California	Yolo County	0.1	1
46615	Indiana	St. Joseph County	0.1	1
80439	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
92346	California	San Bernardino County	0.1	1
83301	Idaho	Twin Falls County	0.1	1
54304	Wisconsin	Brown County	0.1	1
78745	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
55113	Minnesota	Ramsey County	0.1	1
85278	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
95033	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
90293	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
80517	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
85023	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
46825	Indiana	Allen County	0.1	1
97404	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
01966	Massachusetts	Essex County	0.1	1
23168	Virginia	James City County	0.1	1
53188	Wisconsin	Waukesha County	0.1	1
27516	North Carolina	Orange County	0.1	1
93534	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
94946	California	Marin County	0.1	1
99503	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	1
81611	Colorado	Pitkin County	0.1	1
20653	Maryland	St. Marys County	0.1	1
85707	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
80031	Colorado	Adams County	0.1	1
85345	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
20842	Maryland	Montgomery County	0.1	1
06877	Connecticut	Fairfield County	0.1	1
83843	Idaho	Latah County	0.1	1
49740	Michigan	Emmet County	0.1	1
33733	Florida	Pinellas County	0.1	1
48837	Michigan	Eaton County	0.1	1
83602	Idaho	Boise County	0.1	1
97221	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
34209	Florida	Manatee County	0.1	1
32714	Florida	Seminole County	0.1	1
85364	Arizona	Yuma County	0.1	1



49548	Michigan	Kent County	0.1	1
02155	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
53545	Wisconsin	Rock County	0.1	1
85603	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
95065	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
61744	Illinois	McLean County	0.1	1
12883	New York	Essex County	0.1	1
77399	Texas	Polk County	0.1	1
98221	Washington	Skagit County	0.1	1
01742	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
53590	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
82055	Wyoming	Albany County	0.1	1
52722	Iowa	Scott County	0.1	1
04079	Maine	Cumberland County	0.1	1
82070	Wyoming	Albany County	0.1	1
22311	Virginia	Alexandria city	0.1	1
98136	Washington	King County	0.1	1
97058	Oregon	Wasco County	0.1	1
06378	Connecticut	New London County	0.1	1
12184	New York	Columbia County	0.1	1
60004	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
77551	Texas	Galveston County	0.1	1
46375	Indiana	Lake County	0.1	1
40217	Kentucky	Jefferson County	0.1	1
97229	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	1
15550	Pennsylvania	Bedford County	0.1	1
81220	Colorado	Montrose County	0.1	1
81435	Colorado	San Miguel County	0.1	1
06098	Connecticut	Litchfield County	0.1	1
98335	Washington	Pierce County	0.1	1
10506	New York	Westchester County	0.1	1
51106	Iowa	Woodbury County	0.1	1
89052	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1
94117	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
83814	Idaho	Kootenai County	0.1	1
31558	Georgia	Camden County	0.1	1
78664	Texas	Williamson County	0.1	1
11758	New York	Nassau County	0.1	1
98112	Washington	King County	0.1	1
70821	Louisiana	East Baton Rouge Parish	0.1	1
61260	Illinois	Mercer County	0.1	1
21044	Maryland	Howard County	0.1	1
94114	California	San Francisco County	0.1	1
02492	Massachusetts	Norfolk County	0.1	1
94937	California	Marin County	0.1	1
92107	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
80112	Colorado	Arapahoe County	0.1	1
34230	Florida	Sarasota County	0.1	1
85383	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
78726	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
92056	California	San Diego County	0.1	1

85937	Arizona	Navajo County	0.1	1
98943	Washington	Kittitas County	0.1	1
85203	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
53103	Wisconsin	Waukesha County	0.1	1
94565	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
85613	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
46975	Indiana	Fulton County	0.1	1
60659	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
01982	Massachusetts	Essex County	0.1	1
81428	Colorado	Delta County	0.1	1
92120	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
17745	Pennsylvania	Clinton County	0.1	1
85021	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
46228	Indiana	Marion County	0.1	1
30096	Georgia	Gwinnett County	0.1	1
78218	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
49418	Michigan	Kent County	0.1	1
94402	California	San Mateo County	0.1	1
10960	New York	Rockland County	0.1	1
44087	Ohio	Summit County	0.1	1
85644	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
60613	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
85239	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
96722	Hawaii	Kauai County	0.1	1
85731	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
85226	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
98006	Washington	King County	0.1	1
62521	Illinois	Macon County	0.1	1
85306	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85297	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
97838	Oregon	Umatilla County	0.1	1
98075	Washington	King County	0.1	1
14227	New York	Erie County	0.1	1
59865	Montana	Lake County	0.1	1
56482	Minnesota	Wadena County	0.1	1
22314	Virginia	Alexandria city	0.1	1
12997	New York	Essex County	0.1	1
94903	California	Marin County	0.1	1
94609	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
23030	Virginia	Charles City County	0.1	1
19382	Pennsylvania	Chester County	0.1	1
72034	Arkansas	Faulkner County	0.1	1
15731	Pennsylvania	Indiana County	0.1	1
27332	North Carolina	Lee County	0.1	1
77450	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
60657	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
93023	California	Ventura County	0.1	1
98501	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	1
81147	Colorado	Archuleta County	0.1	1
93902	California	Monterey County	0.1	1
90001	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1

48382	Michigan	Oakland County	0.1	1
52761	Iowa	Muscatine County	0.1	1
98548	Washington	Mason County	0.1	1
91942	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
85220	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
60031	Illinois	Lake County	0.1	1
11797	New York	Nassau County	0.1	1
85351	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
55769	Minnesota	Itasca County	0.1	1
94568	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
54521	Wisconsin	Vilas County	0.1	1
47032	Indiana	Dearborn County	0.1	1
60585	Illinois	Will County	0.1	1
57579	South Dakota	Mellette County	0.1	1
32189	Florida	Putnam County	0.1	1
19464	Pennsylvania	Montgomery County	0.1	1
85658	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
54880	Wisconsin	Douglas County	0.1	1
91025	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
59634	Montana	Jefferson County	0.1	1
85254	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
92130	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
10003	New York	New York County	0.1	1
13850	New York	Broome County	0.1	1
56465	Minnesota	Crow Wing County	0.1	1
46064	Indiana	Madison County	0.1	1
81427	Colorado	Ouray County	0.1	1
60532	Illinois	DuPage County	0.1	1
81432	Colorado	Ouray County	0.1	1
71129	Louisiana	Caddo Parish	0.1	1
01951	Massachusetts	Essex County	0.1	1
85013	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1

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

## APPENDIX B - Detailed Satisfaction Results

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

Satisfaction Element	Percent Rating Satisfaction as:					Mean Rating§	Mean Importance†	No. Obs‡
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
Restroom Cleanliness	2.3	4.8	7.2	24.8	60.9	4.4	4.6	104
Developed Facilities	0.4	0.0	13.8	23.2	62.6	4.5	4.4	118
Condition of Environment	0.8	0.0	4.4	20.2	74.6	4.7	4.9	129
Employee Helpfulness	0.6	0.0	7.4	9.9	82.2	4.7	4.7	87
Interpretive Displays	0.0	2.0	19.5	20.0	58.5	4.4	4.3	104
Parking Availability	0.0	1.1	6.5	12.5	79.8	4.7	4.4	128
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	1.5	6.7	15.7	76.0	4.7	4.1	130
Rec. Info. Availability	0.4	2.1	14.3	19.4	63.9	4.4	4.3	116
Road Condition	1.4	14.0	13.1	24.1	47.4	4.0	4.3	99
Feeling of Safety	0.0	1.5	4.5	14.5	79.5	4.7	4.7	129
Scenery	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	94.8	4.9	4.8	130
Signage Adequacy	0.0	2.0	10.8	19.1	68.1	4.5	4.4	123
Trail Condition	1.5	2.6	13.8	32.5	49.6	4.3	4.7	99
Value for Fee Paid	0.9	0.0	2.7	14.1	82.4	4.8	4.5	115

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

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

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

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

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

Satisfaction Element	Percent Rating Satisfaction as:					Mean Rating§	Mean Importance†	No. Obs‡
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
Restroom Cleanliness	0.6	0.0	23.6	27.4	48.3	4.2	4.4	78
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.6	10.3	30.4	58.7	4.5	3.7	84
Condition of Environment	0.0	0.2	3.9	32.6	63.2	4.6	4.4	89
Employee Helpfulness	11.8	0.0	13.6	16.9	57.8	4.1	4.9	72
Interpretive Displays	0.8	0.2	39.7	7.9	51.4	4.1	3.4	63
Parking Availability	0.0	10.1	10.4	5.2	74.4	4.4	4.7	88
Parking Lot Condition	0.7	9.3	1.3	16.3	72.4	4.5	4.4	85
Rec. Info. Availability	0.0	11.0	20.9	19.5	48.7	4.1	4.2	76
Road Condition	0.0	0.0	20.6	32.7	46.7	4.3	4.5	77
Feeling of Safety	0.0	1.2	0.8	5.4	92.6	4.9	4.8	87
Scenery	0.0	0.1	3.2	2.2	94.5	4.9	4.5	89
Signage Adequacy	0.1	1.0	2.6	16.2	80.1	4.8	4.5	89
Trail Condition	0.0	0.0	13.3	24.3	62.4	4.5	4.1	72
Value for Fee Paid	3.2	2.1	1.8	24.5	68.4	4.5	4.2	83

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

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

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

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

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

Satisfaction Element	Percent Rating Satisfaction as:					Mean Rating§	Mean Importance†	No. Obs‡
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
Restroom Cleanliness	3.9	2.6	8.6	16.9	68.0	4.4	4.3	112
Developed Facilities	1.1	1.1	6.8	24.8	66.2	4.5	4.2	125
Condition of Environment	1.1	4.9	5.2	23.2	65.6	4.5	4.8	169
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	8.1	18.0	73.9	4.7	4.3	93
Interpretive Displays	1.2	1.8	18.6	23.8	54.6	4.3	3.8	113
Parking Availability	0.0	3.1	3.5	22.9	70.5	4.6	3.9	153
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	0.5	5.8	17.0	76.7	4.7	3.8	144
Rec. Info. Availability	2.3	7.4	17.4	17.4	55.4	4.2	3.9	146
Road Condition	2.4	5.4	11.8	27.5	52.8	4.2	4.1	149
Feeling of Safety	4.0	4.0	3.3	16.5	72.1	4.5	4.4	171
Scenery	0.4	2.0	1.9	5.0	90.8	4.8	4.7	172
Signage Adequacy	1.6	3.5	10.9	29.0	55.0	4.3	4.0	153
Trail Condition	1.0	1.2	12.5	29.0	56.5	4.4	4.1	121
Value for Fee Paid	0.6	0.4	4.3	19.3	75.3	4.7	4.3	109

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

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

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

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

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

Satisfaction Element	Percent Rating Satisfaction as:					Mean Rating§	Mean Importance†	No. Obs‡
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
Restroom Cleanliness	0.0	0.0	1.4	17.1	81.6	4.8	4.1	36
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.8	10.6	11.4	77.1	4.6	4.2	33
Condition of Environment	0.2	0.2	2.8	18.1	78.7	4.7	4.9	150
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	15.3	6.9	77.7	4.6	4.5	35
Interpretive Displays	0.4	1.8	23.8	21.1	52.9	4.2	3.7	92
Parking Availability	0.2	1.6	4.7	15.9	77.6	4.7	4.2	143
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	0.0	3.7	13.5	82.8	4.8	3.8	142
Rec. Info. Availability	0.9	1.7	13.3	20.6	63.5	4.4	4.1	113
Road Condition	0.0	0.0	19.9	22.4	57.6	4.4	3.8	43
Feeling of Safety	0.2	0.0	5.8	18.5	75.4	4.7	4.4	148
Scenery	0.0	0.0	0.2	7.1	92.6	4.9	4.7	150
Signage Adequacy	2.6	0.8	13.0	23.2	60.4	4.4	4.3	135
Trail Condition	0.4	4.5	3.5	31.2	60.4	4.5	4.6	149
Value for Fee Paid	0.5	0.5	5.3	1.5	92.2	4.8	4.1	55

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

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

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

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

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