



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Natural Resource
Manager

National Visitor
Use Monitoring
Program



Last updated:
2 February 2021

Visitor Use Report

Coronado NF

USDA Forest Service

Region 3

National Visitor Use Monitoring Data collected FY 2017

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	10	140	7.1
DUDS	HIGH	16	341	4.7
DUDS	MEDIUM	11	534	2.1
DUDS	LOW	12	6,405	0.2
DUDS	FR1	10	189	5.3
DUDS	SV1	7	68	10.3
OU DS	HIGH	10	50	20.0
OU DS	MEDIUM	11	576	1.9
OU DS	LOW	10	5,011	0.2
OU DS	DUR4	10	730	1.4
OU DS	DUR5	11	863	1.3
OU DS	RE2	7	2,666	0.3
OU DS	RE4	10	365	2.7
GFA	VERY HIGH	10	65	15.4
GFA	HIGH	16	354	4.5
GFA	MEDIUM	23	1,658	1.4
GFA	LOW	51	13,119	0.4
WILDERNESS	HIGH	19	442	4.3
WILDERNESS	MEDIUM	13	1,420	0.9
WILDERNESS	LOW	27	6,113	0.4
Total		294	41,109	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*	1,725	±16.2
→ Day Use Developed Site Visits	548	±31.4
→ Overnight Use Developed Site Visits	186	±28.7
→ General Forest Area Visits	741	±27.5
→ Designated Wilderness Visits†	250	±23.9
Total Estimated National Forest Visits§	1,417	±15.2
→ Special Events and Organized Camp Use‡	106	±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	1,638	1,023	419
Overnight Use Developed Sites	1,033	793	215
Undeveloped Areas (GFAs)	1,895	1,139	722
Designated Wilderness	634	401	393
Total	5,200	3,356	1,749

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	129	75	260	132	596
Economic	160	82	238	131	611
Satisfaction	130	58	224	130	542
Total	419	215	722	393	1,749

* 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 45% of visits to the Coronado NF are made by females. Among racial and ethnic minorities, the most commonly encountered are Hispanic/Latinos (12.4%) and Asians (2.7%). The age distribution shows that only about 12% of visits are children under age 16. People over the age of 60 account for almost 35% of visits. About 58 percent of visits are from those living within 50 miles of the forest. About one-quarter are from over 500 miles away.

Table 5. Percent of National Forest Visits* by Gender

Gender	Survey Respondents†	National Forest Visits (%)‡
Female	1,920	44.8
Male	1,911	55.2
Total	3,831	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	48	2.6
Asian	49	2.7
Black / African American	33	1.3
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	6	0.5
White	1,464	94.6
Total	1,600	101.7

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	National Forest Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	188	12.3



* 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	11.8
16-19	2.8
20-29	13.4
30-39	9.0
40-49	11.4
50-59	16.9
60-69	24.3
70+	10.4
Total	100.0



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

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

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

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

ZIP Code	State	County	Percent of Respondents	Survey Respondents (n)
85750	Arizona	Pima County	17.1	119
85718	Arizona	Pima County	11.2	78
85704	Arizona	Pima County	7.6	53
Foreign Country			7.3	51
85712	Arizona	Pima County	6.3	44
85719	Arizona	Pima County	6.2	43
85716	Arizona	Pima County	5.8	40
85748	Arizona	Pima County	5.2	36
85711	Arizona	Pima County	5.0	35
85749	Arizona	Pima County	5.0	35
85710	Arizona	Pima County	5.0	35
85741	Arizona	Pima County	4.9	34
85715	Arizona	Pima County	4.7	33
85747	Arizona	Pima County	4.3	30
85705	Arizona	Pima County	4.2	29

* 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	36.1
26 - 50 miles	21.7
51 - 75 miles	5.9
76 - 100 miles	3.0
101 - 200 miles	4.7
201 - 500 miles	2.8
Over 500 miles	25.9
Total	100.1

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.

Half of visits to this forest last less than 4 hours, although the average duration is about 10 hours. The median length of visits to overnight sites is about 13 hours, indicating a one night stay is common. Over 50% of visits come from people who visit at most 5 times per year. Very frequent visitors are not very common: only about 10% 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	7.5	3.0
Day Use Developed		
Overnight Use Developed		
Undeveloped Areas	7.5	3.0
Designated Wilderness		
National Forest Visit		

* 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*	96.6
Number of national forest sites visited on National Forest Visit*	1.1
Group size	2.4
Axles per vehicle	2.1

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

Number of Annual Visits	Visits (%)†	Cumulative Visits (%)
1 - 5	51.0	51.0
6 - 10	12.7	63.7
11 - 15	9.8	73.5
16 - 20	4.7	78.2
21 - 25	1.9	80.1
26 - 30	3.2	83.2
31 - 35	0.3	83.5
36 - 40	2.2	85.7
41 - 50	3.6	89.3
51 - 100	4.9	94.2
101 - 200	3.7	97.9
201 - 300	1.5	99.4
Over 300	0.6	100.0



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

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

3.3. Activities

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

The most frequently reported primary activities are hiking/walking (48%), viewing natural features (12%), and relaxing/hanging out (7%) .


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	73.4	47.9	3.3
Viewing Natural Features	55.6	12.1	3.2
Viewing Wildlife	48.3	7.5	4.4
Relaxing	36.3	7.1	7.9
Driving for Pleasure	22.0	5.8	2.6
Picnicking	17.9	4.5	2.8
Nature Center Activities	17.5	0.6	2.3
Nature Study	13.4	0.6	3.8
Some Other Activity	9.8	6.1	2.7
Developed Camping	8.8	2.9	34.0
Hunting	5.7	3.4	16.7
Visiting Historic Sites	5.6	0.0	0.0
Primitive Camping	5.2	1.0	24.9
Fishing	5.2	2.2	4.2
Other Non-motorized	3.3	0.9	2.6
OHV Use	3.0	0.8	5.4
Backpacking	2.8	0.8	51.7
Motorized Trail Activity	2.4	0.1	2.8
Gathering Forest Products	2.0	0.3	3.4
Bicycling	1.7	0.2	2.5
Resort Use	1.4	0.0	5.0
Non-motorized Water	0.9	0.0	2.0
Horseback Riding	0.9	0.1	5.3
Motorized Water Activities	0.8	0.0	8.0
Downhill Skiing	0.7	0.0	3.5
Cross-country Skiing	0.3	0.0	4.0
Other Motorized Activity	0.3	0.1	2.1
Snowmobiling	0.2	0.0	0.0
No Activity Reported	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	6.9
Scenic Byway	31.1
Visitor Center or Museum	31.4
Designated ORV Area	5.0
Forest Roads	8.1
Interpretive Displays	29.4
Information Sites	27.1
Developed Fishing Site	5.2
Motorized Single Track Trails	3.8
Motorized Dual Track Trails	4.1
None of these Facilities	35.3

* 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.

About 25 percent of visits to the Coronado are made as side trips while the person is on a trip to some other destination. For over 60%, the trip to the forest is a day trip from home rather than a trip that includes an overnight stay. The income distribution results show a concentration in the upper levels: nearly one-third are from households making over \$100,000 a year.

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	\$953
Median Total Trip Spending per Party	\$55
% NF Visits made on trip with overnight stay away from home	35.2%
% NF Visits with overnight stay within 50 miles of NF	33.9%
Mean nights/visit within 50 miles of NF	14.0
Area Lodging Use	% Visits with Nights Near Forest
NFS Campground on this NF	16.5%
Undeveloped Camping in this NF	12.4%
NFS Cabin	2.7%
Other Public Campground	3.3%
Private Campground	6.4%
Rented Private Home	40.8%
Home of Friends/Family	19.9%
Own Home	3.9%
Other Lodging	4.4%

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	21.3
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18.6
\$75,000 to \$99,999	19.5
\$100,000 to \$149,999	18.2
\$150,000 and up	13.4
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 very good. About 83% of people visiting indicated they were very satisfied with their overall recreation experience. Another 14% were somewhat satisfied. The results for the composite indices were also very good. Satisfaction ratings for perception of safety were at least 93% for all types of sites. Ratings for the 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	92.2	83.3	94.3
Access	95.2	81.6	92.6
Services	91.6	81.2	89.2
Feeling of Safety	95.5	93.5	94.3

† 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	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 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	Keep up the Good Work
Developed Facilities	Keep up the Good Work
Condition of Environment	Keep up the Good Work
Employee Helpfulness	Keep up the Good Work
Interpretive Displays	Possible Overkill
Parking Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Parking Lot Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Rec. Info. Availability	Keep up the Good Work
Road Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Feeling of Safety	Keep up the Good Work
Scenery	Keep up the Good Work
Signage Adequacy	Keep up the Good Work
Trail Condition	Keep up the Good Work
Value for Fee Paid	Keep up the Good Work

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	1.9	1.3
9	0.7	2.2	6.9	1.8
8	4.2	8.9	9.2	4.2
7	6.7	2.1	5.0	4.2
6	10.5	16.8	12.2	18.4
5	14.1	17.2	17.1	17.2
4	29.0	16.6	11.8	13.0
3	14.7	11.7	16.1	24.2
2	19.8	16.8	16.7	15.3
1 - Hardly anyone there	0.4	7.9	3.0	0.4
Average Rating	4.2	4.3	4.8	4.4


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	5.4
Of this group, percent who said facilities at site visited were accessible	97.9

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	393	42.7
Male	437	57.3
Total	830	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	12	2.5
Asian	16	4.0
Black / African American	12	2.5
Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1	0.2
White	318	92.9
Total	359	102.1

Ethnicity†	Survey Respondents‡	Wilderness Site Visits (%)§
Hispanic / Latino	45	9.6



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

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


† Race and Ethnicity were asked as two separate questions.

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

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

Table 27. Percent of Wilderness Site Visits* by Age

Age Class	Wilderness Site Visits (%)‡
Under 16	6.5
16-19	2.6
20-29	18.2
30-39	12.4
40-49	13.6
50-59	14.8
60-69	23.3
70+	8.7
Total	100.1



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

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

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

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

ZIP Code	State	County	Percent of Respondents	Survey Respondents (n)
85718	Arizona	Pima County	11.7	21
85704	Arizona	Pima County	10.6	19
85750	Arizona	Pima County	8.9	16
85719	Arizona	Pima County	8.9	16
85742	Arizona	Pima County	7.8	14
85737	Arizona	Pima County	7.2	13
Foreign Country			6.7	12
85741	Arizona	Pima County	5.6	10
85711	Arizona	Pima County	5.6	10
85712	Arizona	Pima County	5.6	10
85716	Arizona	Pima County	5.6	10
85705	Arizona	Pima County	5.6	10
85755	Arizona	Pima County	3.9	7
85730	Arizona	Pima County	3.3	6
85747	Arizona	Pima County	3.3	6

* 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	6.8	119
85718	Arizona	Pima County	4.5	78
85704	Arizona	Pima County	3.0	53
Foreign Country			2.9	51
85712	Arizona	Pima County	2.5	44
85719	Arizona	Pima County	2.5	43
85716	Arizona	Pima County	2.3	40
85748	Arizona	Pima County	2.1	36
85711	Arizona	Pima County	2.0	35
85749	Arizona	Pima County	2.0	35
85710	Arizona	Pima County	2.0	35
85741	Arizona	Pima County	1.9	34
85715	Arizona	Pima County	1.9	33
85747	Arizona	Pima County	1.7	30
85705	Arizona	Pima County	1.7	29
85742	Arizona	Pima County	1.5	27
85730	Arizona	Pima County	1.5	26
85755	Arizona	Pima County	1.4	25
85737	Arizona	Pima County	1.4	25
85739	Arizona	Pima County	1.2	21
85743	Arizona	Pima County	1.1	20
85629	Arizona	Pima County	1.1	20
Unknown Origin*			1.1	19
85745	Arizona	Pima County	1.0	17
85713	Arizona	Pima County	1.0	17
85641	Arizona	Pima County	0.9	16
85658	Arizona	Pima County	0.8	14
85756	Arizona	Pima County	0.7	12
85614	Arizona	Pima County	0.7	12
85615	Arizona	Cochise County	0.7	12
85746	Arizona	Pima County	0.6	11
85650	Arizona	Cochise County	0.6	10
85635	Arizona	Cochise County	0.6	10
85701	Arizona	Pima County	0.5	9
85706	Arizona	Pima County	0.5	9
85623	Arizona	Pinal County	0.4	7
85602	Arizona	Cochise County	0.3	6
85632	Arizona	Cochise County	0.3	6
85603	Arizona	Cochise County	0.3	6
85622	Arizona	Pima County	0.3	6

85757	Arizona	Pima County	0.3	6
85613	Arizona	Cochise County	0.3	5
85611	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.3	5
85648	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.3	5
85708	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	4
85617	Arizona	Cochise County	0.2	4
85653	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	4
85616	Arizona	Cochise County	0.2	4
85546	Arizona	Graham County	0.2	4
85735	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	4
85607	Arizona	Cochise County	0.2	4
81301	Colorado	La Plata County	0.2	3
85016	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85029	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85224	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85714	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	3
86001	Arizona	Coconino County	0.2	3
85552	Arizona	Graham County	0.2	3
85736	Arizona	Pima County	0.2	3
85625	Arizona	Cochise County	0.2	3
85225	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
85226	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.2	3
80525	Colorado	Larimer County	0.2	3
85621	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.2	3
80919	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	2
85215	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
60614	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	2
21921	Maryland	Cecil County	0.1	2
85234	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85752	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	2
50265	Iowa	Polk County	0.1	2
99516	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	2
94588	California	Alameda County	0.1	2
85209	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
86323	Arizona	Yavapai County	0.1	2
85207	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
95060	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	2
95008	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	2
48070	Michigan	Oakland County	0.1	2
22124	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	2
97225	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	2
85008	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85023	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
60610	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	2
85130	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	2
86401	Arizona	Mohave County	0.1	2
85202	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85050	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85543	Arizona	Graham County	0.1	2
80504	Colorado	Weld County	0.1	2
55060	Minnesota	Steele County	0.1	2

55044	Minnesota	Dakota County	0.1	2
60544	Illinois	Will County	0.1	2
85646	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	2
95831	California	Sacramento County	0.1	2
85286	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85044	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85655	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	2
88007	New Mexico	Dona Ana County	0.1	2
85255	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
85249	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
46307	Indiana	Lake County	0.1	2
53704	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	2
81201	Colorado	Chaffee County	0.1	2
86004	Arizona	Coconino County	0.1	2
85282	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
88020	New Mexico	Hidalgo County	0.1	2
55446	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	2
55118	Minnesota	Dakota County	0.1	2
80232	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	2
85643	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	2
87107	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	2
85024	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
92103	California	San Diego County	0.1	2
55410	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	2
85138	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	2
48103	Michigan	Washtenaw County	0.1	2
85284	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	2
88061	New Mexico	Grant County	0.1	2
85608	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
59932	Montana	Flathead County	0.1	1
03431	New Hampshire	Cheshire County	0.1	1
17339	Pennsylvania	York County	0.1	1
86305	Arizona	Yavapai County	0.1	1
40220	Kentucky	Jefferson County	0.1	1
77498	Texas	Fort Bend County	0.1	1
90803	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
95070	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
40206	Kentucky	Jefferson County	0.1	1
85210	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
27713	North Carolina	Durham County	0.1	1
19702	Delaware	New Castle County	0.1	1
85257	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
96158	California	El Dorado County	0.1	1
77399	Texas	Polk County	0.1	1
75150	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
55124	Minnesota	Dakota County	0.1	1
64015	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
54216	Wisconsin	Kewaunee County	0.1	1
85717	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
85392	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
98110	Washington	Kitsap County	0.1	1

92563	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
11225	New York	Kings County	0.1	1
32754	Florida	Brevard County	0.1	1
99603	Alaska	Kenai Peninsula Borough	0.1	1
95667	California	El Dorado County	0.1	1
21212	Maryland	Baltimore city	0.1	1
20007	District of Columbia	District of Columbia	0.1	1
80303	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
75206	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
17042	Pennsylvania	Lebanon County	0.1	1
62521	Illinois	Macon County	0.1	1
32536	Florida	Okaloosa County	0.1	1
77584	Texas	Brazoria County	0.1	1
56039	Minnesota	Martin County	0.1	1
21113	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	0.1	1
28078	North Carolina	Mecklenburg County	0.1	1
85283	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85268	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85212	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
81323	Colorado	Montezuma County	0.1	1
85259	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
98006	Washington	King County	0.1	1
85345	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
80106	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
81321	Colorado	Montezuma County	0.1	1
48439	Michigan	Genesee County	0.1	1
60004	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
95124	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
91423	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
98503	Washington	Thurston County	0.1	1
78759	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
85721	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
92029	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
08205	New Jersey	Atlantic County	0.1	1
20111	Virginia	Prince William County	0.1	1
85086	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85048	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
63118	Missouri	St. Louis city	0.1	1
46140	Indiana	Hancock County	0.1	1
13090	New York	Onondaga County	0.1	1
44202	Ohio	Portage County	0.1	1
83333	Idaho	Blaine County	0.1	1
02184	Massachusetts	Norfolk County	0.1	1
10009	New York	New York County	0.1	1
59634	Montana	Jefferson County	0.1	1
45458	Ohio	Montgomery County	0.1	1
80238	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
75019	Texas	Dallas County	0.1	1
06405	Connecticut	New Haven County	0.1	1
21146	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	0.1	1
66044	Kansas	Douglas County	0.1	1

32605	Florida	Alachua County	0.1	1
03216	New Hampshire	Merrimack County	0.1	1
30082	Georgia	Cobb County	0.1	1
88345	New Mexico	Lincoln County	0.1	1
84040	Utah	Davis County	0.1	1
01354	Massachusetts	Franklin County	0.1	1
05041	Vermont	Orange County	0.1	1
06033	Connecticut	Hartford County	0.1	1
53590	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
80924	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
18901	Pennsylvania	Bucks County	0.1	1
54751	Wisconsin	Dunn County	0.1	1
27617	North Carolina	Wake County	0.1	1
85145	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
80918	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
55344	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
04355	Maine	Kennebec County	0.1	1
81003	Colorado	Pueblo County	0.1	1
50588	Iowa	Buena Vista County	0.1	1
93117	California	Santa Barbara County	0.1	1
62959	Illinois	Williamson County	0.1	1
59715	Montana	Gallatin County	0.1	1
60175	Illinois	Kane County	0.1	1
53017	Wisconsin	Washington County	0.1	1
96094	California	Siskiyou County	0.1	1
94002	California	San Mateo County	0.1	1
14456	New York	Ontario County	0.1	1
02421	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
12561	New York	Ulster County	0.1	1
87505	New Mexico	Santa Fe County	0.1	1
23325	Virginia	Chesapeake city	0.1	1
76112	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
47715	Indiana	Vanderburgh County	0.1	1
37129	Tennessee	Rutherford County	0.1	1
85324	Arizona	Yavapai County	0.1	1
63367	Missouri	St. Charles County	0.1	1
98908	Washington	Yakima County	0.1	1
53089	Wisconsin	Waukesha County	0.1	1
32245	Florida	Duval County	0.1	1
52241	Iowa	Johnson County	0.1	1
76513	Texas	Bell County	0.1	1
77663	Texas	Hardin County	0.1	1
81401	Colorado	Montrose County	0.1	1
60201	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
21794	Maryland	Howard County	0.1	1
80526	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
27103	North Carolina	Forsyth County	0.1	1
48192	Michigan	Wayne County	0.1	1
60423	Illinois	Will County	0.1	1
94305	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
27455	North Carolina	Guilford County	0.1	1

52411	Iowa	Linn County	0.1	1
55331	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
90604	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
85331	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
81303	Colorado	La Plata County	0.1	1
99833	Alaska	Wrangell-Petersburg Census Area	0.1	1
24450	Virginia	Lexington city	0.1	1
97478	Oregon	Lane County	0.1	1
14559	New York	Monroe County	0.1	1
80512	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
22030	Virginia	Fairfax city	0.1	1
85702	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
65203	Missouri	Boone County	0.1	1
51028	Iowa	Plymouth County	0.1	1
49720	Michigan	Charlevoix County	0.1	1
60051	Illinois	McHenry County	0.1	1
78209	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
03046	New Hampshire	Merrimack County	0.1	1
02601	Massachusetts	Barnstable County	0.1	1
44836	Ohio	Seneca County	0.1	1
79424	Texas	Lubbock County	0.1	1
48917	Michigan	Eaton County	0.1	1
06268	Connecticut	Tolland County	0.1	1
21401	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	0.1	1
83654	Idaho	Adams County	0.1	1
78756	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
85085	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
84711	Utah	Sevier County	0.1	1
11217	New York	Kings County	0.1	1
55443	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
27017	North Carolina	Surry County	0.1	1
88220	New Mexico	Eddy County	0.1	1
72908	Arkansas	Sebastian County	0.1	1
52556	Iowa	Jefferson County	0.1	1
97213	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
60091	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
98101	Washington	King County	0.1	1
87111	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
80906	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
03901	Maine	York County	0.1	1
97060	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
98665	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
92118	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
06001	Connecticut	Hartford County	0.1	1
91364	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
85610	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
02139	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
85204	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
27410	North Carolina	Guilford County	0.1	1
93265	California	Tulare County	0.1	1
77706	Texas	Jefferson County	0.1	1

85201	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
40241	Kentucky	Jefferson County	0.1	1
94618	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
54115	Wisconsin	Brown County	0.1	1
53074	Wisconsin	Ozaukee County	0.1	1
80237	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
11701	New York	Suffolk County	0.1	1
21044	Maryland	Howard County	0.1	1
78626	Texas	Williamson County	0.1	1
93619	California	Fresno County	0.1	1
85014	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
46176	Indiana	Shelby County	0.1	1
99504	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	1
94605	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
36526	Alabama	Baldwin County	0.1	1
20712	Maryland	Prince Georges County	0.1	1
98199	Washington	King County	0.1	1
77840	Texas	Brazos County	0.1	1
81432	Colorado	Ouray County	0.1	1
63017	Missouri	St. Louis County	0.1	1
10065	New York	New York County	0.1	1
54482	Wisconsin	Portage County	0.1	1
16801	Pennsylvania	Centre County	0.1	1
64113	Missouri	Jackson County	0.1	1
18332	Pennsylvania	Monroe County	0.1	1
99156	Washington	Pend Oreille County	0.1	1
07649	New Jersey	Bergen County	0.1	1
93067	California	Santa Barbara County	0.1	1
98188	Washington	King County	0.1	1
87110	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
85301	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
55417	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
78254	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
08902	New Jersey	Middlesex County	0.1	1
14212	New York	Erie County	0.1	1
57332	South Dakota	Hanson County	0.1	1
85624	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
85035	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
75071	Texas	Collin County	0.1	1
68114	Nebraska	Douglas County	0.1	1
85051	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
37660	Tennessee	Sullivan County	0.1	1
60660	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
98606	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
22307	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	1
98020	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
80021	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
97222	Oregon	Clackamas County	0.1	1
98201	Washington	Snohomish County	0.1	1
97210	Oregon	Multnomah County	0.1	1
04093	Maine	York County	0.1	1

02746	Massachusetts	Bristol County	0.1	1
55126	Minnesota	Ramsey County	0.1	1
53713	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
78210	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
93442	California	San Luis Obispo County	0.1	1
37067	Tennessee	Williamson County	0.1	1
69032	Nebraska	Hayes County	0.1	1
82601	Wyoming	Natrona County	0.1	1
30143	Georgia	Pickens County	0.1	1
20901	Maryland	Montgomery County	0.1	1
34957	Florida	Martin County	0.1	1
22193	Virginia	Prince William County	0.1	1
80538	Colorado	Larimer County	0.1	1
80220	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
87122	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
85395	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
06877	Connecticut	Fairfield County	0.1	1
94606	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
85012	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
87508	New Mexico	Santa Fe County	0.1	1
60412	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
53220	Wisconsin	Milwaukee County	0.1	1
14072	New York	Erie County	0.1	1
55391	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
11238	New York	Kings County	0.1	1
98685	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
30607	Georgia	Clarke County	0.1	1
85122	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
95694	California	Yolo County	0.1	1
29605	South Carolina	Greenville County	0.1	1
95006	California	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
80125	Colorado	Douglas County	0.1	1
85248	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
14612	New York	Monroe County	0.1	1
58072	North Dakota	Barnes County	0.1	1
01220	Massachusetts	Berkshire County	0.1	1
07087	New Jersey	Hudson County	0.1	1
46530	Indiana	St. Joseph County	0.1	1
85312	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
96067	California	Siskiyou County	0.1	1
56467	Minnesota	Hubbard County	0.1	1
83014	Wyoming	Teton County	0.1	1
20132	Virginia	Loudoun County	0.1	1
13027	New York	Onondaga County	0.1	1
53558	Wisconsin	Dane County	0.1	1
18062	Pennsylvania	Lehigh County	0.1	1
85213	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85135	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
55127	Minnesota	Ramsey County	0.1	1
92587	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
89121	Nevada	Clark County	0.1	1

95610	California	Sacramento County	0.1	1
81210	Colorado	Gunnison County	0.1	1
55359	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
45690	Ohio	Pike County	0.1	1
10075	New York	New York County	0.1	1
16101	Pennsylvania	Lawrence County	0.1	1
49301	Michigan	Kent County	0.1	1
94611	California	Alameda County	0.1	1
14512	New York	Ontario County	0.1	1
86314	Arizona	Yavapai County	0.1	1
98380	Washington	Kitsap County	0.1	1
53516	Wisconsin	Lafayette County	0.1	1
80026	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
81403	Colorado	Montrose County	0.1	1
54911	Wisconsin	Outagamie County	0.1	1
38242	Tennessee	Henry County	0.1	1
06076	Connecticut	Tolland County	0.1	1
91360	California	Ventura County	0.1	1
92823	California	Orange County	0.1	1
60202	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
46804	Indiana	Allen County	0.1	1
96151	California	El Dorado County	0.1	1
81236	Colorado	Chaffee County	0.1	1
95736	California	Placer County	0.1	1
21090	Maryland	Anne Arundel County	0.1	1
94508	California	Napa County	0.1	1
88011	New Mexico	Dona Ana County	0.1	1
88045	New Mexico	Hidalgo County	0.1	1
61603	Illinois	Peoria County	0.1	1
97702	Oregon	Deschutes County	0.1	1
78731	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
85304	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
35621	Alabama	Morgan County	0.1	1
92582	California	Riverside County	0.1	1
08028	New Jersey	Gloucester County	0.1	1
76021	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
30341	Georgia	DeKalb County	0.1	1
86023	Arizona	Coconino County	0.1	1
32566	Florida	Santa Rosa County	0.1	1
17603	Pennsylvania	Lancaster County	0.1	1
30458	Georgia	Bulloch County	0.1	1
85338	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
17837	Pennsylvania	Union County	0.1	1
37379	Tennessee	Hamilton County	0.1	1
68107	Nebraska	Douglas County	0.1	1
93514	California	Inyo County	0.1	1
85281	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
42330	Kentucky	Muhlenberg County	0.1	1
85637	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
46350	Indiana	La Porte County	0.1	1
80439	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1

32043	Florida	Clay County	0.1	1
85143	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
80503	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
85132	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
28152	North Carolina	Cleveland County	0.1	1
85633	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
85628	Arizona	Santa Cruz County	0.1	1
85373	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85041	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
87120	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
60622	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
55414	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
97006	Oregon	Washington County	0.1	1
85033	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
94583	California	Contra Costa County	0.1	1
86002	Arizona	Coconino County	0.1	1
19460	Pennsylvania	Chester County	0.1	1
49091	Michigan	St. Joseph County	0.1	1
60025	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
54494	Wisconsin	Wood County	0.1	1
32250	Florida	Duval County	0.1	1
78727	Texas	Travis County	0.1	1
10567	New York	Westchester County	0.1	1
97365	Oregon	Lincoln County	0.1	1
85140	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
17013	Pennsylvania	Cumberland County	0.1	1
22032	Virginia	Fairfax County	0.1	1
98112	Washington	King County	0.1	1
93546	California	Mono County	0.1	1
61801	Illinois	Champaign County	0.1	1
91745	California	Los Angeles County	0.1	1
95437	California	Mendocino County	0.1	1
98225	Washington	Whatcom County	0.1	1
48706	Michigan	Bay County	0.1	1
80132	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
80302	Colorado	Boulder County	0.1	1
54560	Wisconsin	Vilas County	0.1	1
98155	Washington	King County	0.1	1
60657	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
80004	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
55406	Minnesota	Hennepin County	0.1	1
54729	Wisconsin	Chippewa County	0.1	1
98604	Washington	Clark County	0.1	1
85321	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
65775	Missouri	Howell County	0.1	1
23235	Virginia	Chesterfield County	0.1	1
55303	Minnesota	Anoka County	0.1	1
93010	California	Ventura County	0.1	1
63301	Missouri	St. Charles County	0.1	1
80909	Colorado	El Paso County	0.1	1
99501	Alaska	Anchorage Borough	0.1	1

45013	Ohio	Butler County	0.1	1
66049	Kansas	Douglas County	0.1	1
85295	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
70116	Louisiana	Orleans Parish	0.1	1
94024	California	Santa Clara County	0.1	1
80005	Colorado	Jefferson County	0.1	1
55812	Minnesota	St. Louis County	0.1	1
85142	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
04609	Maine	Hancock County	0.1	1
99676	Alaska	Matanuska-Susitna Borough	0.1	1
97031	Oregon	Hood River County	0.1	1
03768	New Hampshire	Grafton County	0.1	1
93309	California	Kern County	0.1	1
48108	Michigan	Washtenaw County	0.1	1
61615	Illinois	Peoria County	0.1	1
76502	Texas	Bell County	0.1	1
47906	Indiana	Tippecanoe County	0.1	1
52748	Iowa	Scott County	0.1	1
53037	Wisconsin	Washington County	0.1	1
87048	New Mexico	Sandoval County	0.1	1
62704	Illinois	Sangamon County	0.1	1
54829	Wisconsin	Barron County	0.1	1
60030	Illinois	Lake County	0.1	1
85630	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
75032	Texas	Rockwall County	0.1	1
49008	Michigan	Kalamazoo County	0.1	1
85364	Arizona	Yuma County	0.1	1
03038	New Hampshire	Rockingham County	0.1	1
07607	New Jersey	Bergen County	0.1	1
55014	Minnesota	Anoka County	0.1	1
99337	Washington	Benton County	0.1	1
56442	Minnesota	Crow Wing County	0.1	1
76133	Texas	Tarrant County	0.1	1
19734	Delaware	New Castle County	0.1	1
13041	New York	Onondaga County	0.1	1
15228	Pennsylvania	Allegheny County	0.1	1
98115	Washington	King County	0.1	1
80211	Colorado	Denver County	0.1	1
40205	Kentucky	Jefferson County	0.1	1
98274	Washington	Skagit County	0.1	1
95604	California	Placer County	0.1	1
68137	Nebraska	Douglas County	0.1	1
39110	Mississippi	Madison County	0.1	1
21028	Maryland	Harford County	0.1	1
85022	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
78253	Texas	Bexar County	0.1	1
85003	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85120	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
49441	Michigan	Muskegon County	0.1	1
61761	Illinois	McLean County	0.1	1
85260	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1

68506	Nebraska	Lancaster County	0.1	1
14120	New York	Niagara County	0.1	1
12065	New York	Saratoga County	0.1	1
55449	Minnesota	Anoka County	0.1	1
58103	North Dakota	Cass County	0.1	1
85751	Arizona	Pima County	0.1	1
45434	Ohio	Montgomery County	0.1	1
01301	Massachusetts	Franklin County	0.1	1
60655	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
60015	Illinois	Lake County	0.1	1
85004	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
01720	Massachusetts	Middlesex County	0.1	1
45697	Ohio	Adams County	0.1	1
98011	Washington	King County	0.1	1
85032	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
50012	Iowa	Story County	0.1	1
84404	Utah	Weber County	0.1	1
85297	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
60603	Illinois	Cook County	0.1	1
08833	New Jersey	Hunterdon County	0.1	1
77062	Texas	Harris County	0.1	1
56511	Minnesota	Becker County	0.1	1
83703	Idaho	Ada County	0.1	1
08560	New Jersey	Mercer County	0.1	1
04103	Maine	Cumberland County	0.1	1
78414	Texas	Nueces County	0.1	1
57701	South Dakota	Pennington County	0.1	1
92008	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
64062	Missouri	Ray County	0.1	1
63011	Missouri	St. Louis County	0.1	1
55082	Minnesota	Washington County	0.1	1
91910	California	San Diego County	0.1	1
46580	Indiana	Kosciusko County	0.1	1
87113	New Mexico	Bernalillo County	0.1	1
88036	New Mexico	Grant County	0.1	1
85606	Arizona	Cochise County	0.1	1
58102	North Dakota	Cass County	0.1	1
30092	Georgia	Gwinnett County	0.1	1
43035	Ohio	Delaware County	0.1	1
96073	California	Shasta County	0.1	1
96145	California	Placer County	0.1	1
85540	Arizona	Greenlee County	0.1	1
98040	Washington	King County	0.1	1
85296	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
53147	Wisconsin	Walworth County	0.1	1
07023	New Jersey	Union County	0.1	1
11694	New York	Queens County	0.1	1
11579	New York	Nassau County	0.1	1
92677	California	Orange County	0.1	1
81507	Colorado	Mesa County	0.1	1
99148	Washington	Stevens County	0.1	1

21210	Maryland	Baltimore city	0.1	1
85323	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85028	Arizona	Maricopa County	0.1	1
85118	Arizona	Pinal County	0.1	1
68152	Nebraska	Douglas County	0.1	1
03894	New Hampshire	Carroll County	0.1	1
19146	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia County	0.1	1
68842	Nebraska	Greeley County	0.1	1
28692	North Carolina	Watauga County	0.1	1
41015	Kentucky	Kenton County	0.1	1
83646	Idaho	Ada 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	2.2	1.6	10.7	31.7	53.7	4.3	4.5	76
Developed Facilities	0.0	0.0	0.5	33.7	65.8	4.7	4.5	97
Condition of Environment	0.0	0.0	3.1	21.6	75.3	4.7	4.5	129
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	0.8	11.4	87.8	4.9	4.5	86
Interpretive Displays	0.0	0.0	10.1	20.1	69.8	4.6	4.1	97
Parking Availability	0.7	2.5	4.9	14.6	77.3	4.7	4.5	128
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	3.8	1.8	18.4	76.0	4.7	4.5	126
Rec. Info. Availability	3.6	0.0	5.5	9.3	81.6	4.7	4.4	112
Road Condition	0.0	0.0	3.4	28.2	68.4	4.6	4.4	104
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	5.8	11.3	82.9	4.8	4.6	129
Scenery	0.0	0.0	3.5	15.5	81.1	4.8	4.6	130
Signage Adequacy	0.0	0.0	4.7	15.2	80.1	4.8	4.6	127
Trail Condition	0.0	0.0	2.0	23.6	74.5	4.7	4.6	69
Value for Fee Paid	0.0	0.0	0.4	14.1	85.5	4.9	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-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	1.9	3.6	16.4	21.3	56.8	4.3	4.7	46
Developed Facilities	0.0	2.9	0.0	21.1	76.0	4.7	4.3	42
Condition of Environment	0.0	0.0	7.2	12.9	80.0	4.7	4.7	58
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	5.0	4.8	36
Interpretive Displays	0.0	1.3	28.3	30.8	39.6	4.1	4.5	36
Parking Availability	0.0	3.0	0.0	20.0	77.0	4.7	4.5	55
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	0.7	0.0	10.9	88.4	4.9	4.0	52
Rec. Info. Availability	0.0	1.4	20.6	19.7	58.3	4.3	4.2	50
Road Condition	7.2	0.4	1.2	10.8	80.4	4.6	4.2	53
Feeling of Safety	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.2	80.8	4.8	4.4	58
Scenery	0.0	0.0	1.1	16.8	82.2	4.8	4.7	58
Signage Adequacy	0.0	3.7	4.1	32.0	60.2	4.5	4.5	55
Trail Condition	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.6	77.4	4.8	4.5	40
Value for Fee Paid	0.0	0.0	2.9	20.9	76.2	4.7	4.5	44

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

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

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

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

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

Satisfaction Element	Percent Rating Satisfaction as:					Mean Rating§	Mean Importance†	No. Obs‡
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
Restroom Cleanliness	0.4	2.9	20.9	25.5	50.3	4.2	4.3	107
Developed Facilities	0.8	0.0	8.0	22.9	68.4	4.6	4.1	105
Condition of Environment	1.3	1.3	7.9	18.8	70.6	4.6	4.6	212
Employee Helpfulness	5.1	1.6	0.0	12.3	81.0	4.6	4.3	72
Interpretive Displays	2.5	6.9	17.5	22.0	51.1	4.1	4.0	123
Parking Availability	4.4	5.8	12.5	12.0	65.3	4.3	4.2	196
Parking Lot Condition	4.7	1.9	9.0	11.2	73.2	4.5	4.2	178
Rec. Info. Availability	0.3	3.4	13.0	24.4	58.9	4.4	4.3	178
Road Condition	1.7	8.5	9.4	35.0	45.4	4.1	4.1	154
Feeling of Safety	0.2	1.5	4.8	15.7	77.9	4.7	4.5	203
Scenery	1.3	0.0	0.3	14.1	84.3	4.8	4.7	212
Signage Adequacy	0.2	4.0	15.2	19.5	61.2	4.4	4.1	198
Trail Condition	2.3	0.4	11.2	35.1	51.0	4.3	4.5	159
Value for Fee Paid	0.0	2.6	3.5	6.0	87.9	4.8	4.3	183

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	3.9	2.0	36.4	57.6	4.5	4.2	27
Developed Facilities	0.0	5.2	0.0	10.3	84.5	4.7	4.3	17
Condition of Environment	1.5	0.0	4.4	18.0	76.1	4.7	4.7	130
Employee Helpfulness	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	95.1	5.0	4.4	29
Interpretive Displays	0.0	1.8	3.5	20.1	74.6	4.7	3.9	33
Parking Availability	3.0	2.2	6.5	12.5	75.7	4.6	4.4	77
Parking Lot Condition	0.0	0.7	4.0	21.7	73.6	4.7	4.0	78
Rec. Info. Availability	0.6	2.5	4.0	16.8	76.2	4.7	4.5	107
Road Condition	0.0	2.2	0.0	11.8	86.1	4.8	4.2	44
Feeling of Safety	0.4	0.4	4.8	20.8	73.4	4.7	4.5	130
Scenery	0.0	0.0	2.0	4.1	93.9	4.9	4.7	129
Signage Adequacy	1.6	3.1	13.5	25.4	56.4	4.3	4.5	118
Trail Condition	0.0	0.5	8.2	28.9	62.4	4.5	4.5	129
Value for Fee Paid	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.3	95.6	4.9	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.

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