



**Visitor Characteristics, Perceptions of Crowding and  
Conflict, and Management Preferences  
at the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area  
Summer 2001**

**Report to Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area  
307 West Sackett Avenue  
Salida, CO 81201-1654**

**by**

**Roxanne M. Hernandez  
Coal Creek Consultants, LLC**

**January 19, 2002**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Mike Swope, field technician for this survey effort, for his unwavering commitment to data collection and data entry. His efforts made this report possible.

I'd also like to thank the almost 1,800 visitors to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area for taking time from their recreational pursuits to complete the survey.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	i
LIST OF TABLES .....	iii
INTRODUCTION	
Study Objectives .....	1
RESEARCH METHODS	
Study Population .....	1
Study Area .....	1
Sampling Plan .....	1
Data Collection Instrument .....	3
RESULTS	
Demographic Characteristics .....	3
Purpose of Visit .....	3
Place of Origin .....	6
Trip Characteristics .....	8
Perceptions of Resource Damage .....	8
Visit Satisfaction .....	9
Perceptions of Crowding .....	9
Perceptions of Management Problems .....	12
Preferences for Facilities, Services, Management .....	16
APPENDIX A: Survey Instrument .....	22
APPENDIX B: Frequencies .....	25
APPENDIX C: Visitor Comments .....	27

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Surveys collected by river section . . . . .	2
Table 2.	Age of visitors to AHRA . . . . .	3
Table 3.	Recreational activities engaged in . . . . .	3
Table 4.	Primary purpose of visit . . . . .	4
Table 5.	Recreational activities engaged in by river segment . . . . .	4
Table 6.	Primary recreational activity by river segment . . . . .	5
Table 7.	Recreational activities engaged in by river section . . . . .	6
Table 8.	Visitor place of origin . . . . .	7
Table 9.	Visitor county of origin (within Colorado) . . . . .	8
Table 10.	Numbers of people expected to see along the river . . . . .	10
Table 11.	Feelings regarding numbers of people actually seen along the river . . . . .	10
Table 12.	Perceptions of crowding by river segment and location along the river . . . . .	11
Table 13.	Too many commercial boaters experienced as a problem by primary activity type . . . . .	13
Table 14.	Perceptions of selected management problems by river segment . . . . .	14
Table 15.	Too many commercial boaters experienced as a problem by selected primary activity types across segments . . . . .	15
Table 16.	Management action preferences . . . . .	16
Table 17.	Management action preferences by river segment . . . . .	17
Table 18.	Differences between selected river sections and selected management actions . . . . .	20

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area (AHRA) stretches nearly 150 miles, from Leadville to Lake Pueblo State Park. The AHRA is managed cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Colorado Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (CDPOR), in partnership with the United States Forest Service (USFS) and Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW). Use along the river varies from sections that are primarily used by fishermen to areas primarily used by boaters. Levels of development, which range from completely undeveloped sites to hardened sites with campgrounds and/or picnic areas, also vary along the river.

### **Study Objective**

The January 2001 AHRA Management Plan includes an action for monitoring visitor preferences and perceptions regarding public visitation. To accomplish this end, a visitor survey was conducted during the summer months of 2001, the first summer after implementation of the new AHRA management plan. The data contained within this report is intended to provide the BLM, CDPOR, USFS and CDOW with a current assessment of visitor satisfaction, perceptions of conflict and crowding, and management preferences, as well as serve as a baseline for future studies.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

### **Study Population**

The study population was visitors to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area during the summer use season in 2001, from May 24 through August 12. Unlike previous studies conducted on the AHRA, which focused on boaters and/or boaters and fishermen, this study included all visitors to the AHRA, whether boaters, fishermen, picnickers or those engaging in a different activity within the Recreation Area.

### **Study Area**

The AHRA is broken into six segments, which comprise thirteen sections. Twelve of the sections, 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 3, 4A, 4B and 5, were included in this study. These sections include river segments from Leadville to Canon City (See Table 1). Both developed sites, which are those formalized and managed by the BLM and CDPOR, and undeveloped sites, which are informal pulloffs, are included in the sample. Section 6, which extends from Canon City to Pueblo Reservoir, was not included in this study since visitation estimates indicated that an adequate sample size for statistical analysis was unlikely to be obtained.

### **Sampling Plan**

The river was stratified by river section and weekend/weekday. Weekends were considered to be Saturday and Sunday and holidays. Weekdays were Monday through Friday and were assumed to be interchangeable, i.e., weekday use was assumed to vary insignificantly between days.

Each of the river sections within weekday and weekend strata were sampled in systematic fashion in random order after a randomly selected start. Additionally, time periods a.m. (9 a.m. until 1 p.m.) and p.m. (1:30 p.m. until 5:30 p.m.), were sampled in the same fashion. More specifically, a.m.

weekdays were sampled in the order of 2C, 2D, 1A, 4B, 3, 2B, 5, 1D, 4A, 1C, 1B and 2A. P.m. weekdays were sampled in the order of 2D, 1A, 1B, 5, 2B, 4A, 3, 1D, 4B, 2C, 2A and 1C. A.m. weekends were sampled in the order of 1B, 2C, 2B, 1A, 3, 1D, 4B, 5, 4A, 2A, 1C and 2D. Finally, p.m. weekends were sampled in the order of 2A, 4B, 1A, 1B, 4A, 2C, 1D, 2B, 3, 5, 2D and 1C. Each weekday and weekend time period was sampled at least twice during the summer. The field technician had three of seven days off per week. The days off were selected as a block of days in a systematic random fashion. In order to ensure sufficient coverage of weekends, days off were restricted to weekdays. If the first day off fell on a Thursday, the subsequent days off would be Friday and Monday; the following week's days off would be Friday, Monday and Tuesday, and so on. This permitted the cycling of days off during the course of the week and assured coverage of all weekdays at all sections.

Since there were twelve river sections to sample and only one field technician to collect data, each section was saturation sampled. That is, the technician contacted all available visitors at each site within each section, whether developed or undeveloped, throughout the four-hour survey collection period.

A total of 1,779 surveys were collected. Survey locations were determined by put-in/take-out locations and, if the survey respondent was not participating in boating at the time of the survey, by the location where the survey was conducted. If respondents were at the start of their visit, the survey location reflects the section of their put-in location; if respondents were not at the start of their visit, the survey location reflects the section at the take-out location. Surveys collected at developed areas comprised 78.5% of the sample and undeveloped areas comprised the remainder. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of surveys collected across the twelve sections.

Table 1. Surveys collected by river section

	n	%
1A – Leadville to Granite	66	3.7
1B – Granite to Numbers	134	7.5
1C – Numbers to Railroad Bridge	221	12.4
1D – Railroad Bridge to Buena Vista	131	7.4
2A – Buena Vista to Fisherman's Bridge	217	12.2
2B – Fisherman's Bridge to Stone Bridge	309	17.4
2C – Stone Bridge to Big Bend	56	3.1
2D – Big Bend to Salida	70	3.9
3 – Salida to Vallie Bridge	88	4.9
4A – Vallie Bridge to Texas Creek	74	4.2
4B – Texas Creek to Parkdale	209	11.7
5 – Parkdale to Canon City	204	11.5
Total	1779	99.9

Note: Total less than 100% due to rounding.

## Data Collection Instrument

The data collection instrument consisted of a self-administered questionnaire (see Appendix A), two pages in length. Questions on the survey included basic demographic information, perceptions of conflict, crowding and resource damage, and management preferences.

## **RESULTS**

### Demographic Characteristics

Of the 1,779 surveys collected, 56% of the respondents were male, 40% were female, and 4% did not respond to the gender question. Respondents' ages ranged from 12 to 86. Table 2 below reflects the age distribution of visitors who were surveyed at the AHRA.

Table 2. Age of visitors to AHRA

	n	%
18 or younger	181	10.2
19 to 25	318	17.9
26 to 35	524	29.5
36 to 45	345	19.4
46 to 55	219	12.3
56 to 60	54	3.0
61 and over	138	7.8
Total	1779	100.1

Note: Totals more than 100% due to rounding.

### Purpose of Visit

Not surprisingly, the primary purpose of visits to the AHRA was boating-related. Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the overall distribution of activity types and the primary purpose of visits to the AHRA, respectively. The distribution of those engaged in commercial rafting was almost equally split between weekdays and weekends. In contrast, approximately two-thirds of private kayaking and rafting occurred on the weekends.

Table 3. Recreational activities engaged in

Type of activity	n	%	Type of activity	n	%
Commercial kayak	47	2.6	Spin fishing	115	6.5
Private kayak	370	20.8	Fly fishing	198	11.1
Commercial raft	934	52.5	Picnicking	265	14.9
Private raft	280	15.7	Sightseeing	452	25.4
Hiking	339	19.1	Wildlife viewing	273	15.3
Biking	153	8.6	Recreational gold panning	24	1.3
Camping	440	24.7			

Note: Totals more than 100% due to respondents indicating more than one activity type.

Table 4. Primary purpose of visit

Type of activity	n	%	Type of activity	n	%
Commercial kayak	26	1.6	Spin fishing	34	2.1
Private kayak	291	17.7	Fly fishing	92	5.6
Commercial raft	822	50.1	Picnicking	16	1.0
Private raft	182	11.1	Sightseeing	64	3.9
Hiking	35	2.1	Wildlife viewing	2	.1
Biking	15	.9	Recreational gold panning	6	.4
Camping	56	3.4	Total	1641	100.0

In terms of segments, the most frequently engaged in activity on Segment 1 (n=551) was commercial rafting (41.0%), followed by private kayaking (29.4%), camping (27%), and hiking (23.6%). Segment 2 had similar breakdowns. Sightseeing was the most frequently cited recreational activity on Segment 3 (n=88) at 46.6%, followed by camping (40.9%), picnicking (36.4%), and commercial rafting (30.7%). Commercial rafting (55.3%) and sightseeing (40.1%) were the most frequently cited activities for Segment 4 (n=282). Segment 5 (n=204) had the highest proportion of commercial rafters (87.3%), followed by 21.6% of visitors engaging in sightseeing.

Table 5. Recreational activities engaged in by river segment

		Commercial kayaking	Private kayaking	Commercial rafting	Private rafting	Hiking	Biking	Camping	Spin fishing	Fly fishing	Picnicking	Sightseeing	Wildlife viewing	Recreational gold panning
Segment 1	n	10	162	226	68	130	55	149	47	88	73	123	80	8
(n=552)	%	1.8	29.3	40.9	12.3	23.6	10.0	27.0	8.5	16.0	13.2	22.3	14.4	1.5
Segment 2	n	19	167	347	144	107	50	152	22	47	59	131	79	6
(n=652)	%	2.9	25.7	53.4	22.2	16.5	7.7	23.4	3.4	7.2	9.1	20.2	12.2	.9
Segment 3	n	2	6	27	15	14	3	36	15	26	32	41	22	1
(n=88)	%	2.3	6.8	30.7	17.0	15.9	3.4	40.9	17.0	29.5	36.4	46.6	25.0	1.1
Segment 4	n	13	23	156	37	63	32	63	27	30	69	113	69	6
(n=283)	%	4.6	8.2	55.3	13.1	22.3	11.3	22.3	9.6	10.6	24.5	40.1	24.5	2.1
Segment 5	n	3	12	178	16	25	13	40	4	7	32	44	23	3
(n=204)	%	1.5	5.9	87.3	7.8	12.3	6.4	19.6	2.0	3.4	15.7	21.6	11.3	1.5

Note: Rows total more than 100% due to respondents indicating more than one activity type.

All segments reflected the greatest percentage for commercial rafting, with a high of 86% of visitors in Segment 5 (n=193) and a low of 28.4% in Segment 3 (n=81). Segment 3 also showed the greatest diversity in primary recreational activity, with more than 10% of visitors indicating private rafting, camping, fly fishing, or sightseeing as their primary activity. Segments 1 (n=510) and 2



(n=609) had the greatest number of private kayakers at 26.3% and 22.7%, respectively. Table 6 illustrates primary recreational activity by segment.

Table 6. Primary recreational activity by river segment

		Primary Recreational Activity													Total
		Commercial kayaking	Private kayaking	Commercial rafting	Private rafting	Hiking	Bicycling	Camping	Spin fishing	Fly fishing	Picnicking	Sightseeing	Wildlife viewing	Recreational gold panning	
Seg. 1	n	4	134	195	44	16	8	19	12	51	3	19	1	4	510
	%	.8	26.3	38.2	8.6	3.1	1.6	3.7	2.4	10.0	.6	3.7	.2	.8	100.0
Seg. 2	n	10	138	303	97	10	5	19	2	15	1	9	0	0	609
	%	1.6	22.7	49.8	15.9	1.6	.8	3.1	.3	2.5	.2	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Seg. 3	n	1	5	23	10	1	0	9	7	11	5	9	0	0	81
	%	1.2	6.2	28.4	12.3	1.2	0.0	11.1	8.6	13.6	6.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	99.9
Seg. 4	n	9	10	135	21	8	0	6	12	15	7	24	1	0	248
	%	3.6	4.0	54.4	8.5	3.2	0.0	2.4	4.8	6.0	2.8	9.7	.4	0.0	99.8
Seg. 5	n	2	4	166	10	0	2	3	1	0	0	3	0	2	193
	%	1.0	2.1	86.0	5.2	0.0	1.0	1.6	.5	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	1.0	100.0
Total	n	26	291	822	182	35	15	56	34	92	16	64	2	6	1641
	% of total	1.6	17.7	50.1	11.1	2.1	.9	3.4	2.1	5.6	1.0	3.9	.1	.4	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Table 7 on the following page illustrates the distribution of activities engaged in by all river sections. Note that the sample sizes for several river sections are too small to consider the distribution representative of the populations on these sections.

Table 7. Recreational activities engaged in by river section

		Commercial kayaking	Private kayaking	Commercial rafting	Private rafting	Hiking	Biking	Camping	Spin fishing	Fly fishing	Picnicking	Sightseeing	Wildlife viewing	Recreational gold panning
Section 1A	n	0	10	8	0	17	4	13	17	38	8	15	14	0
(n=66)	%	0.0	15.2	12.1	0.0	25.8	6.1	9.7	25.8	57.6	12.1	22.7	21.2	0.0
Section 1B	n	3	43	46	26	28	14	40	18	26	19	25	18	2
(n=134)	%	2.3	32.3	34.6	19.5	21.1	10.5	30.1	13.5	19.5	14.3	18.8	13.5	1.5
Section 1C	n	5	73	115	31	38	19	61	6	16	25	38	25	3
(n=221)	%	2.3	33.0	52.0	14.0	17.2	8.6	27.6	2.7	7.2	11.3	17.2	11.3	1.4
Section 1D	n	2	36	57	11	47	18	35	6	8	21	45	23	3
(n=131)	%	1.5	27.5	43.5	8.4	35.9	13.7	26.7	4.6	6.1	16.0	34.4	17.6	2.3
Section 2A	n	8	48	121	42	31	16	32	6	16	13	30	19	1
(n=217)	%	3.7	22.1	55.8	19.4	14.3	7.4	14.7	2.8	7.4	6.0	13.8	8.8	.5
Section 2B	n	5	71	166	86	44	18	78	8	15	31	66	36	3
(n=309)	%	1.6	23.1	53.9	27.9	14.3	5.8	25.3	2.6	4.9	10.1	21.4	11.7	1.0
Section 2C	n	2	7	39	10	13	8	15	5	7	8	17	10	2
(n=56)	%	3.6	12.7	70.9	18.2	23.6	14.5	27.3	9.1	12.7	14.5	30.9	18.2	3.6
Section 2D	n	4	41	21	6	19	8	27	3	9	7	18	14	0
(n=70)	%	5.7	58.6	30.0	8.6	27.1	11.4	38.6	4.3	12.9	10.0	25.7	20.0	0.0
Section 3	n	2	6	27	15	14	3	36	15	26	32	41	22	1
(n=88)	%	2.3	6.8	30.7	17.0	15.9	3.4	40.9	17.0	29.5	36.4	46.6	25.0	1.1
Section 4A	n	11	2	13	7	27	11	18	12	10	26	33	24	1
(n=74)	%	4.9	2.7	17.6	9.5	36.5	14.9	24.3	16.2	13.5	35.1	44.6	32.4	1.4
Section 4B	n	2	21	143	30	36	21	45	15	20	43	80	45	5
(n=209)	%	1.0	10.1	68.8	14.4	17.3	10.1	21.6	7.2	9.6	20.7	38.5	21.6	2.4
Section 5	n	3	12	178	16	25	13	40	4	7	32	44	23	3
(n=204)	%	1.5	5.9	87.3	7.8	12.3	6.4	19.6	2.0	3.4	15.7	21.6	11.3	1.5

Note: Row totals are more than 100% due to respondents indicating more than one recreational activity engaged in.

### Visitor Place of Origin

Approximately 54% of visitors to the AHRA were Colorado residents. Almost 700 of 1,779 visitors, or 38.3%, were from other states, 1.2% were from other countries, and 7% did not list a place of origin. Of those residing in Colorado at the time of the survey, 72% came from only seven counties. Table 8 reflects the distribution of visitor origin, which includes Colorado, other states and other countries, and Table 9 reflects the county of origin for visitors from Colorado.

Table 8. Place of origin

Place of origin	n	%	Place of origin	n	%
United States	1635	91.9	New Mexico	31	1.7
Alabama	1	.1	New York	12	.7
Alaska	1	.1	North Carolina	9	.5
Arizona	22	1.2	North Dakota	2	.1
Arkansas	12	.7	Ohio	16	.9
California	47	2.6	Oklahoma	18	1.0
Colorado	953	53.6	Oregon	3	.2
Connecticut	1	.1	Pennsylvania	5	.3
District of Columbia	4	.2	Rhode Island	2	.1
Florida	23	1.3	South Carolina	8	.4
Georgia	5	.3	South Dakota	4	.2
Idaho	2	.1	Tennessee	11	.6
Illinois	42	2.4	Texas	136	7.6
Indiana	9	.5	Utah	9	.5
Iowa	21	1.2	Virginia	7	.4
Kansas	42	2.4	Washington	5	.3
Kentucky	3	.2	West Virginia	2	.1
Louisiana	10	.6	Wisconsin	14	.8
Maryland	7	.4	Wyoming	7	.4
Massachusetts	3	.2	Other countries	20	1.1
Michigan	15	.8	Australia	1	.1
Minnesota	28	1.6	Canada	2	.1
Mississippi	1	.1	France	1	.1
Missouri	41	2.3	Liechtenstein	1	.1
Montana	1	.1	New Zealand	4	.2
Nebraska	28	1.6	Scotland	4	.2
Nevada	1	.1	United Kingdom	7	.4
New Hampshire	3	.2	Unknown origin	128	7.2
New Jersey	4	.2	Total	1779	100.2

Note: Totals more than 100% due to rounding

Table 9. Visitor county of origin (within Colorado)

Colorado County	n	%	Colorado County	n	%
Adams	25	2.6	Jefferson	79	8.3
Arapahoe	60	6.3	La Plata	9	0.9
Boone	1	0.1	Lake	10	1.0
Boulder	83	8.7	Larimer	19	1.9
Broomfield	1	0.1	Latham	1	0.1
Chaffee	85	8.9	Otero	1	0.1
Crowley	1	0.1	Park	5	0.5
Denver	170	17.8	Pitkin	8	0.8
Douglas	30	3.1	Pueblo	17	1.8
Eagle	34	3.5	Routt	4	0.4
Elbert	3	0.3	San Miguel	2	0.2
El Paso	131	13.7	Summit	79	8.2
Fremont	43	4.5	Teller	3	0.3
Garfield	13	1.4	Vail	1	0.1
Gilpin	2	0.2	Weld	5	0.5
Grand	6	0.6			
Gunnison	22	2.3			
			Total	955	99.3

Note: Totals less than 100% due to rounding

### Trip Characteristics

Excluding visitors whose primary purpose of their visit was camping, most visitors stay at the AHRA for five to eight hours. Over eighty percent of private kayakers stayed more than two and less than eight hours. Commercial and private rafters were comparable, with 79.3% of commercial rafters visiting for more than two and less than eight hours, and 76.2% of private rafters staying the same amount of time. Excluding campers, the vast majority of visitors listing non-boating activities as the primary purpose of their trip stayed less than five hours.

For those visitors engaging in rafting or kayaking (n=1367), 21.8% of them put in at Fisherman's Bridge and took out at Hecla Junction. The second most frequent combination of put-in/take-out was Numbers/Railroad Bridge with 10.8%, followed by Fisherman's Bridge/Stone Bridge at 6.9%, Pinnacle Rock/Canon City River Station Boat Ramp at 6.1%, and Pinnacle Rock/Pink House at 5.4%. The remaining put-in/take-out combinations each comprised 5% or less of the total.

### Perceptions of Resource Damage

The vast majority, or 98%, of visitors rated the condition of the recreation site in which they were surveyed as good to excellent (n=1,755). When asked whether they thought the river environment was being damaged by recreational use, 64.2% of 1,762 surveyed responded that they did not believe it was being damaged, 23% responded that they did believe it was being damaged, and the remaining 12.7% did not know. When asked what kinds of damage they see, 62.5% of those surveyed indicated litter, 40.3% soil damage/erosion, 35.7% vegetation destruction, 19.8% the presence of human waste, and 14.6% fewer fish.

Only 26.3% percent of Segment 1 respondents believed the river environment is being damaged (n=548), 23.4% of Segment 2 respondents (n=646), 26.4% of Segment 3 respondents (n=87), 21.3% of Segment 4 respondents (n=277), and 14.2% of Segment 5 respondents (n=204). Perceptions of the kinds of resource damage occurring did not vary across segments. The most frequently cited type of damage perceived to be occurring is litter, followed by soil damage/erosion, vegetation destruction, presence of human waste and fewer fish.

Regarding sections, 30.3% of survey respondents in Section 1B (n=132) believe that the river environment is being damaged by recreational use compared to less than 15% of respondents in Section 5 (n=204). On average across all sections, almost one-quarter of respondents perceived damage to the river environment. Consistent with the riverwide results, the most frequently cited type of damage perceived to be occurring is litter, followed by soil damage/erosion, vegetation destruction, presence of human waste and fewer fish.

### Visit Satisfaction

Visit satisfaction may be affected by a variety of factors, including weather, interpersonal interactions, perceptions of crowding and conflict, and an assortment of other variables. Of 1,337 visitors who responded to this question, 86.5% rated their satisfaction with their visit as very good to excellent, 12% rated their visit as good, and only 1.5% rated their satisfaction as fair to poor.

Segment 5 visitors (n=201) showed the highest level of visit satisfaction with 91.1% rating their satisfaction as very good to excellent. Segment 2 followed with 89.2% of visitors (n=473) rating their satisfaction as very good to excellent, followed by 86.4% of Segment 4 respondents (n=176), 82.5% of Segment 1 respondents (n=424) and 77.7% of Segment 3 respondents (n=63).

Considering only those sections whose sample sizes were at least one hundred, the greatest level of visit satisfaction was found in Section 2B (n=290), with 91.4% of visitors rating their satisfaction as very good to excellent. Section 5 followed with 91.1% (n=201), 87.2% for Section 1C (n=211) and 86.8% in Section 4B (n=129).

### Perceptions of Crowding

Perceptions of crowding questions focused on visitors' expectations of the numbers of people they would see at various sites along the river as well as their feelings of the numbers of people they actually saw at different locations. In response to the question, "Overall, did you feel crowded while visiting the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area today?", 86.9% of visitors responded "no" (n=1310). Tables 10 and 11 illustrate visitors' expectations of the numbers of people they would see and feelings regarding the numbers they actually saw, respectively.

Generally, visitors felt more crowded on weekends than on weekdays. In response to the dichotomous crowding question, 17.5% (n=724) of those surveyed on weekend days felt crowded compared to 7.5% (n=586) of those surveyed on weekdays. On average, approximately 10% more visitors surveyed on weekends felt there were a few too many to far too many people seen on the river, at put-in and take-out, at lunch sites and in the campgrounds.

Table 10. Numbers of people expected to see along the river

		Far fewer than expected	Fewer than expected	About what expected	Far more than expected	Had no expectations	Total
While on river	n	117	200	602	201	66	1186
	%	9.9	16.9	50.8	16.9	5.6	100.1
At river put-in	n	96	183	593	193	63	1128
	%	8.5	16.2	52.6	17.1	5.6	100.0
At river take-out	n	92	187	581	119	77	1056
	%	8.7	17.7	55.0	11.3	7.3	100.0
At lunch sites	n	90	151	503	136	106	986
	%	9.1	15.3	51.0	13.8	10.8	100.0
At campgrounds	n	88	133	437	95	143	896
	%	9.8	14.8	48.8	10.6	16.0	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Table 11. Feelings regarding numbers of people actually seen along the river

		Would like to see a lot more people	Would like to see a few more people	Neither too many nor too few people	A few too many people	Far too many people	Total
While on river	n	25	80	806	192	52	1155
	%	2.2	6.9	69.8	16.6	4.5	100.0
At river put-in	n	15	75	777	167	57	1091
	%	1.4	6.9	71.2	15.3	5.2	100.0
At river take-out	n	14	71	783	125	47	1040
	%	1.3	6.8	75.3	12.0	4.5	99.9
At lunch sites	n	13	72	715	133	42	975
	%	1.3	7.4	73.3	13.6	4.3	99.9
At campgrounds	n	19	73	626	103	47	868
	%	2.2	8.4	72.1	11.9	5.4	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Among the five river segments, visitors surveyed in Segments 2 and 5 felt the most crowded, although the vast majority of visitors in all segments did not feel crowded. When asked the forced choice question of whether they felt crowded, 18.8% of visitors in Segment 2 responded in the affirmative (n=467), followed by 18.4% of visitors in Segment 5 (n=190), 9.1% in Segment 4 (n=176), 7.4% in Segment 1 (n=420), and 1.8% in Segment 3 (n=57).

While on the river, 29.5% of Segment 2 visitors (n=406) indicated that they felt there were too many people. 25.8% of Segment 2 visitors (n=398) felt there were too many people at the river put-in. 26.2% of Segment 5 respondents felt there were too many people at the river put-in (n=172) and

26.2% felt there were too many people at the lunch sites. Table 12 illustrates perceptions of crowding by river segment and location along the river.

Table 12. Perceptions of crowding by river segment and location along the river

		Would like to see a lot more people	Would like to see a few more people	Neither too many nor too few people	A few too many people	Far too many people	Total	
While on river	Segment 1	n	5	29	283	44	12	373
		%	1.3	7.8	75.9	11.8	3.2	100.0
	Segment 2	n	7	23	256	91	29	406
		%	1.7	5.7	63.1	22.4	7.1	100.0
	Segment 3	n	3	2	31	3	2	41
		%	7.3	4.9	75.6	7.3	4.9	100.0
	Segment 4	n	7	16	111	19	4	157
		%	4.5	10.2	70.7	12.1	2.5	100.0
	Segment 5	n	3	10	125	35	5	178
		%	1.7	5.6	70.2	19.7	2.8	100.0
At river put-in	Segment 1	n	5	25	266	33	11	340
		%	1.5	7.4	78.2	9.7	3.2	100.0
	Segment 2	n	5	23	267	73	30	398
		%	1.3	5.8	67.1	18.3	7.5	100.0
	Segment 3	n	1	2	26	5	1	35
		%	2.9	5.7	74.3	14.3	2.9	100.1
	Segment 4	n	4	13	103	22	4	146
		%	2.7	8.9	70.5	15.1	2.7	99.9
	Segment 5	n	0	12	115	34	11	172
		%	0.0	7.0	66.9	19.8	6.4	100.1
At river take-out	Segment 1	n	3	23	268	30	9	333
		%	.9	6.9	80.5	9.0	2.7	100.0
	Segment 2	n	4	25	274	59	28	390
		%	1.0	6.4	70.3	15.1	7.2	100.0
	Segment 3	n	1	1	26	3	2	33
		%	3.0	3.0	78.8	9.1	6.1	100.0
	Segment 4	n	5	11	97	14	6	133
		%	3.8	8.3	72.9	10.5	4.5	100.0
	Segment 5	n	1	11	118	19	2	151
		%	.7	7.3	78.1	12.6	1.3	100.0

		Would like to see a lot more people	Would like to see a few more people	Neither too many nor too few people	A few too many people	Far too many people	Total	
At lunch sites	Segment 1	n	2	25	245	30	9	311
		%	.6	8.0	78.8	9.6	2.9	99.90
	Segment 2	n	4	21	233	52	21	331
		%	1.2	6.3	70.4	15.7	6.3	99.9
	Segment 3	n	0	4	33	4	0	41
		%	0.0	9.8	80.5	9.8	0.0	100.1
	Segment 4	n	6	13	107	15	6	147
		%	4.1	8.8	72.8	10.2	4.1	100.0
	Segment 5	n	1	9	97	32	6	145
		%	.7	6.2	66.9	22.1	4.1	100.0
At campgrounds	Segment 1	n	7	26	209	38	17	297
		%	2.4	8.8	70.4	12.8	5.7	100.1
	Segment 2	n	6	24	219	38	19	306
		%	2.0	7.8	71.6	12.4	6.2	100.0
	Segment 3	n	0	0	35	5	0	40
		%	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	100.0
	Segment 4	n	5	11	88	10	5	119
		%	4.2	9.2	73.9	8.4	4.2	99.9
	Segment 5	n	1	12	75	12	6	106
		%	.9	11.3	70.8	11.3	5.7	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

No differences were found to exist between river sections on the dichotomous variable of crowding or feelings regarding the numbers of people actually seen at various locations along the river.

### Perceptions of Management Problems

Perceptions of management problems questions focused on visitor density, resource concerns and the provision of facilities. Regarding litter at recreation sites, 71.9% of visitors indicated that it was not a problem (n=1276), while 26.3% indicated that it was a slight to moderate problem. The presence of human waste was not considered a problem by 86.5% of respondents (n=1226).

The presence of too many fisherman was considered a slight to very serious problem by only 8.2% of those surveyed (n=1259), too many private boaters was considered a slight to very serious problem by 10.2% (n=1244), and 34.2% of those surveyed considered too many commercial boaters to be a slight to very serious problem (n=1264). Too many commercial boaters was perceived to be a moderate to very serious problem by 22.5% of those surveyed on a weekend day, compared to 11.8% of those surveyed on a weekday. Table 13 illustrates the perceptions of too many



commercial boaters by several recreational activities (Only those primary recreational activities whose sample size is 100 or greater are included.).

Table 13. Too many commercial boaters experienced as a problem by primary activity type

		Not a problem	Slight problem	Moderate problem	Serious problem	Very serious problem	Total
Private kayaking	n	93	35	46	16	14	204
	%	45.6	17.2	22.5	7.8	6.9	100.0
Commercial rafting	n	432	112	42	11	1	598
	%	72.2	18.7	7.0	1.8	0.2	99.9
Private rafting	n	65	17	18	16	10	126
	%	51.6	13.5	14.3	12.7	7.9	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Although not considered a problem by most, lack of drinking water at put-ins and at lunch sites was considered more of a problem than the availability of lunch sites and restrooms. Thirty-five percent of respondents indicated the lack of drinking water at put-ins as a slight to very serious problem (n=1193), 35% of respondents considered the lack of drinking water at lunch sites a problem (n=1208), and 29% considered lack of drinking water at campgrounds as a problem (n=1181). Too few restrooms at put-ins was considered by 73.8% not to be a problem (n=1251) and too few restrooms along the river was not considered a problem by 74.9% (n=1238). Occupied lunch sites did not present a problem for 80.4% of respondents (n=1205), nor were too few lunch sites a problem for 81.6% of those surveyed (n=1219).

In most cases, there were no differences between segments regarding perceptions of management problems. On average, 91.7% of respondents did not believe that too many fishermen are a problem (n=1259), 89.8% did not perceive a problem with too many private boaters, (n=1244), 86.5% did not believe the presence of human waste to be a problem (n=1226), and 81.6% did not find too few lunch sites a problem (n=1219). Almost one-third of respondents believe too many commercial boaters and the lack of water at lunch sites and at put-ins/take-outs to be problems, and almost one-quarter of respondents in each segment perceived the lack of restrooms along the river to be a problem. Too few restrooms at put-ins/take-outs was perceived to be a problem for almost one-third of respondents in Segment 5 (n=185). Too few tables at lunch sites was a problem for approximately 25% of visitors surveyed in Segments 4 (n=159) and 5 (n=182), and almost one-quarter of those surveyed in Segment 5 found occupied lunch sites to a problem (n=181). Table 14 illustrates the distribution of perceptions of management problems across segments where differences exist. Table 15 illustrates differences between selected activity types and whether too many commercial boaters was experienced as a problem across segments. Consider the small sample sizes in some segments when interpreting this table.

Table 14. Perceptions of selected management problems by river segment

			Not a problem	Slight to moderate problem	Serious to very serious problem	Total
Too many commercial boaters	Segment 1	n	278	98	25	401
		%	69.3	24.4	6.2	99.9
	Segment 2	n	267	138	47	452
		%	59.1	30.5	10.4	100.0
	Segment 3	n	37	13	4	54
		%	68.5	24.1	7.4	100.0
	Segment 4	n	125	40	5	170
		%	73.5	23.5	2.9	99.9
	Segment 5	n	124	58	5	187
		%	66.3	31.0	2.7	100.0
Lack of water at lunch sites	Segment 1	n	274	96	17	387
		%	70.8	24.8	4.4	100.0
	Segment 2	n	292	115	22	429
		%	68.1	26.8	5.1	100.0
	Segment 3	n	28	15	9	52
		%	53.8	28.8	17.3	99.9
	Segment 4	n	90	57	11	158
		%	57.0	36.1	7.0	100.1
	Segment 5	n	115	54	13	182
		%	63.2	29.7	7.1	100.0
Lack of water at put-in/take-out	Segment 1	n	263	102	20	385
		%	68.3	26.5	5.2	100.0
	Segment 2	n	282	116	29	427
		%	66.0	27.2	6.8	100.0
	Segment 3	n	30	11	7	48
		%	62.5	22.9	14.6	100.0
	Segment 4	n	87	56	11	154
		%	56.5	36.4	7.1	100.0
	Segment 5	n	113	56	10	179
		%	63.1	31.3	5.6	100.0

Table 15. Too many commercial boaters experienced as a problem by selected primary activity type across segments.

			Not a problem	Slight problem	Moderate problem	Serious problem	Very serious problem	Total
Private kayaking	Segment 1	n	41	18	22	11	1	93
		%	44.1	19.4	23.7	11.8	1.1	100.1
	Segment 2	n	47	14	20	3	12	96
		%	49.0	14.6	20.8	3.1	12.5	100.0
	Segment 3	n	2	0	0	2	0	4
		%	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
	Segment 4	n	3	3	1	0	0	7
		%	42.9	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.1
	Segment 5	n	0	0	3	0	1	4
		%	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	100.0
Commercial rafting	Segment 1	n	124	16	5	2	1	148
		%	83.8	10.8	3.4	1.4	0.7	100.1
	Segment 2	n	139	43	23	6	0	211
		%	65.9	20.4	10.9	2.8	0.0	100.0
	Segment 3	n	6	2	2	0	0	10
		%	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Segment 4	n	61	12	3	1	0	77
		%	79.2	15.6	3.9	1.3	0.0	100.0
	Segment 5	n	102	39	9	2	0	152
		%	67.1	25.7	5.9	1.3	0.0	100.0
Private rafting	Segment 1	n	20	7	3	1	2	33
		%	60.6	21.2	9.1	3.0	6.1	100.0
	Segment 2	n	27	8	14	12	7	68
		%	39.7	11.8	20.6	17.6	10.3	100.0
	Segment 3	n	6	0	1	0	0	7
		%	85.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Segment 4	n	5	1	0	2	0	8
		%	62.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0
	Segment 5	n	7	1	0	1	1	10
		%	70.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Considering only those sections with a sample size greater than one hundred, 25% or more of visitors surveyed in Sections 4B and 5 believed the lack of restrooms along the river, the lack of tables at lunch sites, and the lack of lunch sites to be problems. The lack of water at lunch sites was perceived to be a slight to very serious problem to 47.8% of visitors surveyed in Section 4B (n=113), 36.8% of visitors in Section 5 (n=182), 27.6% of visitors surveyed in Section 1C (n=199),

and 24.9% of visitors in Section 2B (n=261). More than one-half of visitors surveyed in Section 4B believe the lack of water at put-ins/take-outs is a problem (n=112), compared to 36.9% in Section 5 (n=179), 31.3% in Section 1C (n=198), and 27.6% in Section 2B (n=261).

### Preferences for Facilities, Services and Management

Table 16 illustrates the level of support or opposition for eight management actions listed on the survey. The majority of those surveyed neither support nor oppose the variety of management actions listed on the survey, which include providing more parking, restrooms, put-in/take-out points, wildlife viewing facilities, campgrounds, lunch sites, and more ranger patrol along the river and in the campgrounds.

Differences did exist, however, between some of the user types. 39.8% of private kayakers (n=201) opposed providing more rangers at recreation sites compared to 17.6% of commercial rafters (n=564) and 27.3% of private rafters (n=121). Almost 42% of private kayakers also opposed providing more rangers on the river (n=201) compared to 17% of commercial rafters (n=564) and 31.2% of private rafters (n=122). Differences also existed regarding providing more parking along the river, with 21.5% of private kayakers supporting the provision of more parking (n=205) compared to only 9.4% of commercial rafters (n=574) and 9.7% of private rafters (n=123).

Table 16. Management action preferences

Management Action	Strongly oppose	Somewhat oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat support	Strongly support	Total
Provide more parking areas along river						
n	273	252	523	135	55	1238
%	22.1	20.4	42.2	10.9	4.4	100.0
Provide more restrooms along the river						
n	194	194	503	252	89	1232
%	15.7	15.7	40.8	20.5	7.2	99.9
Provide more put-in/take-out points along the river						
n	233	199	560	157	63	1212
%	19.2	16.4	46.2	13.0	5.2	100.0
Provide more wildlife viewing facilities at existing recreational sites						
n	145	119	602	251	91	1208
%	12.0	9.9	49.8	20.8	7.5	100.0
Provide more campgrounds along the river						
n	204	218	535	186	72	1215
%	16.8	17.9	44.0	15.3	5.9	99.9

Management Action		Strongly oppose	Somewhat oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat support	Strongly support	Total
Provide more lunch sites along the river	n	191	202	591	175	48	1207
	%	15.8	16.7	49.0	14.5	4.0	100.0
Provide more park rangers on the river	n	158	142	716	136	59	1211
	%	13.0	11.7	59.1	11.2	4.9	99.9
Provide more park rangers at recreation sites	n	155	136	713	142	64	1210
	%	12.8	11.2	58.9	11.7	5.3	99.9

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Across all segments, more visitors surveyed opposed providing more parking along the river, providing more put-in/take-out points, more campgrounds along the river, more lunch sites, more rangers along the river, and more rangers in the campgrounds, than supported those management actions. Only for providing more wildlife viewing facilities did visitors indicate more support than opposition. Table 17 illustrates the differences between river segments for the variety of management actions surveyed.

Table 17. Management action preferences by river segment

		Somewhat or strongly oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat or strongly support	Total	
Provide more parking areas along the river	Segment 1	n	178	162	60	400
		%	44.5	40.5	15.0	100.0
	Segment 2	n	184	198	57	439
		%	41.9	45.1	13.0	100.0
	Segment 3	n	23	17	14	54
		%	42.6	31.5	25.9	100.0
	Segment 4	n	69	57	40	166
		%	41.6	34.3	24.1	100.0
	Segment 5	n	71	89	19	179
		%	39.7	49.7	10.6	100.0

		Somewhat or strongly oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat or strongly support	Total
Provide more restrooms along the river	Segment 1	n 143 35.8	149 37.3	108 27.0	400 100.1
	Segment 2	n 134 30.7	197 45.2	105 24.1	436 100.0
	Segment 3	n 19 35.8	19 35.8	15 28.3	53 99.9
	Segment 4	n 46 28.2	61 37.4	56 34.4	163 100.0
	Segment 5	n 46 25.6	77 42.8	57 31.7	180 100.1
Provide more put-in/take-out points along the river	Segment 1	n 158 40.2	158 40.2	77 19.6	393 100.0
	Segment 2	n 138 31.9	208 48.0	87 20.1	433 100.0
	Segment 3	n 23 43.4	26 49.1	4 7.5	53 100.0
	Segment 4	n 61 38.6	70 44.3	27 17.1	158 100.0
	Segment 5	n 52 29.7	98 56.0	25 14.3	175 100.0
Provide more facilities for viewing wildlife at existing recreational sites	Segment 1	n 95 24.4	198 50.8	97 24.9	390 100.1
	Segment 2	n 87 20.3	227 52.9	115 26.8	429 100.0
	Segment 3	n 13 25.0	27 51.9	12 23.1	52 100.0
	Segment 4	n 36 22.4	61 37.9	64 39.8	161 100.1
	Segment 5	n 33 18.8	89 50.6	54 30.7	176 100.1
Provide more campgrounds along the river	Segment 1	n 153 38.8	155 39.3	86 21.8	394 99.9
	Segment 2	n 146 34.0	200 46.5	84 19.5	430 100.0
	Segment 3	n 16 31.4	24 47.1	11 21.6	51 100.1
	Segment 4	n 66 40.2	57 34.8	41 25.0	164 100.0
	Segment 5	n 41 23.3	99 56.3	36 20.5	176 100.1

		Somewhat or strongly oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat or strongly support	Total	
Provide more lunch sites along the river	Segment 1	n	145	175	71	391
		%	37.1	44.8	18.2	100.1
	Segment 2	n	138	223	66	427
		%	32.3	52.2	15.5	100.0
	Segment 3	n	15	24	12	51
		%	29.4	47.1	23.5	100.0
	Segment 4	n	52	71	41	164
		%	31.7	43.3	25.0	100.0
	Segment 5	n	43	98	33	174
		%	24.7	56.3	19.0	100.0
Provide more park rangers on the river	Segment 1	n	104	222	67	393
		%	26.5	56.5	17.0	100.0
	Segment 2	n	112	256	61	429
		%	26.1	59.7	14.2	100.0
	Segment 3	n	14	31	6	51
		%	27.5	60.8	11.8	100.0
	Segment 4	n	39	88	37	164
		%	23.8	53.7	22.6	100.1
	Segment 5	n	31	119	24	174
		%	17.8	68.4	13.8	100.0
Provide more park rangers at recreation sites	Segment 1	n	102	221	69	392
		%	26.0	56.4	17.6	100.0
	Segment 2	n	109	256	65	430
		%	25.3	59.5	15.1	99.9
	Segment 3	n	12	31	8	51
		%	23.5	60.8	15.7	100.0
	Segment 4	n	37	90	37	164
		%	22.6	54.9	22.6	100.1
	Segment 5	n	31	115	27	173
		%	17.9	66.5	15.6	100.0

Note: Totals do not equal 100% due to rounding.

Differences existed between Sections 1C, 2B, 4B and 5 regarding the provision of more restrooms along the river, provision of wildlife viewing facilities, campgrounds, and more lunch sites. Table 18 illustrates these differences.

Table 18. Differences between selected river sections and selected management actions

		Somewhat or strongly oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat or strongly support	Total	
Provide more restrooms along the river	Section 1C	n	81	81	40	202
		%	40.1	40.1	19.8	100.0
	Section 2B	n	80	126	58	264
		%	30.3	47.7	22.0	100.0
	Section 4B	n	30	45	42	117
		%	25.6	38.5	35.9	100.0
	Section 5	n	46	77	57	180
		%	25.6	42.8	31.7	100.1
Provide more facilities for viewing wildlife at existing recreation sites	Section 1C	n	50	107	39	196
		%	25.5	54.6	19.9	100.0
	Section 2B	n	49	139	71	259
		%	18.9	53.7	27.4	100.0
	Section 4B	n	24	46	48	118
		%	20.3	39.0	40.7	100.0
	Section 5	n	33	89	54	176
		%	18.8	50.6	30.7	100.1
Provide more campgrounds along the river	Section 1C	n	83	72	45	200
		%	41.5	36.0	22.5	100.0
	Section 2B	n	87	129	46	262
		%	33.2	49.2	17.6	100.0
	Section 4B	n	45	42	30	117
		%	38.5	35.9	25.6	100.0
	Section 5	n	41	99	36	176
		%	23.3	56.3	20.5	100.1



		Somewhat or strongly oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat or strongly support	Total	
Provide more lunch sites along the river	Section 1C	n	76	91	30	197
		%	38.6	46.2	15.2	100.0
	Section 2B	n	82	139	37	258
		%	31.8	53.9	14.3	100.0
	Section 4B	n	35	53	30	118
		%	29.7	44.9	25.4	100.0
	Section 5	n	43	98	33	174
		%	24.7	56.3	19.0	100.0

Note: Totals not equal to 100% due to rounding.

APPENDIX A  
Survey Instrument



Welcome to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area! We are conducting this survey to learn more about our visitors. The information you provide on this survey will help us focus our efforts on providing quality recreational experiences and effectively managing this area. Thank you for participating in this survey!



Park Use Only: \_\_\_\_\_ Location \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_ Dev./Undev. Area \_\_\_\_\_ Put-in \_\_\_\_\_

1. Which activities did you, or do you plan to, participate in while visiting the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area today? (Check all that apply.)

- Commercial kayaking       Hiking       Spin fishing       Sightseeing
- Private kayaking       Bicycling       Fly fishing       Wildlife viewing
- Commercial rafting       Camping       Picnicking       Recreational gold panning
- Private rafting

2. Of the activities you checked above, which is the primary reason for your visit to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area? Go back to Question 1 and circle the name of that activity.

3. About how long were you, or do you plan to be, recreating in the Arkansas River corridor today?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Hours      \_\_\_\_\_ Minutes

4. How would you rate the condition of this recreation site?  
 Poor                  Fair                  Good                  Very Good      Excellent  
 1                          2                          3                          4                          5

5. Do you feel the river environment is being damaged by recreational use?  
 Yes (Go to Question 5a.)       No (Go to Question 6.)       Don't know (Go to Question 6.)

5a. What kinds of damage to the river environment do you see?

- Litter                           Human waste                           Soil damage/erosion
- Fewer fish                           Vegetation destruction                           Don't know

6. How would you characterize the condition of the river environment over time? (Check one.)  
 It's in better condition                           There's been no change over time  
 It's in worse condition                           Don't know/No opinion

7. Are you at the start of today's visit to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area?  
 Yes (Go to Question 14.)       No (Continue with survey)

8. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with today's visit to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area?  
 Poor                  Fair                  Good                  Very Good      Excellent  
 1                          2                          3                          4                          5

9. How did the number of people you saw at each of the following places compare with what you had expected to see? (Check the box that best describes your feelings.)

	Not Applicable	Far fewer than expected	Fewer than expected	About what I expected	Far more than I expected	Had no expectations
While on river	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At river put-in	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At river take-out	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At lunch sites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At campgrounds	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

10. How do you feel about the number of people you saw at each of the following places? (Check the box that best describes your feelings.)

	Not Applicable	Would like to see a lot more people	Would like to see a few more people	Neither too many nor too few people	A few too many people	Far too many people
While on river	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At river put-in	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At river take-out	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At lunch sites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
At campgrounds	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

(Turn over to continue)

11. Overall, did you feel crowded while visiting the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area today?

\_\_\_\_\_ No      \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

12. Information about problems you may have experienced during your visit would be helpful in managing this recreation area. To what extent did you find each of the following to be a problem during your visit? (Circle the number that best describes how serious you found each to be.)

	Not a Problem	Slight Problem	Moderate Problem	Serious Problem	Very Serious Problem
Litter at recreation sites	1	2	3	4	5
Too many fishermen	1	2	3	4	5
Too many commercial boaters on river	1	2	3	4	5
Too many private boaters on river	1	2	3	4	5
-----					
Too few restrooms at put-ins/take-outs	1	2	3	4	5
Too few restrooms along river	1	2	3	4	5
Presence of human waste along the river	1	2	3	4	5
Too few tables at lunch sites	1	2	3	4	5
-----					
Too few lunch sites	1	2	3	4	5
Lunch sites occupied by others	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of drinking water at lunch sites	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of drinking water at put-ins/take-outs	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of drinking water at campgrounds	1	2	3	4	5

13. Given the current conditions on the river, how do you feel about each of the following management actions? (Circle the number that shows how much you support or oppose each action.)

	Strongly Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Somewhat Support	Strongly Support
Provide more parking areas along the river	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more restrooms along the river	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more put-in/take-out points along the river	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more facilities for viewing wildlife at existing recreational sites	1	2	3	4	5
-----					
Provide more campgrounds along the river	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more lunch sites along the river	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more park rangers on the river	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more park rangers at recreation sites	1	2	3	4	5

**In conclusion, we would like to ask some questions about you.**

14. What is your gender?      \_\_\_\_\_ Male      \_\_\_\_\_ Female

15. What is your age?      \_\_\_\_\_ years old

16. What is your county of residence?

- |               |                 |                                      |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| _____ Adams   | _____ Denver    | _____ Pueblo                         |
| _____ Arapaho | _____ El Paso   | _____ Other county in Colorado _____ |
| _____ Boulder | _____ Fremont   | _____ Other state _____              |
| _____ Chaffee | _____ Jefferson | _____ Other country _____            |

Comments:

---



---



---



---

***Thank for participating in this survey!***

## APPENDIX B Frequencies

1. Which activities did you, or do you plan to, participate in while visiting the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area today?  
(Check all that apply.)

<u>47</u> Commercial kayaking	<u>339</u> Hiking	<u>115</u> Spin fishing	<u>452</u> Sightseeing
<u>370</u> Private kayaking	<u>153</u> Bicycling	<u>198</u> Fly fishing	<u>273</u> Wildlife viewing
<u>934</u> Commercial rafting	<u>440</u> Camping	<u>265</u> Picnicking	<u>24</u> Recreational gold panning
<u>280</u> Private rafting			

2. Of the activities you checked above, which is the primary reason for your visit to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area?  
Go back to Question 1 and circle the name of that activity.

<u>26</u> Commercial kayaking	<u>35</u> Hiking	<u>34</u> Spin fishing	<u>64</u> Sightseeing
<u>291</u> Private kayaking	<u>15</u> Bicycling	<u>92</u> Fly fishing	<u>2</u> Wildlife viewing
<u>822</u> Commercial rafting	<u>56</u> Camping	<u>16</u> Picnicking	<u>6</u> Recreational gold panning
<u>182</u> Private rafting			

3. About how long were you, or do you plan to be, recreating in the Arkansas River corridor today?  
Range = 4 minutes to 14 days

4. How would you rate the condition of this recreation site?

Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
7	30	352	847	519

5. Do you feel the river environment is being damaged by recreational use?

406 Yes (Go to Question 5a.)      1132 No (Go to Question 6.)      224 Don't know (Go to Question 6.)

- 5a. What kinds of damage to the river environment do you see?

<u>257</u> Litter	<u>81</u> Human waste	<u>165</u> Soil damage/erosion
<u>60</u> Fewer fish	<u>146</u> Vegetation destruction	<u>27</u> Don't know

6. How would you characterize the condition of the river environment over time? (Check one.)

<u>257</u> It's in better condition	<u>285</u> There's been no change over time
<u>124</u> It's in worse condition	<u>1057</u> Don't know/No opinion

7. Are you at the start of today's visit to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area?

629 Yes (Go to Question 14.)      1126 No (Continue with survey)

8. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with today's visit to the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area?

Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
3	17	161	583	573

9. How did the number of people you saw at each of the following places compare with what you had expected to see? (Check the box that best describes your feelings.)

	N/A or Missing	Far fewer than expected	Fewer than expected	About what I expected	Far more than I expected	Had no expectations
While on river	593	117	200	602	201	66
At river put-in	651	96	183	593	193	63
At river take-out	723	92	187	581	119	77
At lunch sites	793	90	151	503	136	106
At campgrounds	883	88	133	437	95	143

10. How do you feel about the number of people you saw at each of the following places? (Check the box that best describes your feelings.)

	N/A or Missing	Would like to see a lot more people	Would like to see a few more people	Neither too many nor too few people	A few too many people	Far too many people
While on river	624	25	80	806	192	52
At river put-in	688	15	75	777	167	57
At river take-out	739	14	71	783	125	47
At lunch sites	804	13	72	715	133	42
At campgrounds	911	19	73	626	103	47

11. Overall, did you feel crowded while visiting the Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area today?

1139 No     171 Yes

12. Information about problems you may have experienced during your visit would be helpful in managing this recreation area. To what extent did you find each of the following to be a problem during your visit? (Circle the number that best describes how serious you found each to be.)

	Not a Problem	Slight Problem	Moderate Problem	Serious Problem	Very Serious Problem
Litter at recreation sites	918	226	110	12	10
Too many fishermen	1155	63	35	3	3
Too many commercial boaters on river	831	209	138	53	33
Too many private boaters on river	1117	82	39	5	1
-----					
Too few restrooms at put-ins/take-outs	923	199	86	27	16
Too few restrooms along river	927	194	80	22	15
Presence of human waste along the river	1060	94	45	18	9
Too few tables at lunch sites	952	158	73	18	10
-----					
Too few lunch sites	995	150	59	9	6
Lunch sites occupied by others	969	156	64	9	7
Lack of drinking water at lunch sites	799	205	132	47	25
Lack of drinking water at put-ins/take-outs	775	192	149	50	27
Lack of drinking water at campgrounds	838	156	119	36	32

13. Given the current conditions on the river, how do you feel about each of the following management actions? (Circle the number that shows how much you support or oppose each action.)

	Strongly Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Somewhat Support	Strongly Support
Provide more parking areas along the river	273	252	523	135	55
Provide more restrooms along the river	194	194	503	252	89
Provide more put-in/take-out points along the river	233	199	560	157	63
Provide more facilities for viewing wildlife at existing recreational sites	145	119	602	251	91
-----					
Provide more campgrounds along the river	204	218	535	186	72
Provide more lunch sites along the river	191	202	591	175	48
Provide more park rangers on the river	158	142	716	136	59
Provide more park rangers at recreation sites	155	136	713	142	64

14. What is your gender?     997 Male     715 Female

15. What is your age?     Range was 12 to 86

16. What is your county of residence?

<u>25</u> Adams	<u>172</u> Denver	<u>17</u> Pueblo
<u>60</u> Arapaho	<u>131</u> El Paso	<u>258</u> Other county in Colorado _____
<u>83</u> Boulder	<u>43</u> Fremont	<u>682</u> Other state _____
<u>85</u> Chaffee	<u>79</u> Jefferson	<u>21</u> Other country _____

## APPENDIX C Visitor Comments

The number preceding each of the following comments corresponds to the survey from which the comment was taken.

2. Survey not truly geared toward resident who lives on river
3. In being here, in and out for 9 years, I feel salida has much to offer for recreation goers. The river is beautiful as well as the all around views. I think that if the good work continues salida will not have a problem keeping it clean and fun for all!
7. Been paddling the ark for many years and it seems to be well managed. Drinking water would be good though.
9. Everything is great the way it is! Good work and muchas gracias.
13. Good! Don't install a fee demo program down here.
15. Keep up the good work!!
18. A porta-john at the salida spot.
20. A great place.
21. Was training as a guide, might cause some bias.
27. Could really use a dumpster and toilets at the salida hole.
28. Would like the creation of more playparks with multiple waves with variety.
33. Born in Colo. Love this state. Saddened by the number of river front ????? that are private water now. Everyone should enjoy.
36. Love this area, keep area under control.
47. Overall the river experience improved over the last 10 years.
48. It looks good!!
49. I find less fish in river catchable.
51. Beautiful area. I'll definitely come back.
56. Thanks!
57. Too many commercial.
66. Love this put-in at Fisherman's bridge. Rangers are doing a great job.
67. Good Day!
71. Good job managing such increased river pressure! Been kayaking here since 1980. Like that one can still camp along river road down by #'s. Thanks.
73. Keep Cristo out!
74. Get rid of Cristo. NO CRISTO
75. Keep Cristo out!
76. Great river- well managed.
77. Keep Cristo out! Real Estate is high enough!
78. Keep Cristo out!
79. The numbers put in road needs help and expansion for busses. Too many boats in Brown's.
87. Nice!
90. We had a wonderful time, it was worth every minute.
95. This is a very nice are. Not too far from home able to come more often.
99. Nice Run.
100. Very pleased with overall.
101. Great site at 5 points.
102. 5 Points: always our fav. Always nice.
103. First visit. Looks good so far.
112. The river is great.

- 114. Enjoyable experience.
- 117. Put in now great for rafter. Thanks!
- 118. Overall things look pretty good.
- 130. Enjoy very much watching the sheep.
- 133. Beautiful river and area!
- 140. There are not enough people at this particular site to be destroying or damaging the environment.
- 147. I appreciate the wonderful opportunity to enjoy this beautiful area.
- 151. As a whole, things are good.
- 162. I had a great time!
- 163. Having fun.
- 166. Shade would be nice!
- 170. Need more mountain bike trails in the area! This would bring more \$\$ to the area too!!
- 178. Very well organized.
- 187. overall great area enjoyed trip so far.
- 193. It was everything I was told it would be.
- 200. Thanks!
- 204. Beautiful Area/Clean
- 206. Please fix the road!!!
- 210. Everything is excellent!!
- 213. What a blast!
- 216. The River is treated well, Education is important for all River Runners, Private and Commercial. Matt Lass, 1-800-497-7238 The Adventure Co.
- 218. Great
- 226. No Dams.
- 228. The dam for Co. Springs water is a bad idea.
- 229. Its a nice place.
- 230. Great campsite- no problems
- 232. Great facilities.
- 233. You need to have trash containers. Everything else is just fine.
- 236. Very fun, but cold!
- 237. Cold
- 239. This is a great area, and I will continue to spend time here.
- 241. Glad you are managing our recreation areas.
- 244. Easy access and facilities have limited random destruction and human waste. Good Show! Fisherman need to learn to clean up after themselves.
- 245. Love the ARK.
- 246. Can't wait to indulge in the River. It's beautiful!
- 247. I think the Ark area has the right balance of amenities.
- 248. Great Playground that allows enjoyment. Minimal fees are reasonable.
- 252. This area must be protected for the natural environment and kept free for responsible recreation use.
- 254. Thanks
- 255. Keep up the good work.
- 257. Excellent job.
- 258. A very beautiful and well maintained state park.
- 265. This is my first visit to Colorado. I will be coming back.
- 270. Nice place.



274. We boated during a weekday late in the afternoon. I've also been on this river on the weekend- which we love to call the "rubber wall of death" because it extremely crowded.
279. Great weekend, see ya soon!
280. I had a great visit and intend to return.
282. Great management but please give the private boaters time and voice.
284. Great day to be on the river.
285. Great day. Great float. Great View.
296. Fun rafting!! We hope to do this again!!
300. Gorgeous! Loved it! Keep it natural.
301. Found everything open and beautiful today though at times it gets crowded during the peak season.
309. Garbage collection needed.
315. This is an awesome place! People seem to be aware of respecting the environment. Good thing since this is home to me!
320. The area I went to was very clean and well kept up. Thanks for the good work.
321. Need more campsites not campgrounds.
322. More campsites to fewer lunch sites.
326. Close the borders (CO's)
329. Beautiful Area
336. We love this river and it seems to be very clean.
337. Can answer better tomorrow night.
339. This is a beautiful area and I love being here. Thanks so much. Emily Suendson
358. This is my first visit so I don't know how heavily impacted the area is.
360. I like the river because it has not been fished out.
362. I really enjoyed hiking behind the river today. The people I met were friendly and the trail was clean.
369. This is still one of the most scenic and fun runs in the state.
375. I love the river!
383. River is clean and free of litter the outfitter was very concerned about keeping the river clean and safe.
388. Thank you for the survey I feel this is the most appropriate data to see what will improve the rec site.
395. Very clean
399. This is a beautiful area with a pristine environment.
402. I think your recreation departments are doing an excellent job on keeping litter to a minimum and providing a safe land fun place to enjoy the wilderness.
404. Very enjoyable , will be staying a few days.
405. Don't raise the user fees! Everything else is great!
406. Had a good time.
407. We vacation here every year and I have had very few complaints.
420. Provide more and easier access to river for dredgens(?) and rafters
424. It seems now that kayakers have taken over the duties of "river grouch." It used to be fishermen. What changed?
439. What a great river.
440. Drinking Water at any campsites/access sites.
444. Boat on!
454. Thanks. Beautiful area. Our Raft Masters guide is very environmentally conscious.
455. I would like to see less people selfishly but I like that people are respectfully enjoying the river.

460. Too many commercial boaters- A circus line these days!
467. Way too many commercial outfitters and boats at Pinnacle Rock put-in.
477. Keep the flows up till end of July ~2500 CFS
480. DK Rocks
481. This river rocks
486. Make permits out of waterproof material.
489. No more commercial outfitters or launch times.
490. Less crowded than I expected. Very pretty. Water @ put-in/Take out would be good.
492. Commercial Boaters seem to be dominating river.
494. Keep up the good work!
497. Over the past 15 years- commercial boating has-raft trips in particular- has increased to the point that river safety and overall experience has severely declined. I think limits on commercial #'s per day needs to be enforced!
499. Way too many commercials- and they have no respect for other boaters- caused problems in rapids!
500. No more commercial boats.
502. Feel good about day use fees.
505. Beautiful!
513. It was a great trip. The forest service does a great job keeping the river nice for the users. Thanks a lot.
519. Too many commercial and launch. Too many boats at one time.
524. Keep up the great work!
528. Don't permit private kayaking!!
535. This is my 10<sup>th</sup> visit to the area, and it seems as wonderful as ever.
545. WAY too many commercial boats.
548. Things have changed since I was a commercial guide from 80-85. Parks have done good with put-ins etc.
554. Great day!
560. Enjoyed very skilled and experienced guides.
561. Great 1<sup>st</sup> experience.
569. I think it is wonderful that the public can enjoy the river.
574. Beautiful area, look after it please!
578. I've been on the Arkansas River for 30+ years, it appears to be in the same excellent condition it has always maintained.
594. fun experience today!
595. Wonderful experience and the park looked nice.
600. It was great!
602. I feel that you all do a great job keeping the area looking good. I take pictures for Cusp(?) and I notice the Ranger and parks people keep control of the area well.
604. Bigger fish!
606. Keep up the good work!
607. Great work! I love the park facilities!
613. AHRA is doing a great job this season! Keep up the good work boys!
618. Enjoyable numbers trip.
628. Leave the Arkansas as is, it's what keeps bringing us back.
633. The two day trip on the river was a motivating experience. The river tested us to the extreme. More rivers should have a quality of rapids such as this one. I will continue to come here and remember this for years to come. Thanks you!
634. Nice bathrooms, clean.

635. Fantastic ride-gorgeous scenery! Canyon Marine did an A+ job as guides and cooks. Will definitely come back.
636. Good experience while on river.
640. Fix the road to the Numbers put-in (Grade it Do something)
650. I'll be back again!
663. I have been boating on the Ark for 20 years, more unimproved campsites would be nice.
665. Road to numbers put-in needs work.
666. Need more accessible put in for numbers section.
686. While the rafts on Browns Canyon area a distraction, I realize the tremendous amount of money they generate for the river and the area. Thus I do totally support the rafting industry.
687. Providing places for people to dump trash. If you pack it out you need to have some place to dump.
695. I had a great time on the river.
705. Beautiful State, one of our favorite vacation areas.
713. Providing trash receptacles at restrooms may prevent/avoid trash dumping inside.
714. Thanks for keeping up the parks and recreation areas.
723. Park seems clean, restrooms need some work.
727. 4<sup>th</sup> visit to Colorado, Arkansas River was one of my places to visit.
729. Thanks to all Park Rangers for the excellent work they do, in providing/maintaining all State Park areas. Rangers are always friendly, helpful, even when the people they are dealing with are not.
732. This site is extremely pleasant, well maintained and well (illegible).
733. Keep the rivers running free!
738. 1<sup>st</sup> time on the river and am excited!
741. Need dumpsters @ put-in & take outs.
742. Commercial rafting is a positive contribution to the economy of this poor county, so I think it's good that Headwaters supports that with improvements at put-ins, etc. But don't forget "private" boaters. Fix the road to Numbers put-in, don't just consider improvements designed to help busses, rafts, lunch for large groups, etc. Make them pay for that stuff.
755. Hope to limit/reduce commercial activity on the river.
756. First time here. More informative if at end of day.
757. Would be good to fill out at end of trip.
759. Excellent service and upkeeps.
762. Great time and experience.
778. Nice place- keep it clean.
783. Less boats at a time.
786. Thank you for making this river a fun safe place for us to play.-Black Diamond Rafting.
787. Great day at the river.
789. Clean up old railroad stuff, wires and things.
794. There were a bit too many people but that's to be expected. Overall, clean and quiet enough to enjoy the area!
803. More Water!
805. The only problems we encountered was human waste and litter. Everything else was quiet and great because we came on Monday and Tuesday. Thanks!
806. Would like to see rafting companies kept to their own parking lot- (illegible) to try and push private vehicles/ boaters around- out of way. Impressed that there is so little litter. Love this area!
807. Separate put ins and take outs for private and commercial boaters.
815. Great to see surveys like these being done. Great job!
820. I love this river, lets do our best to keep it clean!!!

845. These would best be completed @ end of trip!
862. I love and enjoy the Arkansas river very much. Thanks for all your hard work.
866. Nice experience.
869. Drinking Water at put in/take outs would be great. Some day I drink all my water and would like more. Once out of water in water bottle that's it. On hot, hot days we all know how important water is, also at this altitude.
870. The boat ramp in Salida needs bathrooms/changing areas!!
874. Most of the rec. Sites I've visited on the Ark are in great shape despite the number of visitors.
875. As a commercial raft guide in the Gorge(royal) for 8 years, I've seen nothing but improvement! Thanks. Jay Plummer.
878. Need a restroom at boat launch in downtown Salida.
881. I feel that the overall addition of the AHRA is a very positive.
893. We really appreciate the GREAT, well-lit restrooms at the campgrounds. Takeouts/put ins are managed very well. We always enjoy coming here. Thanks you!
894. Even though I started a commercial company (I am no longer in the business) on this river many years ago, I think there is too much commercial activity on the river. Give the private boaters more access to the river and camping sites at the expense of commercial boaters. Do not allow commercial companies to reserve State Park campsites for their patrons.
895. This is beautiful! Keep up the good work.
898. Very good restrooms.
903. Impressed with the wilderness preservation.
914. Our group, Breckenridge WWR was very state park friendly!
917. Very impressed with the facilities available and the likeness and upkeep.
919. Good campsites in the area are heavily occupied.
933. It is somewhat crowded along the Arkansas but it's what I've always known it would be good to have it controlled at this existing level.
936. Arkansas River was great, esp. Pine Creek.
938. Prohibit dogs at Salida wave, too much dog feces. More Play features at Salida wave, Changing rooms at Salida wave, Restrooms at Salida wave.
939. Good kayak park.
942. I think that it is a good thing that you guys take care of the rivers, keep it clean!
947. I don't think any changes are needed!
948. Numbers put in road could use some work, commercial rafters should not use public areas for profit, they destroy it.
952. Excellent place.
957. Commercial rafters think they own the river.
961. Rangers are doing good job.
972. It was a great day on the #'s run!
981. Fabulous!
989. I've been coming here since 1984 and love to fish here, keep up the good work!
993. I would like to see something for people to place their cigarette butts in!
994. Stop littering, increase flow, mediate commercial boating.
995. –State Rangers do excellent work! –Better camp @ real toilet in the #6 vicinity.
999. I enjoyed the river.
1001. Please install restrooms or porta-potties at the Salida playhole!!! (people are going in the river)
1006. Beautiful Lake- Everything looks great!
1112. It would be nice to have private/public access (fishing) better marked along the river.
1017. Enjoyable 4<sup>th</sup> – Not too many people at all.

1019. Groovy time! Raft Masters Rocks!
1035. It was very nice.
1041. It was really nice! Fun.
1042. Need to see more wildlife.
1048. The river banks were VERY clean, not one piece of litter seen. Great Experience.
1051. Rafting company WAO stressed no polluting being earth friendly.
1056. Great Area! Beautiful scenery!
1071. I had a lot of fun and enjoyed my trip even though there were a lot of people on the river while I was rafting.
1076. Clean restrooms.
1080. Visiting, did live in Colorado for 5 years.
1083. Keep up the excellent work!
1101. I liked the boat ride and enjoyed the view.
1102. Wonderful experience.
1108. The river was really beautiful today.
1113. Suggest provisions for hand washing (running water)
1114. Need more trash bins and hand washing area.
1118. Nice and pleasant park attendants, good clean camping and picnic areas.
1119. Need drinking water and overnight camping along river.
1125. We love Salida and this river! We usually don't kayak the Brown's on the weekends if we visit unless very early or late due to the # of commercial trips. Thanks.
1135. Wonderful country. Tell George W. Bush to please keep it protected from further development.
1151. Need vending machines on pick up sites and drop off sites.
1187. We support non-permitted river use!
1188. We support non-permitted private river use.
1191. Need more trash service especially at pay sites. Unfortunately people are cheap and don't pay user fees. But human waste is a problem at many of the free sites, and free bathrooms would help control the problem.
1192. More trash facilities.
1194. Limiting rafts would be great.
2101. \$2 is cheap. Great resource management!
1203. Ran Browns Canyon July 5, way too crowded dangerous due to too many rafts, a very unpleasant trip.
1212. Browns Canyon is like a rubber nightmare during the afternoon. I don't think 1 person craft and fully loaded rafts should be counted as equal.
1213. We put in between commercial trips or we would have been too crowded if boating along with commercial trips.
1216. If this area is not managed correctly- it will be ruined with too many people using it.
1220. Had a wonderful time at this site(5 points) with my family, friendly rangers and people. Enjoyed watching river rafters and scenery. Hope rangers continue taking care of sites. Will come here again. Thank you.
1221. AHRA is doing a great job of managing a busy resource!
1223. Very friendly Park Rangers and Professional. The recreation site was clean and not crowded at all.
1225. Good off-road motorcycling area and fishing area.
1232. This park was very clean and seemed to be very well taken care of.
1235. There is a lot of litter along the river-other than that everything is great!
1236. This is a beautiful place. I do not mind paying a park entrance fee to support the area.

1260. I think this place is being maintained very well.
1261. Keep up the great work! Can't wait to return!
1263. Not busy today (Fri. 8am –noon)
1265. The shorelines look fine. There are a bunch of discarded construction materials and railroad metal. I wish there would be a project to clear that out.
1268. We just stopped for a quick lunch, but we did enjoy our visit.
1270. The biggest problem is a familiar one-too many people. I don't know how to restrict that in a wonderful public recreation area. But lets not turn the banks into a parking lot to accommodate everybody.
1274. Great site, no one on the river for a Saturday.
1302. I loved it.
1309. Keep the river open, remove waste from old dams.
1317. There is no developed recreation site for Pine Creek rapid so it might be a good addition.
1318. Drop fees for usage for Twin Lakes and Turquoise.
1321. The bugs seems worse this time!
1326. Best river in country.
1328. I think it is in great condition. No trash. Beautiful area.
1332. Two picnic tables and a hockey goal in the river.
1338. Good stuff! Noah's Ark helped out. Yea God!
1339. We had a fantastic experience – keep up the awesome job taking care of this beautiful country!!
1340. Been coming here for 30 years, improvements made still look great!
1346. We're Just passing through! Road is dangerous because of traffic, especially "big" vehicles.
1354. I'm concerned about continued development and fees increases over the years by Parks & Rec. You could help me out and cut your costs by focusing your taxes on commercial use and leaving private recreation alone. I'm tired of being hassled by "river rangers".
1359. Restricted areas for commercial use would minimize parking and people congestion. One of the Commercial Rafters had their clients drive and park at Pinnacle Rock- Parking was full and I've never seen that before in the past 4 years.
1360. All in all things are good – need to get a water source for drinking.
1361. We visited the lunch sites approximately 25x over the summer months. Over the past 4 years we've been very pleased at the condition and maintenance of the lunch site.
1363. At the lunch site the poison ivy and poison oak could be removed.
1364. We need trash cans at the recreation sites!
1319. I work at these river sites every day and think they are always looking nice and in good condition. I also use this river for fishing and have had no major problems.
1372. Restrooms should be cleaned out more often; at the minimum more sanitation fluid should be added to reduce the gaseous ammonia fumes that is being created. The Parkdale restrooms are chronically neglected. People are encouraged to urinate or defecate in the river or on the grounds because the restroom smell is irritating to the upper and lower airways.
1375. More than expected, children will never forget.
1400. The Arkansas River is a real gem. I appreciate all efforts to maintain it, especially for its fishing and its beauty.
1422. Great Facility on River! Need more Campgrounds.
1423. The Ark River Corridor is in much better condition than when it wasn't managed as carefully. Thanks.
1425. Need less commercial trips. Need trash containers/pickups at ALL put-ins/take-outs.
1436. This is a very beautiful place.
1438. I had enjoyed my day at the Arkansas Rec. Area, I will be back in years ahead.

1444. No fees, please. \$ should come from Congress and taxes.
1445. I am opposed to user rec fees.
1461. Nice Ride! More class 4 rapids though.
1462. BAD road to Numbers put-in.
1464. People we encountered were nice and there was not litter here as we have seen in our home state. I loved it here, can't wait till next year so I can come back.
1465. I had a very peaceful solitary visit to the river.
1468. There were no trash cans at put in site. Couldn't use bathroom toilet for trash, so no trash site was available.
1477. More public access.
1478. Had a wonderful night camping on the river, great experience/teaching for the entire family. It was quiet and great. Thank you allowing campsites along the river, however I feel if too many campsites could destroy the natural scenery.
1487. Guides were candid and informed regarding environmental impact issues.
1490. I feel this section of river is well managed and doesn't have too many people- however other sections ( browns) I feel are too heavily used.
1493. Human activity tends to degrade a "site" as anything used by the public, but as long as the site remains public what can you do?
1501. Have been boating the ARK for 12 years. Definite Improvements over that time, Thanks.
1513. It's a great day and had a great rafting trip.
1524. The areas need trash cans. There are none even in the bathrooms. It would cut down on some litter.
1528. Way too many people.
1533. Nice park but could use a few areas to dump trash while camping.
1553. Park service does an excellent job. Restrooms and campsites are very clean. Park Service is very friendly.
1555. Campground maintenance is the best in the state. Too many fee's for reservation activity. ½ campsites should be first come first serve.
1583. Had a great time. Nice people. Well prepared & very fun.
1584. It was a great experience. I will do it again!
1586. Great trip. I would have enjoyed lunch on the riverside.
1601. I strongly oppose the number of commercial rafters that I see on the rivers, particularly Browns canyon, I fee there should be a separate permitting system for commercial rafts allowing less rafts on the river at a time. I feel crowded by commercial rafts when I paddle and I believe it affects wildlife and the whole river economy.
1621. Mike, the Park representative was very pleasant and personable.
1626. We just stopped for lunch. It was a nice experience.
1634. The river rangers area top notch.
1664. There are a lot of people here.
1671. I thought the area was well maintained. And I would love to visit again.
1690. I really am enjoying my visit here.
1693. We have had a very enjoyable stay in Colorado.
1703. Kayaked for 5 days. Very impressed with your facilities. Well done! Thank you.
1704. After visiting this area yearly for the last 12 years, I've come to the conclusion that some of the camping areas have been over developed. Such as gravel tent pads, too many signs and too many regulations. I realize that some of this comes with higher use, etc. I wish there was some way of returning to "the good 'ol days" when you could camp where you want, etc.

1706. We love the river. We camp away from the river so we wish there was a place we could just park and look without paying \$4 every time. We stay 3 weeks so it would cost a lot to just drive down to look/relax.
1713. Nice assortment of facilities seem to be available from primitive to developed. Good job on the porta-john availability.
1728. Keep it as natural as possible.
1732. Great Facilities, I can understand why so many people are here.
1740. Do not exploit what we have! Keep what we have in good order.
1761. Of course it's a zoo here, it's the ARK and it's far too late to do anything but try to minimize the impacts. Good job on that! Don't do any more pee areas- allow the unimproved free camping to continue. And don't try to limit the number of people using the resource. It's already too far gone, but still a nice place to paddle. Just one expects a zoo!
1765. Wonderful recreation resource, good mgmt. My hat is off to AHRA! And the State of Colorado.
1767. The improvements have been good, access and facilities- keep up the good work!
1768. Facilities in Colorado are excellent.
1775. Gold miners area eroding river banks.
1778. Please preserve the commercial launch windows.
1779. The more you develop the place the more overused/crowded it will become. – Wouldn't want to see usage increase much!