

Results of a Statewide OHV Owner Telephone Survey for the Little Sahara Recreation Area and Surrounding Lands

June 15, 2001

**Sandra J. Long
Dale J. Blahna**

This survey was completed as part of a class project for RR 4400/6500: Recreation Management and Planning. The authors would like to thank Justin Black, Laura Colton, Heather Dalton, Brandon Flint, George Haskett, Dave Jeppesen, Kim Kettle, Leslie McLachlan, Jared Minnoch, Mert Redmond, and Jamie Stoddard. Special thanks go to Doug Reiter, Research Associate for the Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism.

**Utah State University
College of Natural Resources
Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
Logan, Utah 84322-5215
Professional Report IORT PR2001-5**

Contents

List of Tables	3
Purpose and Methods	5
Survey Results: Basic Frequencies	8
Comparison of Little Sahara Subgroups	24
Open-Ended Comments and Management Suggestions	32
Appendices	
A. Survey and Interviewer Instructions	37
B. List of Respondents' Likes about Little Sahara	44
C. List of Respondents' Dislikes about Little Sahara	49
D. List of "Other Issues" Discussed at the End of the Survey	53

List of Tables

1	Survey sample size and response rate	7
---	--------------------------------------	---

Basic Frequency Tables

2	Respondents' county of residence	9
3	Gender of respondent	9
4	OHV group membership	10
5	Listing of those OHV groups respondents were a member of	10
6	Rating of amount of areas in Utah open to OHV use	11
7	Use of official maps to determine which trails to use	11
8	First year respondent visited Little Sahara	12
9	Number of visits to Little Sahara in the last 5 years	13
10	Pattern of visits over the last five years	13
11	What respondent likes about Little Sahara	14
12	What respondent dislikes about Little Sahara	15
13	Preference for when to visit	16
14	Vehicle driven for recreation	16
15	Preference of riding area(s)	16
16	Last trip to Little Sahara	17
17	Length of last trip to Little Sahara	18
18	Where respondents stayed during their last trip	18
19	Were respondents able to stay at their first choice?	18
20	Attitudes toward sharing the area	19
21	Suggested management improvements	20
22	Suggested improvements to be made from visitor fees	20
23	Willingness to pay an increase in user fees	21
24	Amount extra willing to pay per vehicle	21
25	Problems encountered during visit to Little Sahara and area	21

26	Other issues respondents feel the managers of Little Sahara need to address	22
-----------	--	-----------

Subgroup Comparison Tables

27	Comparison of visitor perception of problems and management priorities by recency of visit	25
28	Comparison of visitor perception of problems and management priorities, day use vs. overnight visitors on their last trip	26
29	Categories of day users vs. overnight visitors on the last trip, in response to the question, “When do you usually visit?”	26
30	Comparison of how much extra a visitor is willing to pay in entrance fees, by gender	27
31	Comparison of visitor perception of problems by gender	27
32	Comparison of visitor perception of management priorities by gender	28
33	Comparison of overnight visitors’ perceptions of problems and management priorities, based on where they stayed	29
34	Comparison of visitor perception of problems, based on when they usually visit	30
35	Comparison of visitor perception of management priorities, based on when they usually visit	31

Purpose and Methods

Purpose and Methods

Introduction

The BLM's Little Sahara Recreation Area (LSRA) in Juab County, Utah, is heavily used by off road motorcyclists and all-terrain vehicle (ATV) drivers. The approximately 62,000 acre LSRA currently receives about 213,000 visitors (638,000 visitor days) per year, and use is expected to increase by as much as 30% over the next 20 years. There are three designated camping areas (Oasis, Jericho, and White Sands) and a large open area at the base of Sand Mountain, the dominant dune, which acts as a recreational staging and overnight use area for off-highway vehicle (OHV) drivers. While the LSRA itself caters to open "sand play" type ATV/OHV use, there are many trails crossing the area and linking it with a 415,830 acre Competitive Sports Area to the north, which is used for six major motocross races as well as general ATV/OHV use.

Sand dunes, sagebrush, and a few areas of piñon-juniper forest dominate the landscape. There are few significant environmental concerns in the area, but it contains one Wilderness Study Area (WSA), the 13,400 acre Rockwell WSA.

In order to provide public input for LSRA managers, we conducted a short, statewide telephone survey in March and April, 2001. The focus of the survey was visitor use characteristics and attitudes toward LSRA management problems and priorities.

Telephone Survey Methods

A statewide telephone survey was conducted with registered OHV owners in March and April, 2001. The purpose of the survey was to estimate the number of OHV drivers in Utah who visit the LSRA, and to identify use patterns, management preferences, and background characteristics. The survey was divided into seven parts: 1) respondent characteristics and OHV club membership, 2) use of OHV area maps in Utah, 3) use of the LSRA, 4) characteristics of their last trip to the LSRA, 5) attitudes toward management and other visitors at LSRA, 6) perceptions of problems at LSRA, and 7) suggested management priorities at LSRA. For those who have not visited the LSRA, only the first two sections of the survey were completed (referred to as the "short survey" below). The survey was approved by Utah State University's Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A for a copy of the survey and interviewer instructions).

The sampling frame was the Utah Tax Commission's list of registered ATV owners for the year 2000, which was obtained from the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. This list includes all registered ATV owners, as well as any motorcycle and four-wheel drive owners that register their machines exclusively for off-road recreation. There were 74,452 ATVs registered in Utah and, after removing duplicate names (those who own more than machine), there were 50,676 individual owners in the database. From this list, 1,000 names and addresses were randomly selected.

Phone numbers were not included in the database; they were identified using three Internet web sites. The primary source was the US West directory. We looked up approximately 900 names and found 531 phone numbers (59%), and 487 of these were used for the study. There were 326 completed surveys (123 long surveys and 203 short surveys), 38 invalid numbers (disconnected, moved, business, etc.), and 123 rejections or non-respondents. After removing invalid numbers, the final sample size was 449 and the 326 completed surveys represented a 72.6% response rate (Table 1). We feel confident this is an adequate representation of recreational OHV owners in Utah.

The survey introduction explained the purpose of the study and asked if the respondent had ever visited the LSRA. Those who had never visited the area were asked three short

questions and thanked for their participation. Those who had visited LSRA were asked to complete the full survey. Up to six contact attempts were made for most sample subjects, and at least three personal contacts were made before the sample subject was called a non-respondent. (Due to time constraints, fewer than 6 attempts were made for 22 subjects.)

Table 1. Survey sample size and response rate

Registered ATVs	74,452
Registered ATV owners	50,676
Original sample size	487
Not qualified (disconnected, moved, etc.)	60
Valid sample	449
Outright Rejections	72 (16.0%)
Other non respondents (no answer, not home, etc.)	51 (11.4%)
Total valid responses	326 (72.6%)
Long surveys	123
Short surveys ¹	203

¹Eleven respondents said they had visited LSRA, but only completed the short survey.

Source: RR4400/6500

The survey results are presented in three sections. The first section reports the basic frequencies for all variables on the long survey form (n=123). The second section reports the results for selected subgroups of respondents that we felt were important for managers to consider: 1) recent visitors compared to those who had not visited in the last five years, 2) day vs. overnight visitors, 3) male vs. female visitors, 4) where overnight visitors stayed on their last trip, and 5) weekend compared to weekday visitors. Finally, we present and discuss open-ended comments visitors made at the end of the survey.

Survey Results:
Basic Frequencies

Survey Results: Basic Frequencies

The following tables contain the basic frequencies obtained from respondents' answers to the Users Survey for Little Sahara Recreation Area 2001. These responses are from those who stated that they had visited the Little Sahara, and who completed the full survey, for a total of 123 individuals. Some response totals for each question are less than 123, as some respondents did not rate the questions (for instance, those who said "I don't know"), and some questions were not applicable to all (for instance, only those who stayed overnight at Little Sahara on their last trip were asked if where they camped was their first choice).

Respondents' addresses were included with the information provided in the list of registered ATV owners from which the sample was selected. Using the address, respondents were categorized by county of residence (Table 2). Most (19 of 22) Utah counties are represented, and slightly more than half (57.7%) of the respondents resided in just three counties: Salt Lake (27.6%), Utah (20.3%), and Davis (9.8%).

Table 2: Respondents' County of residence.

COUNTY	FREQUENCY
Beaver	1 (0.8%)
Box Elder	4 (3.3%)
Cache	2 (1.6%)
Carbon	2 (1.6%)
Davis	12 (9.8%)
Grand	1 (0.8%)
Iron	2 (1.6%)
Juab	3 (2.5%)
Millard	2 (1.6%)
Morgan	1 (0.8%)
Salt Lake	34 (27.6%)
San Juan	1 (0.8%)
Sanpete	5 (4.1%)
Sevier	6 (4.9%)
Tooele	7 (5.7%)
Uintah	1 (0.8%)
Utah	25 (20.3%)
Washington	5 (4.1%)
Weber	9 (7.3%)
TOTAL	123 (100%)

The respondent was not asked their gender; rather the interviewer simply noted it on the response sheet. 103 males and 17 females completed the long survey (Table 3). Three sheets had not been marked for gender and had gender-neutral names; they are not included in this tally (although their responses to the survey questions are included).

Table 3: Gender of respondent.

GENDER	FREQUENCY
Male	103 (85.8%)
Female	17 (14.2%)
Total	120 (100%)

Respondents were asked if they belonged to any off-highway vehicle groups or clubs. Most (84.6%) did not, but 15.4 percent did belong to an OHV group (Table 4). These individuals were asked which groups they belonged to, and sixteen different OHV groups were named (Table 5). While a few respondents had memberships in more than one club, only three clubs were named by more than one respondent, and each of these only twice: the Blue Ribbon Coalition, the Sage Riders, and AMA.

Table 4: OHV group membership.

MEMBER OHV GROUP	RESPONSES
Yes	19 (15.4%)
No	104 (84.6%)
Total	123 (100.0%)

Table 5: Listing of those OHV groups respondents were a member of

MEMBER OF WHICH OHV GROUP	RESPONSES
Utah Association of OHV Users	1 (0.5%)
Red Rock & Wheelers Association	1 (0.5%)
Local Club	1 (0.5%)
Southeastern Utah Land Users	1 (0.5%)
Utah Shared Wilderness	1 (0.5%)
USA All	1 (0.5%)
Rebels	1 (0.5%)
Blue Ribbon Coalition	2 (10.0%)
Buzzards	1 (0.5%)
Sage Riders	2 (10.0%)
Shared USA	1 (0.5%)
Dealers Association	1 (0.5%)
Price Club	1 (0.5%)
Utah ATV	1 (0.5%)
Desert Foxes	1 (0.5%)
AMA	2 (10.0%)
Total	19 (100.0%)

When asked to think about the number of areas in Utah that are open to OHV use, a majority (65%) felt that there was not enough (Table 6), and 32.5% felt there was just enough. Less than 3% believed there are too many areas in Utah open to OHV use.

Table 6: Rating of areas in Utah open to OHV use.

NUMBER OF AREAS OPEN TO OHV USE	RESPONSES
Too Many	3 (2.5%)
Just Enough	39 (32.5%)
Not Enough	78 (65.0%)
Total	120 (100%)

Respondents were asked if they used official maps to determine which trail to use. A majority (70.3%) answered either “yes” or “sometimes” (Table 7).

Table 7: Use of official maps to determine which trails to use.

USE OF OFFICAL MAPS	RESPONSES
Yes	55 (45.5%)
No	36 (29.3%)
Sometimes	30 (24.8%)
Total	120 (97.6%)

The response to the question “In what year did you first visit the Little Sahara?” received a wide range of replies, from the year 1920 to 2000, with 39 different years mentioned (Table 8). The largest categories of responses were 1980 (8.4%), 1970 (6.7%), and 1990 (5.9%), but some of this may be due to the tendency of individuals to round numbers. Eleven (9.2%) respondents said their first visit was prior to 1970, 32 (26.9%) first visited between 1970 and 1979, 37 (31.1%) first visited between 1980 and 1989, and 39 (32.8%) had their first visit sometime in 1990 or after. This shows that LSRA has a diversity of both new and long-term visitors.

Table 8: First year respondent visited Little Sahara.

YEAR FIRST VISITED THE LITTLE SAHARAH RECREATION AREA	RESPONSES
1920	1 (0.8%)
1950	1 (0.8%)
1957	1 (0.8%)
1960	1 (0.8%)
1965	2 (1.7%)
1966	1 (0.8%)
1967	1 (0.8%)
1968	2 (1.7%)
1969	1 (0.8%)
1970	8 (6.7%)
1971	2 (1.7%)
1972	2 (1.7%)
1973	2 (1.7%)
1975	4 (3.4%)
1976	4 (3.4%)
1977	2 (1.7%)
1978	6 (5.0%)
1979	2 (1.7%)
1980	10 (8.4%)
1981	4 (3.4%)
1982	1 (0.8%)
1983	2 (1.7%)
1984	2 (1.7%)
1985	5 (4.2%)
1986	3 (2.5%)
1987	4 (3.4%)
1988	3 (2.5%)
1989	3 (2.5%)
1990	7 (5.9%)
1991	3 (2.5%)
1992	4 (3.4%)
1993	1 (0.8%)
1994	1 (0.8%)
1995	4 (3.4%)
1996	4 (3.4%)
1997	3 (2.5%)
1998	4 (3.4%)
1999	4 (3.4%)
2000	4 (3.4%)
Total	119 (100.0%)

Respondent were asked how many times they had visited in the last five years. The largest categories of responses were none (15.7%), twice (13.9%), and once (11.3%) (Table 9). A total of 64 respondents had visited 5 or fewer times in the last five years, while 24 (20.9%) respondents had visited 20 times or more in the last five years. Respondents were then asked for their pattern of use over the last five years, if the number of times that they visited each year was increasing, staying the same, or decreasing. The majority (54.1%) said their visits were staying about the same (Table 10). A sizable minority, 29.6%, said their visits were decreasing, while 16.3% said their visits were increasing.

Table 9: Number of visits to Little Sahara in the last 5 years.

HOW MANY TIMES VISITED LS IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS	RESPONSES
None	18 (15.7%)
1	13 (11.3%)
2	16 (13.9%)
3	4 (3.5%)
4	6 (5.2%)
5	10 (8.7%)
8	2 (1.7%)
10	11 (9.6%)
12	4 (3.5%)
15	6 (5.2%)
18	1 (0.9%)
20	8 (7.0%)
25	1 (0.9%)
30	4 (3.5%)
40	1 (0.9%)
50	5 (4.3%)
60	2 (1.7%)
100	3 (2.6%)
TOTAL	115 (100.0%)

Table 10: Pattern of visits over last 5 years.

IN LAST 5 YEARS HAS THE # OF TIMES YOU'VE GONE....	RESPONSES
Increased	16 (16.3%)
Stayed the same	53 (54.1%)
Decreased	29 (29.6%)
Total	98 (100.0%)

The respondents were asked what they liked about the Little Sahara (Table 11). While respondents could give more than one answer, some gave only one. Of those who gave more than one answer, only the first two mentioned are included here, for a total of 166 responses. The greatest number of responses, by a sizable margin (53.6%) was about some aspect of the natural characteristics of the area, such as the sand or the scenery. The next highest category of responses (27.7%) was the recreational opportunities, for instance that it was a good place to ride or camp. Other comments (13.9%) include responses such as that it was fun, or they liked the social opportunities. Very few (4.8%) rated the facilities and/or management as something that they liked about the Little Sahara. A list of all the responses to this question is given in Appendix B.

Table 11: What respondent likes about Little Sahara.

LIKE ABOUT LITTLE SAHARA	RESPONSES¹
NATURAL CHARACTERISTICS	89 (53.6%)
Sand/sand dunes/Sand mountain	47
Openness	30
Unique	6
Desert	2
Peaceful/quiet	2
Scenery	2
RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES	46 (27.7%)
Versatility/variety	12
Good place to ride	11
Camping	9
A place for all kinds of OHV's	3
A place to race OHVs	2
Sand area for kids	2
Trails/plenty of trails	2
Can ride anywhere	2
Few restrictions	1
Terrain	1
Place for scouting trips	1
INFRASTRUCTURE/MANAGEMENT	8 (4.8%)
Facilities	3
Well-managed/organized	2
Inexpensive	2
Clean	1
OTHER	23 (13.9%)
Fun	10
Social/be with family and friends	7
Location/close to town	2
Not too crowded mid-week	2
Everything	2
TOTAL	166 (100%)

¹ Percents represent responses, not respondents.

The respondents were then asked what they disliked about the Little Sahara (Table 12). Again, respondents could give more than one answer, but few did so. No more than the first two are recorded, for a total of 96 responses. The largest number of responses (58.3%) was about some aspect of crowding or conflict issues, such as the crowds on weekends or the drinking. The next highest category of responses (15.6%) were related to the conditions of the facilities and maintenance needed, followed by management issues (11.5%), such as they didn't like the fees, or felt the fees were not going back into improvements. An even split of responses (7.3% each) were about problems related to driving, for instance inexperienced drivers, or to restrictions that the users did not like, such as the feeling that there were too many rules. A list of all the responses given to this question is listed in Appendix C.

Table 12: What respondent dislikes about Little Sahara.

DISLIKE ABOUT LITTLE SAHARA	RESPONSES¹
CONFLICTS/CROWDS	56 (58.3%)
Too crowded	27
Holidays/weekends/Easter	10
Too many rowdy people	7
Drinking	4
Parties	3
Speeding in campgrounds	2
Noisy at night	1
Can't take children	1
People's attitudes	1
IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED	15 (15.6%)
Facilities not kept up/not clean	4
Litter	3
Not developed enough	2
Not enough restrooms	1
Lack of shelters for shade	1
Lack of trees in Sand Mtn. camping area	1
Bad/rough roads	1
Blind trails	1
Need showers	1
MANAGEMENT ISSUES	11 (11.5%)
Entry fees/cost	4
Fees not going back into LSRA	2
Lack of enforcement	2
Lack of management	1
Not enforced on big holidays	1
Inadequate safety patrols	1
OHV ISSUES/CONFLICTS	7 (7.3%)
Dangerous/inexperienced drivers	3
Mixed ATV with dune buggy	1
Young riders destroying trails	1
Too much traffic on Sand mountain	1
Overuse	1
RESTRICTIONS	7 (7.3%)
Too many rules	2
Wilderness study area	2
Fencing up areas	1
Locked gate at the north end	1
Flag regulation	1
TOTAL	96 (100%)

¹Percents represent responses, not respondents.

Respondents were asked when they usually visited Little Sahara. A majority (67.6%) said they usually visit on holidays and/or weekends (Table 13). Others (15.7%) said they visit at all times of the week, while a minority (16.7%) advised that they usually only visit on weekdays.

Table 13: Preference for when to visit.

DO YOU USUALLY VISIT ON...	RESPONSES
Weekdays	18 (16.7%)
Holidays & Weekends	73 (67.6%)
All	17 (15.7%)
Total	108 (100.0%)

The type of vehicle the respondent drives for recreation at the Little Sahara was noted. The respondent could name more than one vehicle, and several did. The majority (69.2%) use an ATV (Table 14). (Only one of the respondents drove a 3-wheel ATV, the rest are 4-wheel.) Next highest were motorcycles (35%), followed by 4x4s (24.2%), and last were dune buggies (13.3%). The respondents were asked where they preferred to ride. Most (31.9%) said they rode in all areas (Table 15). Of those who had one preferred area, 19% listed Sand Mountain as their riding area of choice, followed by the other sand dunes (13.8%), and the trails in the area (10.3%).

Table 14: Vehicle driven for recreation.

TYPE OF VEHICLE USED AT LITTLE SAHARA RECREATION AREA	RESPONSES
Motorcycle	42 (35.0%)
4X4	29 (24.2%)
Dune Buggy	16 (13.3%)
ATV/ 3 wheeler	83 (69.2%)
Total	170*

*170=number of responses, 120 individuals answered the question, thus the percent tallies to >100% as respondents could list more than one vehicle.

Table 15: Preference of riding area(s).

WHERE DO YOU RIDE AT THE LITTLE SAHARA RECREATION AREA	RESPONSES
Sand Mountain	22 (19.0%)
Other Sand Dunes	16 (13.8%)
The trails in the area	12 (10.3%)
Sand Mountain & Other Sand Dunes	11 (9.5%)
Sand Mountain & the trails	6 (5.2%)
Other Sand dunes & the trails in the area	12 (10.3%)
All	37 (31.9%)
Total	116 (100.0%)

Respondents were asked when was their last trip to Little Sahara. Over half, or a total of 78, had visited sometime in 2000 or 2001, with 55 (36.1%) visiting sometime in 2001, and 23 (19.3%) visiting sometime between January and March of 2001 (Table 16). An additional 14 (11.7%) had last visited in 1999, and 6 (5.0%) had last visited in 1998.

Table 16: Last trip to Little Sahara.

WHEN WAS YOUR LAST TRIP TO LITTLE SAHARA?	RESPONSES
January 2001	2 (1.7%)
February 2001	4 (3.4%)
March 2001	16 (13.4)
2001	1 (0.8%)
March 2000	1 (0.8%)
April 2000	3 (2.5%)
May 2000	2 (1.7%)
June 2000	1 (0.8%)
August 2000	6 (5.0%)
September 2000	5 (4.2%)
October 2000	9 (7.6%)
November 2000	1 (0.8%)
Spring 2000	2 (1.7%)
Summer 2000	3 (2.5%)
Fall 2000	3 (2.5%)
2000	19 (16.0%)
April 1999	2 (1.7%)
May 1999	1 (0.8%)
Summer 1999	1 (0.8%)
Fall 1999	1 (0.8%)
1999	9 (7.6%)
September 1998	1 (0.8%)
1998	5 (4.2%)
1997	2 (1.7%)
1995	2 (1.7%)
1993	1 (0.8%)
1991	1 (0.8%)
1990	3 (2.5%)
1989	2 (1.7%)
1987	2 (1.7%)
1985	1 (0.8%)
1984	1 (0.8%)
1982	1 (0.8%)
1980	2 (1.7%)
1978	1 (0.8%)
1976	1 (0.8%)
1970	1 (0.8%)
Total	119 (100.0%)

Length of stay on their last trip was asked of respondents. Table 17 summarizes length of stay, with the majority (66.1%) being overnight visitors and most (38.1%) staying two days. (Any response of two days or more was coded as overnight in the Subgroup Comparison section below.) About one third (33.9%) were day users. Those who stayed two or more days on their last trip were asked where they stayed. Most (25%) stayed at Jericho, followed closely by White Sands Campground (22.4%), and Sand Mountain (21.1%) (Table 18). Only 5.2% chose some other dispersed setting within Little Sahara. Those who camped in Little Sahara on their last trip were then asked if they were able to stay at their first choice, only four were not able to do so (Table 19). Of those, only one respondent offered a reason they went elsewhere; because there were too many people at their first choice.

Table 17: Length of last trip to Little Sahara.

HOW LONG DID YOU STAY AT LITTLE SAHARA	RESPONSES
1 day or less	40 (33.9%)
2	45 (38.1%)
3	22 (18.6%)
4	8 (6.8%)
5	1 (0.8%)
6	1 (0.8%)
10	1 (0.8%)
Total	118 (100.0%)

Table 18: Where respondents stayed during their last trip.

WHERE DID YOU STAY AT LITTLE SAHARA	RESPONSES
Oasis	9 (11.8%)
White Sands	17 (22.4%)
Jericho	19 (25.0%)
Sand Mountain	16 (21.1%)
Unofficial site among trees	1 (1.3%)
Other unofficial site within LS	3 (3.9%)
Outside of LS	6 (7.9%)
Other	5 (6.6%)
Total	76 (100.0%)

Table 19: Were respondents able to stay at their first choice?

WAS THIS YOUR FIRST CHOICE	RESPONSES
Yes	72 (93.5%)
No	4 (5.2%)
Cannot remember	1 (1.3%)
Total	77 (100.0%)

Respondents were asked to rate how often other user groups interfered with their enjoyment. Possible responses ranged from: never (=1), rarely (=2), sometimes (=3), or often (=4) (Table 20). Horseback riders were rated the lowest, with 98.3% stating they never interfered, with a mean of 1.03. Cattle closely followed, with 85.1% stating never, with a mean of 1.2. Likewise, OHVs interfering with the use of the sand play areas was rated low, with 75% stating never (mean 1.4). OHV interference in general had a more mixed response; most said rarely (30.6%) or never (29.8%), but a sizable minority replied sometimes (23.1%) or often (16.5%) (mean 2.26).

Table 20: During Visit To Little Sahara; Attitudes Toward Sharing the Area (Based on a scale of 1=never to 4=often)

DURING YOUR PREVIOUS VISITS HOW OFTEN DID....	MEAN	NEVER	RARELY	SOME-TIMES	OFTEN
Cattle interfere with your OHV experience?	1.20	103 (85.1%)	13 (10.7%)	4 (3.3%)	1 (0.8%)
Horseback riders interfere with your OHV experience?	1.03	119 (98.3%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Other OHV drivers interfere with your experience?	2.26	36 (29.8%)	37 (30.6%)	28 (23.1%)	20 (16.5%)
OHV interfere with your use of non-OHV sand play areas experience?	1.40	87 (75.0%)	16 (13.8%)	9 (7.8%)	4 (3.4%)

Opinion statements regarding five management issues were next read to the respondents, who were given response choices of strongly disagree (=1), disagree (=2), agree (=3), or strongly agree (=4) (Table 21). The highest agreement overall was for quiet hours to be better enforced in designated campgrounds, with 83.4% either agreeing or strongly agreeing (mean 3.12). Opinions on protecting endangered species were fairly evenly divided, with 45% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and 55% agreeing or strongly agreeing. The majority of users (71.8%) agreed that managers should leave regulations as they are, but a sizable minority (17.3%) disagreed (mean 2.88). However, only two respondents strongly disagreed with that statement, the lowest number for any category of these questions. Almost exactly as many respondents strongly disagreed (12.1%) as strongly agreed (12.9%) with the need for more regulations for personal safety, and 57.8% disagreed overall vs. 42.4% agreed overall (mean 2.43) with that statement. Exactly half said they agreed an additional fee should be paid for campground upkeep, with 61.2% agreeing overall, vs. 38.8% disagreeing.

Table 21: Suggested Management Improvements (Based on a scale of 1=strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree)

IN YOUR OPINION...	MEAN	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
Should quiet hours be better enforced in designated campgrounds.	3.12	5 (4.3%)	14 (12.2%)	58 (50.4%)	38 (33.0%)
It is important to manage the area for threatened or endangered species.	2.53	15 (13.5%)	35 (31.5%)	48 (43.2%)	13 (11.7%)
Managers should leave regulations how they are.	2.88	2 (1.8%)	19 (17.3%)	79 (71.8%)	10 (9.1%)
More regulations are needed for personal safety.	2.43	14 (12.1%)	53 (45.7%)	34 (29.3%)	15 (12.9%)
An additional fee should be charged for camping in order to help pay for campground upkeep.	2.62	9 (7.8%)	36 (31.0%)	58 (50.0%)	13 (11.2%)

Respondents were asked to rate a list of eleven possible facility and management improvements on a scale of one to ten, where one is the lowest priority, and ten is the highest, regarding where they would like to see their visitor fees spent (Table 22). Highest rated was the need for more facilities; topping the list were more semi-developed campgrounds (mean 6.92), followed closely by more restrooms (mean 6.83), and more developed campgrounds (mean 6.4). Rating the need for more services was split, with more safety patrols somewhat highly rated (mean 5.95), but lowest of all was the preference for more visitor center displays (mean 3.53), and campfire programs (mean 3.96).

Table 22: Suggested Improvements To Little Sahara From Visitor Fees

LIST FOLLOWING IN PRIORITY (1=LOWEST; 10= HIGHEST) WHERE YOU WANT VISITOR FEES SPENT.	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Area set aside for beginner OHV users	5.12	3.17
Printed map/trail guides	5.72	2.98
More sand play areas closed to OHV use	4.21	3.00
More Safety Patrols	5.95	2.77
Better law enforcement	5.75	2.79
More restrooms	6.83	2.62
More visitor center displays	3.53	2.08
Campfire/educational programs	3.96	2.46
More semi-developed campgrounds	6.92	2.23
More developed campgrounds	6.40	2.58
More sites with pull-through spaces	5.78	2.87

After considering possible improvements to Little Sahara, respondents were told that the current user fee is \$6 per vehicle, and asked if they would be willing to pay an increase in user fees to help provide for those facilities or services. The majority (72.7%) said they would be willing to pay more (Table 23). These respondents were then asked how much extra would they be willing to pay. Most said \$4 more (32.9%), followed closely by \$2 more (30.6%)(Table 24). The average is \$3.64.

Table 23: Willingness to pay an increase in user fees.

ARE YOU WILLING TO PAY AN INCREASE IN USER FEES TO HELP PAY FOR THESE IMPROVEMENTS?	RESPONSES
Yes	88 (72.7%)
No	27 (22.3%)
Possibly/unsure	6 (5.0%)
TOTAL	121 (100%)

Table 24: Amount extra willing to pay per vehicle.

HOW MUCH EXTRA WOULD YOU PAY PER VEHICLE (CENTS ROUNDED TO HIGHER DOLLAR AMOUNT)	
\$1	4 (4.7%)
\$2	26 (30.6%)
\$3	10 (11.8%)
\$4	28 (32.9%)
\$5	5 (5.9%)
\$6	7 (8.2%)
\$8	1 (1.2%)
\$9	4 (4.7%)
MEAN	3.64
TOTAL	85 (100%)
Seasonal pass, \$15 more	1 (N/A)
Seasonal pass, \$20 more	1 (N/A)

Problems encountered by respondents during to their visit to Little Sahara were rated on a scale of one to ten, with one being no problem and ten the biggest problem. Table 25 lists the results. The lowest ranked problem was cattle interfering with the camping experience, with a mean of 1.77 and a low standard deviation of 1.68. Rated fairly low was damage to or loss of personal property (mean 3.00), and too many OHVs on designated trails (mean 3.46). Highest ranked problems were reckless drivers (mean 6.17), littering (mean 5.91), and not enough designated camping spaces (mean 5.21).

Table 25: Problems Encountered During Visit To Little Sahara and Area

THE FOLLOWING ARE PROBLEMS IN THE AREA, RATE THEM 1-10, WITH 1=NOT A PROBLEM TO 10=BIGGEST PROBLEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Littering	5.91	2.62
Graffiti/ Vandalism	4.30	2.95
Cattle interfering with camping experience	1.77	1.68
Inexperienced drivers in difficult areas	4.72	2.92
Reckless drivers	6.17	2.70
Too many rules and regulations	4.08	2.82
Damage to or loss of personal property	3.00	2.60
Conflicts between groups	3.61	2.83
Too many OHVs on sand dunes	4.32	2.71
Too many OHVs on designated trails	3.46	2.48
Not knowing who to contact in an emergency	4.38	3.25
Not enough designated camping spaces	5.21	2.79
Not enough information about where to go and what to see	4.01	2.56
Too many people going off trails	3.92	2.83

Finally, at the end of the survey, respondents were asked, “Do you have any other issues, or concerns, that the Little Sahara managers need to address?” Respondents could give more than one answer, only the first two mentioned are included, for a total of 88 responses. Table 26 shows the major categories of responses, with 34.1% commenting on enforcement or safety issues, 19.3% of the comments were regarding conflicts and/or crowding, 19.3% on restriction concerns, 15.9% on suggested improvements and maintenance issues, and 11.4% are comments on other management issues. For a more complete discussion of this question, see the section “Open-Ended Comments and Management Suggestions” which follows on page 32. A list of all the answers given in response to this question can be found in Appendix D.

Table 26: Other issues respondents feel the managers of Little Sahara need to address.

OTHER ISSUES	RESPONSES¹
ENFORCEMENT/SAFETY	30 (34.1%)
Enforce drug/alcohol laws	7
Enforce rules/laws	4
Safety problems	4
Enforce quiet hours	3
Increase regulations	2
Give out more fines	2
More patrols	2
Need phones in campgrounds	2
Post emergency contact number	1
Not safe for kids in campgrounds	1
Limit drinking to campgrounds	1
On-site drug testing	1
CONFLICTS/CROWDING	17 (19.3%)
Better control on Sand mountain	5
Too crowded	4
Control crazy/rowdy people	3
Close Sand mountain for 3 years	1
Limit users on Sand mountain	1
Tires ignited and rolled down Sand Mtn.	1
Limit number of people into area	1
Better control on holiday weekends	1
RESTRICTION CONCERNS	17 (19.3%)
Keep it open	7
Less management	2
Declassify WSA	2
Too many regulations	2
Too many rangers	1
Too much law enforcement	1
Allow limited OHV use to WSA	1
Open access from Cherry Creek	1

IMPROVEMENTS/MAINTAINENCE	14 (15.9%)
Increase maintenance	2
Mark trails better	2
Do not develop more	2
Too developed	1
More primitive campsites	1
Keep toilet paper stocked	1
Provide showers	1
Dump stations not always functional	1
Upgrade blacktop at Oasis	1
Have change available at pay box	1
Improve LSRA web site	1
OTHER MANAGEMENT ISSUES	10 (11.4%)
Lack of education	2
Lack of year-round personnel	1
Make more family oriented	1
Inform about busy times	1
Find partnerships for activities such as racing	1
Increase fees for improvements	1
Too expensive	1
Should be free	1
Give refund	1
TOTAL	88 (100%)

¹Percents represent responses, not respondents.

Comparison of
Little Sahara Subgroups

Comparison of Little Sahara Subgroups

Several subgroups of Little Sahara visitors warranted further study from the survey results. The following subgroups are contrasted in this section: those who visited in the last five years vs. those who have not, day users vs. overnight visitors on their last trip, males vs. females, overnight visitors' perceptions based on where they stayed, and visitor perceptions based on when they visited. Analyses were run for all the "improvements needed" and "problems encountered" survey questions, as well as willingness to pay. Those with statistically significant differences at the .10 level are the main focus of this section, but a few non-significant findings of interest are included.

Visitor attitudes by recency of visit

Recreationists who have not visited in the last five years evaluated problems more negatively than more recent visitors, and four of these problems were viewed as significantly higher: 1) too many OHVs on the sand dunes, 2) too many OHVs on the established trails, 3) not knowing who to contact in an emergency, and 4) too many people going off trails (Table 27). It could be speculated that these former users have been displaced due to their dissatisfaction with these issues, but it should be noted a specific question as to why a respondent had not returned in the last five years was not incorporated into the survey. Furthermore, only 15% of the respondents had not visited in the last five years. Those who had not visited in the last five years were also more likely to feel that managers should put a higher priority on providing maps and other guides.

Table 27: Comparison of visitor perception of problems and management priorities by recency of visit.

Problem/improvements needed	Visited in Last Five Years ¹	Mean	s.d.	t-test	sig.
Too many OHVs on the sand dunes ²	<u>Yes</u> (N=96)	4.06	2.47	-2.379	.019
	<u>No</u> (N=17)	5.71	3.39		
Too many OHVs on the established trails ²	<u>Yes</u> (N=95)	3.26	2.25	-2.135	.035
	<u>No</u> (N=17)	4.65	3.44		
Not knowing who to contact in an emergency ²	<u>Yes</u> (N=98)	4.19	3.24	-1.782	.077
	<u>No</u> (N=17)	5.71	3.14		
Too many people going off trails ²	<u>Yes</u> (N=97)	3.62	2.74	-2.658	.009
	<u>No</u> (N=17)	5.53	2.72		
Printed map/trail guides ³	<u>Yes</u> (N=98)	5.58	2.92	-1.821	.071
	<u>No</u> (N=18)	6.94	2.90		

¹ Total who visited in last 5 years = 98, those who did not = 20, variations in totals reflect the omission of visitors who did not rate the question, for instance those who said "I don't know".

² Problem means measured on a scale of 1=no problem, to 10=the biggest problem.

³ Management priorities measured on a scale of 1=the lowest priority, 10=the biggest priority.

Visitor perception of day users vs. overnight visitors on their last trip

Respondents were asked the length of their last trip, and these groups were split into day users or overnight visitors. Overnight visitors were more likely than day users to rank problems and management priorities higher, with four items significantly higher: 1) inexperienced drivers, 2) not enough designated camping spaces, 3) more safety patrols, and 4) better law enforcement (Table 28). The amount of camping spaces is obviously of more concern to an overnight visitor. Other concerns, such as inexperienced drivers, would seem at first glance to be independent of overnight stay. Running additional analysis, it was found that of 36 respondents who did not camp on their last trip, 10 said they usually visited exclusively on weekdays, while only 5 out of the 68 multi-day users were strictly weekday visitors (Table 29). Overnight visitors tend to see more problems, not only because they stay longer, but also because they are also more likely to visit during the busier times.

Table 28: Comparison of visitor perception of problems and management priorities, day use vs. overnight visitors (multi-day use) on last trip.

Problem/improvements needed	Day use vs. Multi-day use ¹	Mean	s.d.	t-test	sig.
Inexperienced drivers ²	<u>Day</u> (N=40)	3.90	2.65	-2.037	.044
	<u>Multi</u> (N=76)	5.01	2.87		
Not enough designated camping spaces ²	<u>Day</u> (N=39)	4.13	2.97	-2.999	.003
	<u>Multi</u> (N=75)	5.73	2.57		
More safety patrols ³	<u>Day</u> (N=40)	5.23	2.70	-1.940	.055
	<u>Multi</u> (N=75)	6.24	2.66		
Better law enforcement ³	<u>Day</u> (N=39)	4.85	2.87	-2.435	.016
	<u>Multi</u> (N=76)	6.13	2.58		

¹ Total day users on last trip = 40, multi-day users = 78, variations in totals reflect the omission of visitors who did not rate the question, for instance those who said "I don't know".

² Problem means measured on a scale of 1=no problem, to 10=the biggest problem.

³ Management priorities measured on a scale of 1=the lowest priority, 10=the biggest priority.

Table 29: Categories of day users vs. overnight visitors on the last trip, in response to the question, "When do you usually visit?"

Day use vs. Multi-day use ¹	weekdays only	holidays and weekends	all	Total ¹
<u>Day</u>	10 (27.8%)	21 (58.3%)	5 (13.9%)	36
<u>Multi</u>	5 (7.4%)	51 (75.0%)	12 (17.6%)	68

¹ Total day users on last trip = 40, multi-day users = 78, variations in totals reflect the omission of visitors who did not rate the question, for instance those who said "I don't know".

Visitor perception by gender

Gender of respondents was established by the interviewer who noted it on the response sheet. Thus, 103 males and 17 females were identified as completing the long survey. (Three were not marked by the interviewer and had gender-neutral names, they are not included here.) There were several substantially significant differences by gender. While no statistically significant differences were found between males and females in their willingness to pay a fee, the amount extra that they were willing to pay did differ significantly (Table 30). Males were willing to pay an average of \$3.85 more, while females an average of \$2.45 more. There is a very low standard deviation for these averages, suggesting little disagreement within gender as to these figures.

Table 30: Comparison of how much extra a visitor is willing to pay in entrance fees, by gender.

	Gender ¹	Mean ²	s.d.	t-test	sig.
How much extra would you be willing to pay for the use of Little Sahara?	<u>Male</u> (N=72)	3.85	1.88	2.374	.020
	<u>Female</u> (N=11)	2.45	1.21		

¹ Numbers reflect only those who said they would be willing to pay an additional fee.

² Dollar amount.

Males and females differed significantly in six problem and management priorities (Tables 31 and 32), but males rated only one priority significantly higher than females, that of wanting more semi-developed campgrounds. While not a significant difference, males also rated the problem of not enough designated camping spaces higher than females. There were no significant differences in gender as to whether their visit was day use or overnight, nor if they tended to visit only during weekdays versus weekends, so this difference is not easily explained.

Females rated several problems higher than males, and two were significantly higher: 1) graffiti or other vandalism, and 2) too many OHVs on the sand dunes (Table 31). Females also rated the problem of littering higher than males, but not significantly so.

Table 31: Comparison of visitor perception of problems by gender.

Problem/improvements needed ¹	Gender ²	Mean	s.d.	t-test	sig.
Littering	<u>Male</u> (N=100)	5.80	2.71	-1.251	.214
	<u>Female</u> (N=16)	6.69	2.06		
Graffiti or other vandalism	<u>Male</u> (N=100)	4.02	2.91	-3.056	.003
	<u>Female</u> (N=16)	6.38	2.53		
Too many OHVs on the sand dunes	<u>Male</u> (N=98)	4.16	2.67	-1.652	.101
	<u>Female</u> (N=15)	5.40	2.92		
Not enough designated camping spaces	<u>Male</u> (N=98)	5.37	2.82	1.16	.249
	<u>Female</u> (N=15)	4.47	2.67		

¹ Problems measured on a scale of 1=no problem, to 10=the biggest problem.

² Males = 103, females = 17, variations in totals reflect the omission of visitors who did not rate the question, for instance those who said "I don't know".

Gender differences also existed in the ranking of management priorities. Females rated three significantly higher: 1) more sand play areas closed to OHVs, 2) more safety patrols, and 3) providing more maps and other printed guides (Table 32). Although not significant, females also rated having an area set aside for beginner OHVs as more of a priority than males.

Table 32: Comparison of visitor perception of management priorities by gender.

Problem/improvements needed ¹	Gender ²	Mean	s.d.	t-test	sig.
An area set aside for beginner OHVs	<u>Male</u> (N=102)	4.99	3.13	-1.424	.157
	<u>Female</u> (N=16)	6.19	3.08		
More sand play areas closed to OHVs	<u>Male</u> (N=101)	3.98	2.91	-2.634	.010
	<u>Female</u> (N=16)	6.06	3.15		
More safety patrols	<u>Male</u> (N=100)	5.74	2.76	-2.153	.033
	<u>Female</u> (N=16)	7.31	2.36		
More semi-developed campgrounds	<u>Male</u> (N=102)	7.19	2.21	2.983	.003
	<u>Female</u> (N=16)	5.44	1.97		
Printed map/trail guides	<u>Male</u> (N=96)	5.58	2.92	-1.821	.071
	<u>Female</u> (N=17)	6.94	2.90		

¹ Measured on a scale of 1=the lowest priority, 10=the biggest priority.

² Males = 103, females = 17, variations in totals reflect the omission of visitors who did not rate the question, for instance those who said "I don't know".

Overnight visitors' perceptions based on where they stayed

Relatively few significant differences exist in overnight visitors' evaluations of problems and management issues as a result of where they stayed (Table 33). While enforcement of quiet hours was rated relatively low by all groups (about 3 on the 10 point scale), those who stayed overnight at the Oasis or White Sands campgrounds tended to agree that quiet hours needed more enforcement, while those who stayed either at Jericho or Sand Mountain tended to rate it lower. Overnight visitors to Sand Mountain were most likely to rate not knowing who to contact in an emergency as a problem (nearly 6 on the scale).

Differences existed, although not at a significant level, for other problems. Using the problem scale of 1 to 10, it can be seen that those who stayed at Oasis and Sand Mountain rated inexperienced drivers in difficult areas as more of a problem, while those who stayed elsewhere rated it as less of a problem. A difference in opinion is also seen regarding the perception that too many people are going off trails, with those staying at Oasis rating that as more of a problem, and those who stayed elsewhere as less of a problem. Reckless drivers were considered a problem by all, but especially by those who stayed at Sand Mountain and Oasis. It is important to note the medium to high standard deviation for each category, which shows there is a fair amount of inconsistency in the way each problem was rated by visitors in each group.

Only one significant difference was found in overnight visitors' ratings of the improvements that they would like to see. Visitors staying at Oasis and Jericho put a significantly higher priority on providing printed maps and trail guides than those who stayed elsewhere (Table 33). A difference that exists, but not at a significant level, is the wish for an area to be set aside for beginner OHVs, with those staying at Sand Mountain and Oasis placing more of a priority on it, but those staying at White Sands and Jericho rating it lower. Having more safety patrols and better law enforcement were a priority of all groups, but both were rated highest by those staying at Oasis.

Table 33: Comparison of overnight visitors' perceptions of problems and management priorities, based on where they stayed.

Problem/improvements needed		Oasis (N=9)	White Sands (N=17)	Jericho (N=18)	Sand Mtn. (N=16)	Total (N=60)	F value	Sig.
Quiet hours need to be better enforced ¹	<u>Mean</u>	3.44	3.47	2.94	2.87	3.14	2.82	.048
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	.73	.64	.64	.83	.74		
Inexperienced drivers in difficult areas ²	<u>Mean</u>	5.44	4.35	4.33	5.75	4.88	.953	.421
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.01	2.55	2.85	3.80	2.96		
Reckless drivers ²	<u>Mean</u>	6.22	5.71	5.88	7.37	6.29	1.22	.311
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.49	2.66	2.96	2.70	2.75		
Not knowing who to contact in an emergency ²	<u>Mean</u>	3.44	3.65	3.00	5.88	4.02	2.79	.049
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.35	3.22	2.68	3.63	3.21		
Too many people going off trails ²	<u>Mean</u>	5.56	3.00	4.22	3.40	3.86	1.77	.165
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.92	2.55	2.78	3.31	2.94		
An area set aside for beginner OHVs ³	<u>Mean</u>	5.56	4.47	4.61	6.06	5.10	.827	.484
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.70	3.08	3.15	4.06	3.33		
Printed map/trail guides ³	<u>Mean</u>	7.22	4.12	6.06	4.94	5.38	3.04	.036
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.33	2.12	3.04	3.17	2.89		
More sand play areas closed to OHVs ³	<u>Mean</u>	5.11	3.35	4.67	4.13	4.22	.842	.477
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.14	2.15	3.27	3.56	3.05		
More safety patrols ³	<u>Mean</u>	7.11	6.50	5.78	6.31	6.32	.482	.696
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.93	1.97	2.94	3.28	2.78		
Better law enforcement ³	<u>Mean</u>	7.33	6.12	5.72	6.06	6.17	.758	.522
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.12	1.93	2.97	3.15	2.64		

¹ Issue means measured on a scale of 1=strongly disagree, to 4=strongly agree.

² Problem means measured on a scale of 1=no problem, to 10=the biggest problem.

³ Management priorities measured on a scale of 1=the lowest priority, 10=the biggest priority

Visitor perceptions based on when they visited

Comparisons were made on how visitors evaluated problems and management priorities based on when they usually visited: weekdays only, holidays and weekends, or at all times. Recreationists who visited the Little Sahara at all times tended to rate problems overall as bigger. Of the 14 problem statements they rated 9 higher than the other two groups, but only two of these problems were rated significantly higher: 1) littering, and 2) damage to or loss of personal property (Table 34). Perhaps because this group visits at all times they perceive more problems because they can see the contrast between the busier and slower times.

Those who visited exclusively on weekdays rated one problem significantly higher, that of too many rules and regulations, and another problem was almost significantly higher, that of not knowing who to contact in an emergency. Due to lower levels of visitation on weekdays, these visitors may not see the need for some of the rules and regulations, and they may have less contact with staff in general.

Table 34: Comparison of visitor perception of problems, based on when they usually visit.

Problem ¹		Weekdays (N=18)	Holidays and Weekends (N=72)	All times (N=17)	Total (N=107)	F value	Sig.
Littering	<u>Mean</u>	4.76	5.70	6.65	5.70	2.34	.101
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	2.82	2.40	2.78	2.57		
Graffiti or other vandalism	<u>Mean</u>	3.71	4.13	4.76	4.16	.589	.557
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.22	2.64	3.53	2.88		
Inexperienced drivers in difficult areas	<u>Mean</u>	3.88	4.31	5.06	4.36	.818	.444
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.26	2.69	2.46	2.75		
Reckless drivers	<u>Mean</u>	5.41	6.11	6.24	6.02	.507	.604
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.32	2.76	2.02	2.74		
Too many rules and regulations	<u>Mean</u>	5.65	3.82	3.53	4.07	3.38	.038
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.39	2.72	2.21	2.83		
Damage to or loss of personal property	<u>Mean</u>	3.41	2.39	4.00	2.82	3.691	.028
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.02	2.06	3.00	2.46		
Not knowing who to contact in an emergency	<u>Mean</u>	5.59	4.07	3.47	4.22	2.204	.116
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.81	2.95	3.10	3.16		
Not enough designated camping spaces	<u>Mean</u>	4.29	5.18	5.24	5.05	.739	.480
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.46	2.59	2.91	2.79		

¹ Problems measured on a scale of 1=no problem, to 10=the biggest problem.

Those who visited at all times also had a slightly higher priority for seeing campfire educational programs instituted, while other groups tended not to support them (Table 35). More safety patrols and better law enforcement were a priority by all three groups.

Table 35: Comparison of visitor perception of management priorities, based on when they usually visit.

Improvements needed ¹		Weekdays (N=18)	Holidays and Weekends (N=72)	All times (N=17)	Total (N=107)	F value	Sig.
An area set aside for beginner OHVers	<u>Mean</u>	5.83	5.03	4.82	5.13	.551	.578
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.55	3.04	3.47	3.18		
Printed map/trail guides	<u>Mean</u>	6.83	5.37	5.82	5.69	1.747	.179
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.07	3.08	2.32	3.00		
More safety patrols	<u>Mean</u>	5.47	5.70	6.82	5.85	1.31	.274
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.45	2.77	1.85	2.78		
Better law enforcement	<u>Mean</u>	5.28	5.61	6.75	5.73	1.358	.262
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	3.66	2.69	2.14	2.81		
Campfire/educational programs	<u>Mean</u>	3.56	3.47	5.06	3.74	3.433	.036
	<u>Std Dv.</u>	1.92	2.18	2.93	2.32		

¹ Measured on a scale of 1=the lowest priority, 10=the biggest priority.

**Open-Ended Comments and
Management Suggestions**

Open-Ended Comments and Management Suggestions

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked, “Do you have any other issues, or concerns that the Little Sahara managers need to address?” The majority of comments fell into 5 general categories: enforcement and safety (30), conflicts and crowding (17), restriction concerns (17), improvements and maintenance (14), and other management issues (10). Out of 123 respondents, 53 had one or more comments related to management suggestions. Since these are qualitative responses made by less than half of those who completed the long survey, they should not be considered representative of all registered ATV owners that visit Little Sahara. (Verbatim responses are listed in Appendix D).

Table 26: Categories of other concerns and issues.

OTHER ISSUES	RESPONSES
ENFORCEMENT/SAFETY	30 (34.1%)
Enforce drug/alcohol laws	7
Enforce rules/laws	4
Safety problems	4
Enforce quiet hours	3
Increase regulations	2
Give out more fines	2
More patrols	2
Need phones in campgrounds	2
Post emergency contact number	1
Not safe for kids in campgrounds	1
Limit drinking to campgrounds	1
On-site drug testing	1
CONFLICTS/CROWDING	17 (19.3%)
Better control on Sand mountain	5
Too crowded	4
Control crazy/rowdy people	3
Close Sand mountain for 3 years	1
Limit users on Sand mountain	1
Tires ignited and rolled down Sand	1
Limit number of people into area	1
Better control on holiday weekends	1
RESTRICTION CONCERNS	17 (19.3%)
Keep it open	7
Less management	2
Declassify WSA	2
Too many regulations	2
Too many rangers	1
Too much law enforcement	1
Allow limited OHV use to WSA	1
Open access from Cherry Creek	1

IMPROVEMENTS/MAINTENANCE	14 (15.9%)
Increase maintenance	2
Mark trails better	2
Do not develop more	2
Too developed	1
More primitive campsites	1
Keep toilet paper stocked	1
Provide showers	1
Dump stations not always functional	1
Upgrade blacktop at Oasis	1
Have change available at pay box	1
Improve LSRA web site	1
OTHER MANAGEMENT ISSUES	10 (11.4%)
Lack of education	2
Lack of year-round personnel	1
Make more family oriented	1
Inform about busy times	1
Find partnerships for activities such as	1
Increase fees for improvements	1
Too expensive	1
Should be free	1
Give refund	1
TOTAL	88 (100%)

Enforcement and Safety

More than one-third of all open-ended responses expressed concerns with enforcement of existing laws and regulations, most notably drug and alcohol laws.

Too much drinking is being done by park visitors.

Drinking should be allowed in camps only.

Have on-site drug tests, and if people don't pass, don't fine them, ban them.

Safety concerns and rule violations were also generally seen as needing more enforcement of existing rules, and/or more patrolling.

I would really like to see the BLM going out there and giving people tickets for speeding in the campgrounds, driving while drunk and things like that. If they start to slap people with \$50 fines then I think the word would get around, and that kind of behavior we would see less of.

Need better law enforcement. It's not safe for kids in campgrounds.

Conflicts and Crowding

Related to the need for more rule enforcement, control of crowds at Sand Mountain was also a major concern of Little Sahara visitors.

Sand Mountain is too crowded.

The party atmosphere at Sand Mountain is pretty scary.

There are people lighting tires on fire and rolling them down the hill at Sand Mountain.

Have a Sand Mountain live-cam on the net so people can see how crowded it is.

Need some directions on Sand Mountain, so people aren't going up and down in the same spot.

Relatively few respondents (n=6) recommended use limits.

Should limit the number of users that go up and down Sand Mountain.

Close Sand Mountain for 3 years, let Sand Mountain recover and break the trend.

Restriction Concerns

In contrast to a few comments in the last section, several visitors expressed concerns that access should not be restricted. Overall, there were more comments against use limits than for them.

There's not a lot of places to go anymore, keep it open.

I think we need to continue to have the area open, and to share it responsibly.

I just don't want to see restrictions on use. They send you into one area and then later tell you not to use it because it is overused.

Keep it the way it is not closed down. It's important to keep it open - too many areas are being closed. I am environmentally friendly, but not extreme. Don't kill the human soul by closing areas.

In contrast with the first section on enforcement and safety issues, a few people complained about there being too many regulations and too much law enforcement.

There are too many rangers and rules.

There's too much law enforcement.

And a few of the LSRA visitors were concerned with the restrictions imposed by the wilderness study area.

Now there's a lot of proposed wilderness. These areas used to have a lot of users and bike races through them and now they are a pristine wilderness.

Take out the wilderness study area. Wilderness land is land of no use.

Improvements and Maintenance

Most of these comments are directed to improvements in general, such as two users who requested that the BLM mark the trails better. Other comments requested improvements at specific locations, such as to keep the dump stations functional, or to upgrade the blacktop at Oasis. Two comments requested improvements on the BLM's web site.

They ought to make sure that they have better links on home pages to all the communities in the state and maybe the state itself. The trails should be on the web.

While a few users requested more development, such as providing showers, some requested the BLM provide no more development.

No improvements should be made because more people will come.

They should keep up on what they have, no new development.

Other Management Issues

There were several categories of comments made by just a few visitors regarding other management issues not covered in the prior sections.

Provide information about holidays and other busy times on pamphlets so people can make better decisions about when to come. Advise people where the quiet or noisy places to camp are.

It should be more family oriented. They ought to put the families in a separate place from the young people.

There has been no one down there when we are, to ask questions, or give change at the box.

Because this question dealt overall with issues that the Little Sahara users would like to see management address, positive comments were not always recorded by the interviewer, and so they are not included in the table. It is important to note, however, that positive comments were also given. Examples of some of the positive comments include:

In my past experiences down there, they've been great.

They do an all around good job. Something for everyone.

They're starting to do a good job trying to get people to disperse.

I think the BLM has done a pretty good job of doing what they need to with what they have, except on Easter Weekend.

Appendix A
Survey and Interviewer Instructions

Respondent ID# _____

Questions Specific To Little Sahara

In what year did you first visit the Little Sahara? _____

How many times have you visited in the last *five* years? _____

In the last five years has the number of times you've gone to the Little Sahara area each year increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?

INCREASED STAYED THE SAME DECREASED
[PROBE]

What do you like about Little Sahara? _____

[PROBE]
What things do you dislike about Little Sahara? _____

Do you usually visit on [circle]: WEEKDAYS HOLIDAYS WEEKENDS?

What type of vehicle do you drive at the Little Sahara area [check all that apply]?
___ MOTORCYCLE ___ 4x4 ___ DUNE BUGGY ___ 4 WHEEL ATV

Where do you usually ride when you visit the Little Sahara area? [CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY]
SAND MOUNTAIN OTHER SAND DUNES THE TRAILS IN THE AREA

Last Trip to Little Sahara

When was your last trip to Little Sahara? _____
How long did you stay? _____ [RECORD HOURS OR DAYS]

[IF OVERNIGHT]
Where did you stay during your last trip? Did you stay at the Oasis Campground, the White Sands campground, the Jericho area, the Sand Mountain area, or somewhere else?

___ OASIS ___ WHITE SANDS ___ JERICO ___ SAND MOUNTAIN

OTHER (WHERE): _____

Was this your first choice? YES NO

[IF NOT] Why did you not stay in your preferred spot? Were there...
___ TOO MANY PEOPLE ___ CAMPSITE FULL OR SOMETHING ELSE
___ TOO NOISY ___ OTHER: _____

Attitudes Toward Sharing the Little Sahara and surrounding area

During your previous visits:

How often have cattle interfered with your OHV experience? Would you say . .

NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES OFTEN

How often do horseback riders interfere with your OHV experience?

NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES OFTEN

How often have other OHV drivers interfered with your experience?

NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES OFTEN

How often have OHVs interfered with your use of the non-OHV sand play areas?

NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES OFTEN

Next, I'll read some opinion statements, I would like you to tell me if you agree or disagree with each statement. [FIRST].....

Quiet hours should be better enforced in designated campgrounds such as White Sands and Oasis. [DO YOU]...

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Don't Know

It is important to manage the area for threatened or endangered species. [DO YOU]...

SD D A SA DK

Managers should leave the regulations how they are. [DO YOU]...

SD D A SA DK

More regulations are needed for personal safety. [DO YOU]...

SD D A SA DK

Currently there is just a daily fee for access to the Little Sahara Recreation Area and no specific campground fee. An additional fee should be charged for camping in order to help pay for campground upkeep. [DO YOU]...

SD D A SA DK

IMPROVEMENTS:

Please rate the following on a scale from one to ten, where one is the lowest priority and ten is the highest priority, of where you would like your visitor fees spent on improvements.

- An area set aside for beginner OHVs
- Printed map/trail guides
- More sand play areas that are closed to OHV use
- More safety patrols
- Better law enforcement
- More restrooms
- More visitor center displays
- Campfire/Educational programs
- More *semi-developed* campgrounds with vault toilets and fire rings
- More *developed* campsites with flushing toilets, parking, and picnic tables
- More sites with pull-through spaces for large recreation vehicles.

The current user fee is \$6 per vehicle. Would you be willing to pay an increase in user fees to help provide these facilities or services?

YES NO POSSIBLY / UNSURE

[IF YES] How much extra would you be willing to pay per vehicle for the use of Little Sahara? _____

Problems Encountered During Your Visit To Little Sahara and Area

Please rate the following on a scale from one to ten, where one is the no problem and ten is the biggest problem.

- Littering
- Graffiti or other vandalism
- Cattle interfering with your camping experience
- Inexperienced drivers in difficult areas
- Reckless drivers
- Too many rules and regulations
- Damage to or loss of personal property
- Conflicts between groups
- Too many OHVs on the sand dunes
- Too many OHVs on the designated trails
- Not knowing who to contact in an emergency
- Not enough designated camping spaces
- Not enough information about where to go and what to see
- Too many people going off trails.

Do you have any other issues, or concerns that the Little Sahara managers need to address?

That is the end of the survey. Thanks for helping us and providing valuable input. We appreciate the time you have taken to answer the questions. Have a good

2001 Little Sahara Recreation Area Users Survey

Interviewer Instructions

Study Purpose:

To get input to help the BLM in OHV and other recreation planning and management for the Little Sahara Recreation Area and the surrounding lands.

General Rules:

1. Be personable and conversational, but read the questions *exactly as they are written*. Anything in CAPS indicates interviewer instructions or comments to you that *you do not read to the respondent*. Where possible responses are in the body of the question, read the responses clearly and hesitate a bit between potential responses.
2. If a respondent wants clarification, try to simply repeat the key part of the question with a little different emphasis. If you change some wording, even by accident or to clarify a question, write and circle the wording you used in the margins.
3. If a respondent declines an interview, try to reschedule at a convenient time. Emphasize the value of the results for managers at the Little Sahara Recreation Area.
4. If a respondent wants to quit in the middle of the survey, try telling them that they are already halfway, or nearly done, but don't push it. Offer a call back if they seemed interested but something was interrupting them.
5. For open-ended questions, we want to "prompt" for additional information. Use words like "anything else?" or "any other issues?", and keep prompting until the respondent says "no." Write the prompts you use. Sometimes *silence* is a good prompt.
6. Write everything that is said by you or by the respondent that is not already written on the survey including clarifications, prompts, and open-ended responses. Use abbreviations when possible, such as AE= "anything else?", R="respondent", OHV="Off Highway Vehicle", OHM= Off Highway Motorcycle", etc. Be consistent with your abbreviations and write a key to them if they are not self-evident.
7. DO NOT say "ORV"; be sure to use "OHV" (sensitive issue for some)!
8. Practice the survey, especially "skip" patterns. We don't have many, but you could find yourself skipping a few questions, for instance if their last trip was a daytrip you would skip the camping questions.
9. Complete a cover sheet for every potential contact person and note it if you can't get them or if it is a business, etc. This information is important for calculating response rates.
10. Complete a cover sheet even if they only answered yes or no to the question "Have you ever been to the Little Sahara?" and then hang up. If they answer no (or say they never visited LS during the intro.) without hanging up, ask if they would answer just three quick questions.
11. Best times to contact are weekdays between 6:00pm and 9:00pm and Saturday afternoons. Sunday afternoons are good as well, though you can expect some individuals will prefer to reschedule.

Survey:

1. Act friendly and familiar when you ask for the respondent. We need to get a high response rate so ask for the respondent like you would ask for a friend or acquaintance. For example, "Hi, is Terry Worthen there?" Use the first name if that helps, but not Mr. or Mrs. (But assume Mr. if the first

name is not available). **Try to figure out the pronunciation of the person's name before you dial. Nothing is a bigger turnoff than having one's name mispronounced.** It is ok to use the first name especially if you are sure you will mangle the last name.

2. If the person who answers the phone asks, "who's calling?" before getting the respondent, say "This is (your name), and I'm calling from Utah State University." If they say Respondent is unavailable, just leave your name, but say *you* will call back, and ask them for a good time to call.
3. If they ask "What is the survey about?" or "How is this information going to be used?" respond by saying "We are conducting a survey of off-highway vehicle drivers to help prepare a recreation management plan for use by the BLM in the Little Sahara area" OR "I am a recreation student at Utah State and we are doing a management plan for the area around the Little Sahara as part of a class project." If they want more information: "...it's about where you OHV at Little Sahara, where you camp, what's important to you there, things like that."
4. If you detect hesitancy, explain that we only call a small sample of OHV drivers and that it is important to get their input so that the results are an accurate picture of the opinions of what all Little Sahara users want the BLM to manage the area.
5. Be very polite and encourage participation without being a nuisance. Try to get an interview when you have them on the phone, but be very sensitive to the fact that they may be in the middle of something and may want you to call back.
6. Complete the call record clearly; you may not be doing the follow-up calls.
7. If you get an answering machine, don't leave a message, but try back several times. If this doesn't work, then leave a message with a plea to participate in the study and ask them to call you at their convenience but that you will call them right back so it won't cost them.
8. The general call back rule is a minimum of six tries (more if you just get an answering machine or no answer), and *at least three contacts when you actually speak to the respondent*. (Unless they decline outright, of course.) IF they put you off three times and seem to be unwilling, call it a rejection (but keep the coversheet record).
9. Be sure to include the respondent number at the top of the cover sheet and the first page of the survey.

Good luck and have FUN with it.

Appendix B
List of Respondents' Likes about Little Sahara

Likes

The following is a list of all the responses given in answer to the question, “What do you like about the Little Sahara?” A summary of the major categories of responses is outlined in Table 11 on page 14.

Sand

1258	Sand
1653	Sand
1615	Sand dunes
1717	Sand
1684	Sand dunes
1149	Sand, lots of area
1051	Sand dunes
1279	Sand Mountain
1794	Sand
1637	Sand area to ride on
1034	The Sand
1712	Dunes
1096	Lots of open sand
1045	Warm sandy areas, kids like sand
1252	Riding in the sand any time during the week
1896	Sand of course, sand is what I go there for
1739	Ability to ride on the sand dunes
1234	The sand areas
1181	Sand, Sand Mountain
1415	Sand, peaceful
1404	Sand
1788	Dunes
1165	Sand, lots of good stuff
1768	Sand
1230	Dunes
1361	Sand, get away from people
1254	Sand, wind, 2 seasons scout master, ride motorcycles.
1328	Sand dunes, desert
1036	Like the sand
1342	Sand
1818	Sand dunes, trails
1148	Sand
1558	Sand, expect a lot of people
1563	Sand Mountain, space, holds a lot of people
1364	Sand, campsites
1311	Big play area, play in the sand
1213	Like riding on the sand
1055	Sand and dunes
1029	Sand mountain trail
1380	Kids like sand
1996	A lot of sand
1014	Uniqueness of it, that its sand

Variety

1070	Variety
1719	Variety
1687	Variety of trails, between the rocks and the sand
1055	Variety
1590	Variety (sand and other trails)
1255	Variety of terrain

- 1172 Variety of riding
- 1187 Different/variety
- 1891 Varsity
- 1927 Lot of places to go, play & stuff
- 1026 There are a lot of different places for different skill areas; It's a unique area.

Versatility of terrain

- 1029 The versatility of the terrain,
- 1059 Versatility, dunes and trails
- 1650 Terrain, being out there
- 1617 Terrain for OHV is good.

Wide-open spaces

- 1255 Openness
- 1719 The openness
- 1698 Wide open
- 1926 Wide open spaces
- 1567 Wide open spaces
- 1832 Wide open space
- 1683 Wide open spaces
- 1618 Open, lot of area
- 1712 Open space
- 1796 Vastness
- 1151 Ride 4-wheelers, open area
- 1067 Big, a lot of room
- 1977 I used to race motor cross out there. I like the openness
- 1020 Open, you can just go out there and ride
- 1595 Wide open, can ride most anywhere
- 1598 Open to ride everywhere.
- 1331 Only area really open
- 1394 Open, not a lot of restrictions openness, facilities, flush, water
- 1213 That there's a lot of open area to ride
- 1336 Wide open
- 1028 The wide-open place.
- 1313 Good place to go, open second areas, good atmosphere and scenery
- 1324 Open, no real trails
- 1229 Open, go down and have a good time
- 1878 The open spaces
- 1343 Play area lots of space
- 1344 Big sand box. Lots of area + play
- 1996 Open

Riding

- 1878 Plenty of riding
- 1019 Plenty of trails
- 1015 Great place to ride
- 1034 Just riding
- 1337 Being able to ride all around
- 1007 Great place to ride
- 1048 Climbing rim
- 1916 The riding
- 1336 Good place to ride
- 1010 Variety of riding
- 1796 Openness to driving
- 1380 Like riding at Cherry Creek
- 1813 4-wheeling
- 1217 It's the only place I like to take my dune buggy.
- 1890 Good sand to ride on

Camping

- 1891 Close camping facilities.
- 1590 The camping
- 1110 Camping early in season
- 1637 Campgrounds
- 1019 Campgrounds close to sand
- 1034 Has a great camping ground
- 1027 Campgrounds, inexpensive, can't do damage, remoteness
- 1684 Camping
- 1700 Camp ground
- 1878 Plenty of campsites
- 1380 Camping

Fun

- 1642 Everything, people, fun riding on sand.
- 1703 Fun
- 1737 In the middle of week, it's nice cause not too many people. It's a fun place to go
- 1540 Fun recreation
- 1148 Fun, place, atmosphere
- 1693 Fun place to ride
- 1394 A lot of fun
- 1780 Place you can have fun, nice place to go...
- 1028 It's fun to go there

Facilities

- 1896 Facilities
- 1029 Facilities are nice; BLM has done a good job of putting in campgrounds.
- 1609 Facilities- clean up well, country getting in?
- 1781 It's pretty clean
- 1380 Bathrooms

Everything

- 1677 Everything good
- 1341 Everything, that I can spend time with my family in a nice area in Utah
- 1572 Good for riding, kids playing in sand area, scout camps, foxes, coyotes, and close

Atmosphere

- 1063 Pretty, I guess
- 1890 Beautiful
- 1141 Family, atmosphere, sand areas for kids, sand area, and adults

People

- 1343 People are great and nice
- 1996 Usually run into friends

Miscellaneous

- 1086 Just something to do
- 1996 Good place to race

Location

- 1228 Close
- 1788 Close to town. Able to play with out strict regulations

1609 Closest better dunes
1235 The location-prime real-estate
1877 Like no other place in Utah, desert and sand

Cost

1228 Price

Weather

1127 Weather

Crowding

1096 Crowded

Management

1014 It's well managed, has adequate health care if you need it.
1597 Quiet, organized
1336 Well managed
1890 Used to be more unregulated

Appendix C
List of Respondents' Dislikes about Little Sahara

Dislikes

The following is a list of all the responses given in answer to the question, “What things do you dislike about the Little Sahara?” A summary of the major categories of responses is outlined in Table 12 on page 15.

Crowding

1615	Too many people
1070	Crowds out of control
1717	All the people
1567	When it’s too crowded
1341	A lot of people
1149	Lots of people – Too many
1712	Too many people in the busy season
1877	Does tend to get crowded
1650	People
1174	Too crowded
1181	Getting crowded
1597	Crowded
1336	Too many people, I go on weekdays to avoid people
1890	Crowds
1234	The crowds that are increasing
1235	Too many people there
1217	Sometimes too crowded
1324	A lot of people
1094	Too many people
1597	Crowds
1559	Too many people
1014	It’s crowded
1059	Crowds
1279	Crowds
1737	Too crowded at times
1148	Over-crowded

Holidays

1831	Holiday weekends
1540	Easter weekend
1336	Holidays and weekends
1361	Easter, there’s too many people
1618	Too many riders on holidays
1020	It gets a little busy around Easter
1595	Crowded on holidays
1328	Crowded holidays
1563	Holidays – too many people

Alcohol / Drugs

1650	Alcohol and drug abuse
1014	The drinking
1230	Drinking
1217	Too much drinking

Rowdiness/ Parties

1341	Very noisy
1788	Crazy
1992	Rowdy

- 1650 Attitudes
- 1015 Rowdiness
- 1890 Party atmosphere
- 1563 People are crazy
- 1258 Parties
- 1719 Some of the parties that go on
- 1977 Too many crazy people

Driving problems

- 1796 Idiots at the Sand Mountain
- 1896 Posted speed limits – they should ticket speeders in campgrounds
- 1380 Going too fast in campgrounds
- 1252 Younger kids riding heavy dune buggies mixed with ATVs
- 1096 Young people destroying the trails
- 1230 People running machines all night
- 1147 A lot of people driving like maniacs
- 1026 In some places there's too much traffic, more around Sand Mountain
- 1015 Dangerous driving
- 1698 Blind trails

Management

- 1055 The locked gates on the north end, and having to pay to get in
- 1794 Need to manage it better
- 1896 The BLM should keep a closer eye on things
- 1380 Not regulated on big weekends
- 1597 Not enough patrol
- 1059 They are not putting money back into the park
- 1977 Too many rules
- 1703 Rules and regulations
- 1172 Fences going up everywhere

Facilities

- 1609 The roads are rough
- 1926 Not developed enough
- 1794 Need more control over facilities
- 1404 Not many public restrooms, not clean
- 1415 Improvements, showers
- 1684 Need cleaner bathrooms
- 1213 I would like to see more improvements from the revenues created. I don't mind paying but it should go back into the park.

Campgrounds

- 1896 Campgrounds
- 1026 People need to take better care of the campgrounds
- 1228 Sand Mountain camping needs trees

Trash/ Garbage

- 1127 Garbage
- 1217 Trash
- 1027 Trash

Wilderness

- 1029 Every time I see a map they're taking bigger clumps out for wilderness
- 1254 All the Wilderness Study Areas

Safety Concerns

1788 Safety issues
1700 Flags
1324 The safety patrol is horrible

Environmental

1687 It's hot
1677 The wind
1926 It rained, that is the only thing I remember
1027 The heat in the summer
1086 Too sandy
1067 No shade
1254 Hot in the summer, with a nasty wind
1590 Sometimes the weather is bad and you can't ride

Fees

1048 Fees going up
1890 The cost
1311 Should make it an open area where you go and not pay

Miscellaneous

1637 The county road getting to it
1597 Nothing is segregated
1331 Overuse
1040 I prefer going to something that's closer to a community
1693 Different type
1737 There's not enough of it
1653 Forest Service groom the trails

Appendix D
List of Other Issues Regarding Little Sahara

Other Issues

Following is a list of all the answers which respondents gave to the question “Do you have any other issues, or concerns, that the Little Sahara managers need to address?”, except those who said “no” or “none”.

- 1059 Maintenance: keep dump stations functioning, and upgrade the blacktop in Oasis. Also safety.
- 1067 Need to patrol it more, issue more tickets for reckless drivers and drunk drivers. Should limit the number of users that go up and down Sand Mountain.
- 1279 Quiet hours need to be enforced.
- 1737 I just don't want to see restrictions on use. They send you to one area and then later tell you not to use it because it is overused.
- 1615 It's too expensive. Also there are too many rangers and rules.
- 1831 Sand Mountain- control the vehicles around there more.
- 1609 Changing rules for the safety of everybody is good!
- 1567 Mostly just drunk driving.
- 1572 Not a lot of places to go anymore, keep it open.
- 1788 Too much law enforcement. No TP!!!! Very poorly managed facilities. Open more areas to reduce crowding.
- 1344 Don't let the wilderness people take the area. It's a great place to play.
- 1055 Open access from Cherry Creek road. No \$6 fee. Cattle are not a problem, they help prevent fires.
- 1796 Close Sand Mountain for 3 years, let Sand Mountain recover and break the trend. Have on site drug tests, and if people don't pass, don't fine them, ban them. Enforce quiet hours, and other rules. People need to be kinder to people on first encounter, sometimes they tend to over react, and charge into the situation.
- 1794 More regulations on what people can do and where.
- 1896 I just would like to see the area open, like it is now. I would really like to see the BLM going out there and giving people tickets for speeding in the campgrounds, driving while drunk and things like that. If they start to slap people with \$50 fines then I think the word would get around and that kind of behavior we would see less of.
- 1781 No, my past experiences down there, they've been great. I would like to see a refund possible, because sometimes we've come in there, and its been too icy to ride, so we go right back out, but the person at the booth wasn't willing to refund our money. The flags on the motorcycles are a pain, I don't think they are really needed; anyway, they just keep breaking off.
- 1540 Advise people where the quiet or noisy places to camp are. Have phones in the campgrounds for emergencies. Provide information about holidays and other busy times on pamphlets so people can make better decisions about when to come.
- 1650 Drug and alcohol abuse, stop it now.
- 1252 Need to make rules and enforce them... FLAGS.
- 1380 Un-rule on big weekends. Need better law enforcement. It's not safe for kids in campgrounds.

- 1019 More phones, regular patrols.
- 1015 The drinking is too out of control.
- 1034 Biggest one is to try to use a bit more common sense in what they do...(Interviewer: Meaning- so far as what the managers are doing?) Yes, they try to have too much power and authority over people and I think that's just not right.
- 1029 My only concern is that they keep an area where everyone can use it. Now there's a lot of purposed wilderness. These areas used to have a lot of users and bike races through them and now they are a pristine wilderness. The public lands keep getting smaller and smaller. I think the BLM has done a pretty good job of doing what they need to with what they have, except on Easter Weekend.
- 1337 Safety.
- 1780 There has been no one down there when we are, to ask questions, or give change at the box.
- 1754 I think we need to continue to have the area open, and share it responsibly.
- 1230 Drinking should be allowed in camps only.
- 1010 Enforce quiet hours. Also, there are people lighting tires on fire and rolling them down the hill at Sand Mountain.
- 1012 I don't really like the crowds and development there now. The crowds mostly.
- 1174 It's too crowded, we go other places, but never there anymore.
- 1001 Mainly it's just the rowdiness and the drinking. It should be more family oriented. They ought to put the families in a separate place from the young people. I think people in charge are trying to do a good job, but it's just not a place that older people want to take their families.
- 1165 Take out the wilderness study area. Wilderness is land of no use. Put in better-marked trails. Trail makers are needed, and signs for environmentalists to go home.
- 1181 No-It's the greatest place to go, but now is over rated by other people going there. Lots of people.
- 1415 Control drinking, provide showers. Sand Mountain is too crowded.
- 1597 No, they do an all around good job. Something for everyone.
- 1336 Post emergency contact phone numbers.
- 1147 They should up the price to make the enforcement and facilities better.
- 1890 They're starting to do a good job trying to get people to disperse. They should look into partnerships to do activities such as racing so they are all working together. It's good that all have whip antennas. Need some directions on Sand Mountain, so people aren't going up and down in the same spot. More solar panels out there would be cool. Have a Sand Mountain Live-Cam on the net so you can see how crowded it is. Should advertise more areas cause it is too crowded there. People should know where else to go, like 5 Mile Pass. The BLM should rehabilitate old surface mines as OHV play areas. The BLM should have GPS maps to help people go into not as used areas in the outback. The BLM should point out good areas for beginners.
- 1229 I hate to see anything ruined, but I hate to see it shut down so you can't use it. I always have a good time there.
- 1217 Alcohol and use of drugs needs to be better enforced.
- 1324 More safety control is good, put a limit on the number of people that can go into the area.

- 1311 Not really, we go down when it's not super busy and we have a good time.
- 1213 The biggest thing I see is safety problems and lack of education.
- 1094 No improvements should be made because more people will come.
- 1891 The party atmosphere at Sand Mountain is pretty scary.
- 1027 Allow some access to the Rockwell study area, as long as people remain on trails. Some trails exist outside of Little Sahara that go into the Rockwell area. These people should have to pay.
- 1331 More people are out of control.
- 1040 Not that I can think of. I go down there when it's not crowded, so I don't have many problems.
- 1014 They ought to make sure that they have better links on home pages to all the communities in the state and maybe the state itself with multiple links. Trails should be on the web. Should be more web friendly. I like what I see at Little Sahara- to have an open place to ride. I would like to have the BLM have an open place in the community, or at least an open playground area where people can go and be safe.
- 1394 Stay the way it is not closed down. It's important to keep it open – too many areas are being closed. I am environmentally friendly, but not extreme. Don't kill the human soul by closing areas.
- 1254 It needs less management. I would like to see more designated undeveloped camping sites.
- 1172 No, I like it and their fences are going up everywhere.
- 1813 Too much drinking being done by park visitors.
- 1255 They should keep up on what they have, no new development. Sand Mountain is a problem spot fix it!