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Executive Summary

This visitor study report profiles a systematic random sample of Obed Wild and Scenic River (WSR) visitors during September 11 – October 4, 2012. A total of 334 questionnaires were distributed to visitor groups. Of those, 177 questionnaires were returned, resulting in a 53.0% response rate.

Group size and type
Forty-two percent of visitor groups consisted of two people and 31% consisted of three or four people. Thirty-nine percent of visitor groups consisted of friends and 30% consisted of family groups.

State of residence and residents of the area
United States visitors were from 16 states and comprised 99% of total visitation during the survey period, with 81% from Tennessee. Forty-seven percent of visitor groups were residents of the area (within 50 miles of the park).

Frequency of visits
Eighty-one percent of visitors first visited the park in 2001-2012 and 12% first visited in 1981-2000. Forty-one percent of visitors visited the park six or more times in their lifetime and for 30% this was their first visit.

Age, gender, ethnicity, and race
Forty-one percent of visitors were ages 21-35 years, 19% were 51-65 years old, and 8% were ages 15 years or younger. Sixty percent of respondents were male. One percent of visitors were Hispanic or Latino. Ninety-three percent of visitors were White and 3% were Asian.

Information sources
Most visitor groups (83%) obtained information about the park prior to their visit through friends/relatives/word of mouth (66%), previous visits (47%), and maps/brochures (30%). Most visitor groups (92%) received the information they needed. Fifty-four percent of visitor groups prefer to use the park website to obtain information for a future visit, while 41% prefer maps/brochures and 40% friends/relatives/word of mouth.

Park as destination
During the on-site interview, 76% of visitor groups said the park was their primary destination, for 12% the park was one of several destinations, and for 12% the park was not a planned destination.

Primary reason for visiting the area and the park
The most common primary reasons for visiting the park area among non-resident visitor groups were to visit the park (58%) and visit friends/relatives in the area (9%). Fifty-five percent of visitor groups chose to visit the park because of the scenery and 47% visited because of climbing opportunities.

Services or products needed in the park or in the area
Most visitor groups (96%) found the support services or products they needed either inside the park or in the area; 4% did not.

Transportation
Seventy-six percent of visitor groups used one vehicle to arrive at the park, while 17% used two vehicles.

Overnight stays
Twenty-seven percent of visitor groups stayed overnight in the area within 50 miles of the park.

Length of visit
Of the visitor groups that spent less than 24 hours in the park, the average length of stay was 4.4 hours. Of the visitor groups that spent 24 hours or more, the average length of stay was 3.7 days. The average length of stay for all visitor groups was 21.9 hours, or .9 days.
Executive Summary (continued)

Local attractions visited
Twenty-nine percent of visitor groups visited other local attractions on this visit. Of those visitor groups that visited other local attractions, 51% visited Frozen Head State Park, 32% visited Catoosa Wildlife Management Area, and 26% visited Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area.

Sites visited
The most common places visited in the park were Lilly Bridge (66%), Lilly Bluff Overlook (56%), and NPS visitor center (32%).

Activities on visit
The most common activity was hiking/walking (61%). Forty-seven of visitor groups participated in rock climbing activities, of which 83% were sport climbing and 25% were bouldering. The most common sites at which visitor groups rock climbed were Lilly Bluff (58%), South Clear Creek (43%), and Lilly Boulder Field (24%).

Activities on future visits
The most common activities in which visitor groups would prefer to participate on future visits were hiking/walking (75%), stopping at scenic overlooks (59%), swimming (57%) and camping (57%).

Services and facilities
The services and facilities most often used by visitor groups were the trails (73%), toilet facilities (60%), and assistance from park staff (45%).

Protecting park resources and attributes
The highest combined proportions of “extremely important” and “very important” ratings of protecting park, resources and attributes included clean water (97%), clean air (93%), natural features (92%), and scenic views (90%).

Expenditures
The average visitor group expenditure (inside and outside the park within 50 miles of the park) was $97. The median group expenditure (50% of groups spent more and 50% of groups spent less) was $25. The average total expenditure per person (per capita) was $52.

Ranger-led programs on a future visit
Thirty-two percent of visitor groups were interested in attending ranger-led programs on a future visit. Of those visitor groups interested in ranger-led programs, the most preferred length of program included ½ to 1 hour (43%) and 1 to 2 hours (27%).

Methods of learning about the park
Ninety-four percent of visitor groups were interested in learning about the park, most often through the following methods: self-guided with printed materials (62%), park website (44%), ranger-led programs (40%), and outdoor exhibits (39%).

Items available for purchase at the bookstore
Forty-two percent of visitor groups were interested in having items available for purchase at the visitor center bookstore. The most common items were additional publications (54%), souvenir items (49%), and convenience items (45%).

Overall quality
Most visitor groups (95%) rated the overall quality of facilities, services, and recreational opportunities at Obed WSR as “very good” or “good.” One percent of visitor groups rated the overall quality as “very poor” and no group rated the overall quality as “poor.”

For more information about the Visitor Services Project, please contact the Park Studies Unit at the University of Idaho at (208) 885-2585 or the following website http://www.psu.uidaho.edu.
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Introduction

This report describes the results of a visitor study at Obed WSR in Wartburg, TN, conducted September 11 – October 4, 2012 by the National Park Service (NPS) Visitor Services Project (VSP), part of the Park Studies Unit (PSU) at the University of Idaho.

As described in the National Park Service website for Obed WSR, "The Obed Wild and Scenic River looks much the same today as it did when the first white settlers strolled its banks in the late 1700s. While meagerly populated due to poor farming soil, the river was a hospitable fishing and hunting area for trappers and pioneers. Today, the Obed stretches along the Cumberland Plateau and offers visitors a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities." (www.nps.gov/obed, retrieved May 2013).

Organization of the Report

This report is organized into three sections.

Section 1: Methods
This section discusses the procedures, limitations, and special conditions that may affect the study results.

Section 2: Results
This section provides a summary for each question in the questionnaire and includes visitor comments to open-ended questions. The presentation of the results of this study does not follow the order of questions in the questionnaire.

Section 3: Appendices
Appendix 1. The Questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire distributed to visitor groups.

Appendix 2. Additional Analysis. A list of sample questions for cross-references and cross comparisons. Comparisons can be analyzed within a park or between parks. Results of additional analyses are not included in this report.

Appendix 3. Decision rules for Checking Non-response Bias. An explanation of how the non-response bias was determined.
Presentation of the Results

Results are represented in the form of graphs (see Example 1), scatter plots, pie charts, tables, and text.

Key

1. The figure title describes the graph’s information.

2. Listed above the graph, the “N” shows the number of individuals or visitor groups responding to the question. If “N” is less than 30, “CAUTION!” is shown on the graph to indicate the results may be unreliable.

* appears when the total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

** appears when total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer choice.

3. Vertical information describes the response categories.

4. Horizontal information shows the number or proportion of responses in each category.

5. In most graphs, percentages provide additional information.

Example 1

[Graph showing number of visits to Obed Wild and Scenic River]
Methods

Survey Design and Procedures

Sample size and sampling plan

All VSP questionnaires follow design principles outlined in Don A. Dillman’s book *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (2007). Using this method, the sample size was calculated based on the park visitation statistics of previous years.

Brief interviews were conducted with a systematic, random sample of visitor groups that arrived at four sites during September 11 – October 4, 2012. Visitors were surveyed between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Table 1 shows the four locations, number of questionnaires distributed at each location, and the response rate for each location. During this survey, 341 visitor groups were contacted and 334 of these groups (97.7%) accepted questionnaires. (The average acceptance rate for 277 VSP visitor studies conducted from 1988 through 2012 is 91.3%.) Questionnaires were completed and returned by 177 respondents, resulting in a 53.0% response rate for this study. (The average response rate for the 277 VSP visitor studies is 71.6%.)

Table 1. Questionnaire distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling site</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Returned*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc Howard Climbing Area</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilly Bridge</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemo Bridge</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

Questionnaire design

The Obed WSR questionnaire was developed at a workshop and through conference calls held with park staff and community members to design and prioritize questions. Some of the questions were comparable with VSP studies conducted at other parks while others were customized for Obed WSR. Many questions ask respondents to choose answers from a list of responses, often with an open-ended option, while others are completely open-ended.

No pilot study was conducted to test the Obed WSR questionnaire. However, all questions followed Office Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines and/or were used in previous surveys; thus, the clarity and consistency of the survey instrument have been tested and supported.
**Survey procedure**

Visitor groups were greeted, briefly introduced to the purpose of the study, and asked to participate. If visitors agreed, they were asked which member (at least 16 years old) had the next birthday. The individual with the next birthday was selected to complete the questionnaire for the group. An interview, lasting approximately two minutes, was conducted with that person to determine group size, group type, the age of the member completing the questionnaire, and how this visit to the park fit into their group’s travel plans. These individuals were asked their names, addresses, and telephone numbers or email addresses in order to mail them a reminder/thank-you postcard and follow-ups. Participants were asked to complete the survey after their visit, and return it using the Business Reply Mail envelope provided.

Two weeks following the survey, a reminder/thank-you postcard was mailed to all participants who provided a valid mailing address (see Table 2). Replacement questionnaires were mailed to participants who had not returned their questionnaires four weeks after the survey. Seven weeks after the survey, a second round of replacement questionnaires was mailed to participants who had not returned their questionnaires.

The survey dates were extended until all questionnaires were passed out, resulting in two rounds of replacement mailings. The round one mailing dates are for the survey period of September 11-17, 2012, and the round two mailing dates are for the survey period of September 18 – October 4, 2012.

**Table 2. Follow-up mailing distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>October 2, 2012</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; replacement</td>
<td>October 17, 2012</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; replacement</td>
<td>November 6, 2012</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>October 19, 2012</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; replacement</td>
<td>November 2, 2012</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; replacement</td>
<td>November 21, 2012</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data analysis**

Visitor responses were entered twice and double-key validation was performed on numeric and short text responses. The remaining checkbox (bubble) variables were read by optical mark recognition (OMR) software. Responses to open-ended questions were categorized and summarized prior to data analysis.

Numeric data were processed and descriptive statistics were calculated using Statistical Analysis Software® (SAS).
Limitations

As with all surveys, this study has limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results.

1. This was a self-administered survey. Respondents completed the questionnaire after their visit, which may have resulted in poor recall. Thus, it is not possible to know whether visitor responses reflected actual behavior.

2. The data reflect visitor use patterns at the selected sites during the study period of September 11 – October 4, 2012. The results present a ‘snapshot in time’ and do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year.

3. Caution is advised when interpreting any data with a sample size of less than 30, as the results may be unreliable. When the sample size is less than 30, the word “CAUTION!” is included in the graph, figure, table, or text.

4. Occasionally, there may be inconsistencies in the results. Inconsistencies arise from missing data or incorrect answers (due to misunderstood directions, carelessness, or poor recall of information). Therefore, refer to both the percentage and N (number of individuals or visitor groups) when interpreting the results.

Special conditions

The weather during the survey period ranged from cloudy and rainy to sunny and warm with lows in the 60’s and highs in upper 70’s F.

No major special events occurred in the area that would have affected the type and amount of visitation to the park.
Checking nonresponse bias

Five variables were used to check nonresponse bias: participant age, group size, group type, park as destination, and participant travel distance to the park. Respondents and nonrespondents were significantly different from each other in terms of age, group size, and group type (see Tables 3 - 6). The results indicated that there is a potential nonresponse bias. Respondents at younger age range (35 years old or less and visitors traveled alone maybe underrepresented in the survey results. See Appendix 3 for more details on the non-response bias checking procedures.

Table 3. Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents by average age and group size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>p-value (t-test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>43.95 (N=176)</td>
<td>35.13 (N=157)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>2.93 (N=177)</td>
<td>2.37 (N=151)</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents by group type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group type</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>p-value (chi-square)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>28 (16%)</td>
<td>34 (22%)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>53 (30%)</td>
<td>46 (29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>68 (39%)</td>
<td>73 (47%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and friends</td>
<td>27 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents by primary destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>p-value (chi-square)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park as primary destination</td>
<td>135 (77%)</td>
<td>114 (76%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park as one of several destinations</td>
<td>25 (14%)</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unplanned visit</td>
<td>15 (9%)</td>
<td>24 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6*. Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents by distance from home to park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>p-value (chi-square)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 500 miles</td>
<td>121 (70%)</td>
<td>113 (74%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100 miles</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200 miles</td>
<td>21 (12%)</td>
<td>18 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 miles or more</td>
<td>20 (12%)</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Three respondents were international visitors.
Results

Group and Visitor Characteristics

Visitor group size

**Question 21b**
On this visit, how many people were in your personal group, including yourself?

**Results**
- 42% of visitor groups consisted of two people (see Figure 1).
- 31% were in groups of three or four.

![Figure 1. Visitor group size](image)

Visitor group type

**Question 21a**
On this visit, which type of personal group (not guided tour/school/other organized group) were you with?

**Results**
- 39% of visitor groups consisted of friends (see Figure 2).
- 30% consisted of family groups.

![Figure 2. Visitor group type](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Visitors with organized groups**

**Question 20a**
On this visit, was your personal group with a climbing club/organization?

**Results**
- 4% of visitor groups were with a climbing club/organization (see Figure 3).

![Figure 3. Visitors with a climbing club/organization](image)

**Question 20b**
On this visit, was your personal group with a guided rafting/canoeing/kayaking group?

**Results**
- 2% of visitor groups were with a guided rafting/canoeing/kayaking group (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Visitors with a guided rafting/canoeing/kayaking group](image)

**Question 20c**
On this visit, was your personal group with a school/educational group?

**Results**
- 1% of visitor groups were with a school/educational group (see Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Visitors with a school/educational group](image)

---

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Question 20d

On this visit, was your personal group with an “other” organized group (scouts, work, church, etc.)?

Results
- 5% of visitor groups were with an “other” organized group (see Figure 6).

Figure 6. Visitors with an “other” organized group

Question 20e

If you were with one of these organized groups, how many people, including yourself, were in this group?

Results – Interpret with **CAUTION**!
- Not enough visitor groups responded to this question to provide reliable results (see Figure 7).

Figure 7. Organized group size

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**United States visitors by state of residence**

**Question 23b**  
For your personal group on this visit, what is your state of residence?

Note: Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

**Results**

- U.S. visitors were from 16 states and comprised 99% of total visitation to the park during the survey period.
- 81% of U.S. visitors came from Tennessee (see Table 7 and Figure 8).
- 4% came from North Carolina and 3% were from Florida.
- Smaller proportions came from 13 other states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of visitors</th>
<th>Percent of U.S. visitors N=372 individuals*</th>
<th>Percent of total visitors N=376 individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Visitors from Tennessee and adjacent states by county of residence

Note: Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

Results
- Visitors from Tennessee and adjacent states were from 41 counties and comprised 92% of the total U.S. visitation to the park during the survey period.
- 26% came from Knox County, TN (see Table 8).
- 22% came from Morgan County, TN.
- Small proportions of visitors came from 39 other counties in Tennessee and adjacent states.

Table 8. Visitors from Tennessee and adjacent states by county of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County, State</th>
<th>Number of visitors N=342 individuals</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knox, TN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, TN</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, TN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, TN</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland, TN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roane, TN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, TN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount, TN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, TN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentress, TN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam, TN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 other counties</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents of the area

Question 3a
Was every member in your personal group a resident (year round or part time) of the Obed WSR area (within 50 miles of the park)?

Results
- For 47% of visitor groups, all members were area residents (see Figure 9).

Figure 9. Visitor groups that were comprised of area residents only

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
International visitors by country of residence

**Question 23b**
For your personal group on this visit, what is your country of residence?

**Note:** Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

**Results – Interpret with CAUTION!**
- Not enough visitor groups responded to the question to provide reliable results (see Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of visitors</th>
<th>Percent of international visitors N=4 individuals*</th>
<th>Percent of total visitors N=376 individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Year of first visit to the Obed WSR**

**Question 23c**
For your personal group on this visit, what year was your first visit to the Obed WSR?

Note: Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

**Results**
- 81% of visitors first visited in 2001-2012 (see Figure 10).

![Figure 10. Year of first visit to the Obed WSR](image)

**Number of times visited the Obed WSR up to date**

**Question 23d**
For your personal group on this visit, what is the number of times visited the Obed WSR up to date (including this visit)?

Note: Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

**Results**
- 41% of visitors visited the park six or more times (see Figure 11).
- 30% were visiting for the first time.
- 18% had visited two or three times.

![Figure 11. Number of visits to the Obed WSR up to date](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer*
Visitor age

Question 23a
For your personal group on this visit, what is your current age?

Note: Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

Results
- Visitor ages ranged from 1 to 86 years.
- 41% of visitors were 21 to 35 years old (see Figure 12).
- 19% were 51-65 years old.
- 10% were 66 years or older.
- 8% were 15 years or younger.

Figure 12. Visitor age

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Respondent gender**

**Question 24**
For you only, what is your gender?

**Results**
- 60% of respondents were male (see Figure 13).

![Figure 13. Respondent gender](image)

**Visitors of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity**

**Question 22a**
Are members of your personal group Hispanic or Latino?

**Note:** Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

**Results**
- 1% of visitors were Hispanic or Latino (see Figure 14).

![Figure 14. Visitors of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Visitor race

Question 22b
What is the race of each member of your personal group?

Note: Response was limited to seven members from each visitor group.

Results
- 93% of visitors were White (see Figure 15).
- 3% were Asian.

![Figure 15. Visitor race](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Trip/Visit Characteristics and Preferences

**Information sources prior to visit**

**Question 1a**
Prior to this visit, how did your personal group obtain information about Obed WSR?

**Results**
- 83% of visitor groups obtained information about Obed WSR prior to their visit (see Figure 16).
- As shown in Figure 17, among those visitor groups that obtained information about Obed WSR prior to their visit, the most common sources used were:
  - 66% Friends/relatives/word of mouth
  - 47% Previous visits
  - 30% Maps/brochures
- Other websites (9%) used to obtain information prior to visit were:
  - Climbing sites
  - Dead Point Magazine (DPM) climbing
  - NPS
  - NPS stamp cancellation
  - Outdoor sites
  - www.maps.google.com
  - www.mountainproject.com
  - www.rockclimbing.com
- “Other” sources (6%) were:
  - Book on national parks
  - GPS software
  - Local resident
  - Whitewater clubs
  - Work

*Figure 16. Visitor groups that obtained information prior to visit*

*Figure 17. Sources of information used by visitor groups prior to visit*

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer*
Question 1c
From the sources you used prior to this visit, did your personal group receive the type of information about the park that you needed?

Results
- 92% of visitor groups received needed information prior to their visit (see Figure 18).

![Figure 18. Visitor groups that received needed information prior to their visit](image)

Question 1d
If NO, what type of park information did your personal group need that was not available? (Open-ended)

Results – Interpret results with CAUTION!
- 7 visitor groups listed information they needed but was not available (see Table 10).

Table 10. Needed information that was not available (N=7 comments) – CAUTION!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needed information</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure site map for climbing wasn't detailed enough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed fishing information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking trail maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to access river</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still do not know what there is - we just drive and stop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
### Information sources for future visit

**Question 1b**

If you were to visit Obed WSR in the future, how would your personal group prefer to obtain information about the park?

**Results**

- As shown in Figure 19, visitor groups’ most preferred sources of information for a future visit were:
  - 54% Obed WSR website
  - 41% Maps/brochures
  - 40% Friends/relatives/word of mouth

- Other websites (10%) were:
  - Climbing sites
  - Outdoor sites
  - [www.mountainproject.com](http://www.mountainproject.com)
  - [www.rockclimbing.com](http://www.rockclimbing.com)

- “Other” sources of information (6%) were:
  - Local resident
  - Ranger visits to scout troops
  - Visit visitor center
  - Whitewater clubs

![Figure 19. Sources of information to use for a future visit](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Primary reason for visiting the park area

Question 3b
For the non-resident members in your personal group, what was the primary reason they came to the Obed WSR area (within 50 miles of the park) on this trip?

Results
- For 58% of visitor groups, visiting Obed WSR was the primary reason non-resident group members visited the area (see Figure 20).
- 9% were visiting friends/relatives in the area.
- “Other” reasons (13%) were:
  - Climbing
  - Native American presentation
  - University of Tennessee game

Park as destination

Question from on-site interview
A two-minute interview was conducted with each individual selected to complete the questionnaire. During the interview, the question was asked: “How did this visit to Obed WSR fit into your personal group’s travel plans?”

Results
- 76% of visitor groups said Obed WSR was their primary destination (see Figure 21).
- 12% said the park was not a planned destination.
- 12% said the park was one of several destinations.

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Reasons why Obed WSR was chosen as destination**

**Question 4**
For this visit, what were the reasons that your personal group chose to visit Obed WSR rather than other destinations?

**Results**
- 55% of visitor groups chose to visit Obed WSR because of the scenery (see Figure 22).
- 47% visited because of the climbing opportunities.
- 33% visited because of the hiking opportunities.
- "Other" reasons (18%) for visiting are shown in Table 11.

*Figure 22. Reasons why visitor groups chose to visit Obed WSR rather than other destinations*

---

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer*
Table 11. “Other” reasons for visiting Obed WSR rather than other destinations (N=30 comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit family/friends in area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American study</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War lecture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to Devil's Triangle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to hotel in Harriman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy water access</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk watching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love the place!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was on our way home and a road less taken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Ranger program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local area is our ancestral home. We were showing our granddaughter.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for rock house, caves, sites, where Indians would reside or old homesteads once sat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycling in area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My thinking place</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National park stamp cancellation opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American visitors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See where we used to boat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get trail info</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfalls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding at overlook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Availability of support services

Question 18a
On this visit to Obed WSR, were there any support services or products that your personal group needed but were not available inside the park or in the area (within 50 miles of the park)?

Results
- Four percent of visitor groups indicated there were support services needed but were not available inside the park or in the area (see Figure 23).

Figure 23. Visitor groups that indicated there were support services needed but not available inside the park or in the area (within 50 miles of the park)

Question 18b
If YES, what were the products/services that your personal group needed but were not available? Please be specific. (Open-ended)

Results – Interpret results with CAUTION!
- 9 visitor groups listed the products/services they needed but were not available (see Table 12).

Table 12. Products/services needed but not available (N=10 comments; one visitor group made more than one comment) – CAUTION!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product/service</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obed</td>
<td>Camping with showers/electric</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilly Boulders parking</td>
<td>Hand sanitizer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Del and Marte’s</td>
<td>Food options</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemo Bridge</td>
<td>Cat rescue (my wife started crying when she saw many stray starving cats)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger station</td>
<td>Info (climbed for four years at Obed and have never seen the ranger station)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Couldn’t find Lilly Overlook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Detailed trail conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>No one would drive more than 10-15 miles to get any items they forgot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Ranger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Number of vehicles**

**Question 21c**

On this visit, how many vehicles did your personal group use to arrive at the park?

**Results**

- 76% of visitor groups used one vehicle to arrive at the park (see Figure 24).
- 17% used two vehicles.

Figure 24. Number of vehicles used to arrive at the park

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
** Overnight stays **

**Question 5a**
On this trip, did your personal group stay overnight away from home inside Obed WSR or in the area (within 50 miles of the park)?

Results
- 27% of visitor groups stayed overnight away from home inside the park or in the area within 50 miles of the park (see Figure 25).

**Question 5b**
If YES, please list the number of nights inside Obed WSR.

Results – Interpret results with **CAUTION!**
- Not enough visitor groups responded to this question to provide reliable results (see Figure 26).

**Question 5b**
If YES, please list the number of nights in Obed WSR area (within 50 miles).

Results – Interpret results with **CAUTION!**
- Not enough visitor groups responded to this question to provide reliable results (see Figure 27).

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Accommodations used inside the park**

**Question 5c**
In which type(s) of accommodations did your personal group spend the night(s) inside the park?

**Results** – Interpret results with **CAUTION!**
- Not enough visitor groups responded to this question to provide reliable results (see Figure 28).
- “Other” type of accommodation (35%) was:

  Del and Marte’s The Lily Pad

![Figure 28. Accommodations used inside the park](image)

**Accommodations used in the area outside the park**

**Question 5d**
In which type(s) of accommodations did your personal group spend the night(s) outside park in the local area?

**Results** – Interpret results with **CAUTION!**
- Not enough visitor groups responded to this question to provide reliable results (see Figure 29).

![Figure 29. Accommodations used in the area outside the park](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Length of stay in the park**

**Question 2**
On this visit, how much total time (both on land and on the river) did your personal group spend visiting Obed WSR?

**Results**

**Number of hours if less than 24 (79%)**
- 43% of visitor groups spent five or more hours in the park (see Figure 30).
- 34% spent one to two hours.
- 23% spent three to four hours.
- The average length of stay for visitor groups who spent less than 24 hours was 4.4 hours.

**Number of days if 24 hours or more (21%)**
- 55% of visitor groups spent two days in the park on this visit (see Figure 31).
- 27% spent three or more days.
- The average length of stay for visitor groups who spent 24 hours or more was 3.7 days.

**Average length of stay for all visitors**
- The average length of stay for all visitor groups was 21.9 hours or .9 days.

---

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer

Figure 30. Number of hours spent in the park

Figure 31. Number of days spent in the park
Local attractions visited

Question 6

On this trip to Obed WSR area, please indicate all other attractions in the area that your personal group visited.

Results

- 29% of visitor groups visited other local attractions on this visit (see Figure 32).

- As shown in Figure 33, the local attractions most commonly visited were:
  - 51% Frozen Head State Park
  - 32% Catoosa Wildlife Management Area
  - 26% Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area

- "Other" local attractions (23%) were:
  - Ancestral home within Catoosa WMA boundary
  - Dells Lilly Pad
  - Fall Creek Falls State Park
  - Jack’s for burgers for lunch
  - Knoxville
  - Lilly Bluff
  - Little Clear Creek
  - Lone Mountain State Forest
  - Oak Ridge
  - Obed Junction
  - Rode through Catoosa on ATVs
  - South Cedar Creek

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Sites visited in the park

Question 7
On this visit to Obed WSR, please indicate all the sites within the park that your personal group visited

- As shown in Figure 34, the most commonly visited sites by visitor groups at Obed WSR were:
  - 66% Lilly Bridge
  - 56% Lilly Bluff Overlook
  - 32% NPS visitor center

- The least visited site was:
  - 5% Potters Ford

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Activities on this visit**

**Question 10a**  
On this visit, in which activities did your personal group participate within Obed WSR?

**Results**

- As shown in Figure 35, the most common activities in which visitor groups participated on this visit were:
  - 61% Hiking/walking
  - 49% Climbing
  - 45% Stopping at scenic overlooks

- “Other” activities (8%) were:
  - Getting maps and info
  - Native American talk and demonstration
  - Photography
  - Plant identification
  - Purchased senior pass
  - Retirement area
  - Skating/roller blading
  - Visiting with relatives, friends

Figure 35. Activities on this visit

---

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Rock climbing**

**Question 8a**
During this visit to Obed WSR, did your personal group participate in any type of rock climbing activity?

**Results**
- 47% of visitor groups participated in rock climbing activities on this visit (see Figure 36).

**Question 8b**
If YES, what type of rock climbing did your personal group participate in?

**Results**
- As shown in Figure 37, the most common rock climbing activities in which visitor groups participated on this visit were:
  - 83% Sport climbing (bolted routes)
  - 25% Bouldering
- “Other” type of rock climbing (1%) was:
  - Rappelling - scout training

**Question 8c**
Where did your personal group climb during this visit to Obed WSR?

**Results**
- As shown in Figure 38, the most common sites at which visitor groups rock climbed on this visit were:
  - 58% Lilly Bluff
  - 43% South Clear Creek
  - 24% Lilly Boulder Field
- “Other” locations (20%) were:
  - Bouldering on route to Alley Ford
  - Canoe Hole
  - Cumberland Trail
  - Little Clear Creek
  - Off the port trail

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Activities on future visits**

**Question 10b**

If you were to visit the park in the future, in which activities would your personal group prefer to participate within the park?

**Results**

- As shown in Figure 39, the most common activities in which visitor groups would prefer to participate on future visits were:
  
  - 75% Hiking/walking
  - 59% Stopping at scenic overlooks
  - 57% Swimming
  - 57% Camping

- "Other" activities (8%) were:
  
  - Mountain biking
  - Opportunity for solitude
  - Photography
  - Plant identification
  - To see fall colors

![Figure 39. Activities on future visits](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Ratings of Services, Facilities, Attributes, Resources, and Elements

Services and facilities used

Question 11a
Please indicate all the services and facilities that your personal group used at Obed WSR during this visit.

Results
- As shown in Figure 40, the most common services and facilities used by visitor groups were:
  - 73% Park brochure/map
  - 60% Toilet facilities
  - 45% Assistance from park staff
- The least used service/facility was:
  - 3% Junior Ranger program

Figure 40. Services and facilities used

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Importance ratings of services and facilities

Question 11b
For only those services and facilities that your personal group used, please rate their importance to your visit from 1-5.

1=Not at all important
2=Slightly important
3=Moderately important
4=Very important
5=Extremely important

Results
- Figure 41 shows the combined proportions of “extremely important” and “very important” ratings of services and facilities that were rated by 30 or more visitor groups.
- Table 13 shows the importance ratings of each service and facility.
- The services and facilities receiving the highest combined proportions of “extremely important” and “very important” ratings were:
  - 94% Trails
  - 87% Assistance from park staff
  - 85% Park brochure/map
- The service/facility receiving the highest “not at all important” rating that was rated by 30 or more visitor groups was:
  - 2% Toilet facilities

Figure 41. Combined proportions of “extremely important” and “very important” ratings of services and facilities

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Table 13. Importance ratings of services and facilities
(N=number of visitor groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/facility</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from park staff</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore sales items</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CAUTION!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground - CAUTION!</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Ranger program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CAUTION!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park brochure/map</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park newspaper - CAUTION!</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park website: <a href="http://www.nps.gov/obed">www.nps.gov/obed</a></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used before or during visit - CAUTION!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger-led programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CAUTION!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet facilities</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center exhibits</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center (overall)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Quality ratings of services and facilities

Question 11c
For only those services and facilities that your personal group used, please rate their quality from 1-5.

1=Very poor
2=Poor
3=Average
4=Good
5=Very good

Results
- Figure 42 shows the combined proportions of “very good” and “good” ratings of services and facilities that were rated by 30 or more visitor groups.

- The services and facilities receiving the highest combined proportions of “very good” and “good” ratings were:

  100% Assistance from park staff
  94% Visitor center (overall)
  89% Visitor center exhibits

- Table 14 shows the quality ratings of each service and facility.

- The service/facility receiving the highest “very poor” rating that was rated by 30 or more visitor groups was:

  1% Toilet facilities

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Table 14. Quality ratings of information services and facilities
(N=number of visitor groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/facility</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from park staff</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore sales items (selection, price, etc.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– CAUTION!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground – CAUTION!</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Ranger program – CAUTION!</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park brochure/map</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park newspaper – CAUTION!</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park website: <a href="http://www.nps.gov/obed">www.nps.gov/obed</a> used before or during visit – CAUTION!</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger-led programs – CAUTION!</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet facilities</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center exhibits</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor center (overall)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Mean scores of importance and quality ratings of services and facilities

- Figure 43 and Figure 44 show the mean scores of importance and quality ratings of information services and facilities that were rated by 30 or more visitor groups.

- All information services and facilities were rated above average in importance and quality.

Figure 43. Mean scores of importance and quality ratings of information services and facilities

Figure 44. Detail of Figure 43

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Importance of protecting park resources and attributes**

**Question 9**

It is the National Park Service’s responsibility to protect Obed WSR natural, scenic, and cultural resources while at the same time providing for public enjoyment. How important is protection of the following resources/attributes in the park to your personal group?

1 = Not at all important
2 = Slightly important
3 = Moderately important
4 = Very important
5 = Extremely important

**Results**

- As shown in Figure 45, the highest combined proportions of “extremely important” and “very important” ratings of protecting park resources and attributes included:

  - 97% Clean water
  - 93% Clean air (visibility)
  - 92% Natural features
  - 90% Scenic views

- The attribute/resource receiving the highest “not at all important” rating was:

  - 7% Educational opportunities

- Table 15 shows the importance ratings of park resources and attributes.

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Table 15. Visitor rating of importance of protecting park resources and attributes (N=number of visitors groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource/attribute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean air (visibility)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean water</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear night sky</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed recreation facilities (campground, trails, etc.)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native plants</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native wildlife</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural features (such as arches, bluffs, streams)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural quiet/sounds of nature</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic views</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitude</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Expenditures**

*Total expenditures inside and outside the park*

**Question 17**
For your personal group, please estimate expenditures for the items listed below for this visit to Obed WSR and the surrounding area (within 50 miles of the park).

**Results**
- 54% of visitor groups spent $1-$100 (see Figure 46).
- 18% spent $101 or more.
- The average visitor group expenditure was $97.
- The median group expenditure (50% of groups spent more and 50% of groups spent less) was $25.
- The average total expenditure per person (per capita) was $52.
- As shown in Figure 47, the largest proportions of total expenditures inside and outside the park were:
  - 19% All other expenditures
  - 19% Restaurants and bars
  - 14% Groceries and takeout food
  - 12% Lodge, motel, rented condo/home, cabin, B&B, etc.

---

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer*
**Number of adults covered by expenditures**

**Question 17c**
How many adults (18 years or older) do these expenses cover?

**Results**
- 47% of visitor groups had two adults covered by expenditures (see Figure 48).
- 28% had three or more adults covered by expenditures.
- 24% had one adult covered by expenditures.

![Figure 48. Number of adults covered by expenditures](image)

**Number of children covered by expenditures**

**Question 17c**
How many children (under 18 years) do these expenses cover?

**Results**
- 88% of visitor groups had no children covered by expenditures (see Figure 49).
- 10% had one or two children covered by expenditures.

![Figure 49. Number of children covered by expenditures](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Expenditures inside the park

Question 17a
Please list your personal group’s total expenditures inside Obed WSR.

Results
- 74% of visitor groups spent no money in the park (see Figure 50).
- 25% spent $1-$100.
- The average visitor group expenditure inside the park was $7.
- The median group expenditure (50% of groups spent more and 50% of groups spent less) was $0.
- The average total expenditure per person (per capita) was $15.
- As shown in Figure 51, the largest proportions of total expenditures inside the park were:
  - 65% All other expenditures
  - 30% Camping fees and charges (including backcountry)

Figure 50. Total expenditures inside the park

Figure 51. Proportions of total expenditures inside the park

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Camping fees and charges (including backcountry)

- 87% of visitor groups spent no money on camping fees and charges inside the park (see Figure 52).
- 9% spent $1-$20.

Rafting/kayaking/canoeing guide fees and rental charges

- 100% of visitor groups (N=89) spent no money on rafting/kayaking/canoeing guide fees and rental charges inside the park.

Other guide fees and charges

- 96% of visitor groups spent no money on other guide fees and charges inside the park (see Figure 53).

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
All other expenditures (souvenirs, books, postcards, sporting goods, clothing, donations, etc.)

- 84% of visitor groups spent no money on all other purchases inside the park (see Figure 54).
- 9% spent $1-$20.

Figure 54. Expenditures for all other purchases inside the park

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Expenditures outside the park**

**Question 17b**
Please list your personal group’s total expenditures in the surrounding area outside the park (within 50 miles of the park).

**Results**
- 56% of visitor groups spent $1-$100 (see Figure 55).
- 24% spent no money.
- 20% spent $101 or more.

- The average visitor group expenditure outside the park was $101.
- The median group expenditure (50% of groups spent more and 50% of groups spent less) was $30.
- The average total expenditure per person (per capita) was $64.
- As shown in Figure 56, the largest proportions of total expenditures outside the park were:
  - 20% Restaurants and bars
  - 17% All other purchases
  - 15% Groceries and takeout food
  - 13% Lodge, motel, rented condo/home, cabin, B&B, etc.

![Figure 55. Total expenditures outside the park](image)

![Figure 56. Proportions of total expenditures outside the park](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer*
Lodge, motel, rented condo/home, cabin, etc.

- 86% of visitor groups spent no money on lodging outside the park (see Figure 57).
- 8% spent $1-$100 or more.
- 5% spent $201 or more.

Camping fees and charges (including backcountry)

- 77% of visitor groups spent no money on camping fees and charges outside the park (see Figure 58).
- 16% spent $1-$40.

Rafting/kayaking/canoeing guide fees and rental charges

- 98% of visitor groups spent no money on rafting/kayaking/canoeing guide fees and rental charges outside the park (see Figure 59).

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Other guide fees and charges

- 100% of visitor groups (N=61) spent no money on other guide fees and charges outside the park.

Restaurants and bars

- 41% of visitor groups spent no money on restaurants and bars outside the park (see Figure 60).
- 38% spent $1-$40.

Groceries and takeout food

- 47% of visitor groups spent $1-$40 on groceries and takeout food outside the park (see Figure 61).
- 39% spent no money.

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Gas and oil (auto, RV, boat, etc.)

- 41% of visitor groups spent $1-$40 on gas and oil outside the park (see Figure 62).
- 36% spent no money.

**Figure 62. Expenditures for gas and oil outside the park**

Other transportation (rental cars, taxis, auto repairs, but NOT airfare)

- 95% of visitor groups spent no money on other transportation outside the park (see Figure 63).

**Figure 63. Expenditures for other transportation outside the park**

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Admission, recreation, and entertainment fees
(other than rafting/kayaking/canoeing)

- 93% of visitor groups spent no money on admission, recreation, and entertainment fees outside the park (see Figure 64).

All other expenditures (souvenirs, books, postcards, sporting goods, clothing, donations, etc.)

- 77% of visitor groups spent no money on all other purchases outside the park (see Figure 65).
- 19% spent $1-$40.

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Preferences for Future Visits

**Ranger-led programs for future visit**

**Question 14a**  
If your personal group were to visit Obed WSR in the future, please list any ranger-led programs that you would like to have available.

**Results**  
- 32% of visitor groups were interested in attending ranger-led programs on a future visit to the park (see Figure 66).

![Figure 66. Visitor groups that were interested in participating in ranger-led programs on a future visit](image)

**Preferred length of ranger-led programs**

**Question 14b**  
What length of ranger-led program would your personal group like to attend?

**Results**  
- 43% of visitor groups preferred a program length of ½ to 1 hour (see Figure 67).
- 27% preferred a program length of 1 to 2 hours.
- Table 16 lists the programs visitor groups would like to have available on a future visit. Interpret results with CAUTION!

![Figure 67. Preferred length of ranger-led programs](image)

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding  
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Table 16. Preferred length of ranger-led programs – **CAUTION!**
(N=number of visitors groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Under ½ hour</th>
<th>½ - 1 hour</th>
<th>1-2 hours</th>
<th>More than 2 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area history</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insect identification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native animals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native plants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl walks/bat watching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant identification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Preferred methods to learn about the park

Question 19
If you were to visit Obed WSR in the future, how would your personal group prefer to learn about cultural and natural history/features of the park?

Results
- 94% of visitor groups were interested in learning about the cultural and natural history/features of Obed WSR on a future visit (see Figure 68).
- As shown in Figure 69, among those visitor groups that were interested in learning about the park, the most common methods to learn were:
  - 62% Self-guided with printed materials
  - 44% Park website
  - 40% Ranger-led programs
  - 39% Outdoor exhibits
- “Other” methods (4%) were:
  - Kiosk information
  - Local paper
  - Mail to PO box
  - Park brochures

Figure 68. Visitor groups that were interested in learning about the cultural and natural history/features of Obed WSR on a future visit

Figure 69. Preferred methods for learning about the cultural and natural history/features of Obed WSR on a future visit

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
**Items available for purchase at the visitor center bookstore on a future visit**

**Question 13**
If you were to visit Obed WSR in the future, what would your personal group like to have available for purchase at the visitor center bookstore?

**Results**
- 42% of visitor groups were interested in having items available for purchase at the visitor center bookstore on a future visit (see Figure 70).
- As shown in Figure 71, the most common items visitor groups would like to have available for purchase at the visitor center bookstore on a future visit were:
  - 54% Additional publications
  - 49% Souvenir items
  - 45% Convenience items
- "Other" items (12%) were:
  - Bumper stickers
  - Climbing gear/supplies
  - More Junior Ranger items
  - Music
- Topics of additional publications visitor groups would like available for purchase on a future visit were:
  - Brochures
  - Climbing
  - Cumberland Trail
  - Edible plants
  - Flora/fauna guides
  - Geology
  - Guidebook
  - History
  - Information
  - Kayaking
  - Local natural history/culture
  - Maps
  - Native peoples
  - Nature
  - Prehistory
  - Usage information

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding

**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Question 12
If you were to visit Obed WSR in the future, what additional facilities would your personal group like to have available? (Open-ended)

Results
- 63 visitor groups listed facilities they would like to have available on a future visit (see Table 17).
- Some visitor groups listed services instead of facilities (see Table 18).

Table 17. Services visitor groups would like to have available on a future visit (N=71 comments; some visitor groups made more than one comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None needed</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to drinking water</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better signage/trail markers for climbing areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trails</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry camping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better handicap access</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved restrooms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More camping options</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail markers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash cans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other facilities</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Services visitor groups would like to have available on a future visit – CAUTION! (N=11 comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better/more detailed maps</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone coverage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking trail conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local area and NPS maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River trips</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Overall Quality

Question 15
Overall, how would you rate the quality of the facilities, services, and recreational opportunities provided to your personal group at Obed WSR during this visit?

Results
- 95% of visitor groups rated the overall quality of facilities, services, and recreational opportunities as "very good" or "good" (see Figure 72).
- 1% of visitor groups rated the quality as "very poor."
- No visitor groups rated the quality as "poor."

Figure 72. Overall quality rating of facilities, services, and recreational opportunities

*total percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding
**total percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could select more than one answer
Visitor Comment Summaries

Planning for the future

Question 16
If you were a manager planning for the future of Obed WSR, what would your personal group propose? (Open-ended)

Results
- 53% of visitor groups (N=94) responded to this question.
- Table 19 shows a summary of visitor comments. The transcribed open-ended comments can be found in the Visitor Comments section.

Table 19. Planning for the future
(N=138 comments; some visitor groups made more than one comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased ranger presence at park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPRETIVE SERVICES (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More detailed information about trails</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES/MAINTENANCE (42%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved restrooms</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping at Lilly Bluff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better signage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access/conveniently located garbage cans</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded climbing opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard rails</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hookups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trails</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY/MANAGEMENT (34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of bolting moratorium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it natural</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More advertising</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More local outreach/involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve access to climbing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand acreage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve litter issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Eastern Tennessee Climbers Coalition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Number of times mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (1%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCESSIONS (1%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL (12%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue as is</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up the good work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Additional comments**

**Question 25**

Is there anything else your personal group would like to tell us about your visit to Obed WSR? (Open-ended)

**Results**

- 47% of visitor groups (N=84) responded to this question.
- Table 20 shows a summary of visitor comments. The transcribed open-ended comments can be found in the Visitor Comments section.

Table 20. Additional comments
(N=153 comments; some visitor groups made more than one comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL (14%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff was friendly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff was helpful</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff was knowledgeable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff was great</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPRETIVE SERVICES (3%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed exhibits</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACILITIES/MAINTENANCE (6%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need better signage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear blown down trees on trails</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY/MANAGEMENT (7%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate climber-friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it natural</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL (70%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed visit</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great climbing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great park</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up the good work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the park</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to return</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy having the park close by</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great scenery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great swimming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Visitor Comments**
This section contains visitor responses to open-ended questions.

**Question 16**

If you were a manager planning for the future of Obed WSR what would your personal group propose? (Open-ended)

- A comprehensive, massive network of hiking trails and backcountry opportunities
- A little more parking near the Lilly Bridge. Easy access/conveniently located garbage cans, and maybe some trails along the roads to make walking down them safer.
- A way to get more locals involved in the park activities and park conservation. The locals need to understand how important our park is.
- Access roads in case of emergency
- Add acres to park when possible
- All motorcycled trail access
- Allow geocaches
- Are there places on the river for intro/moderate kayakers? It seems to be a bit too difficult for beginners - places to swim that are safe for kids.
- ATV trails
- Better camping with hookups!
- Better signage
- Better signage to points of interest
- Better toilet facilities - outdoors
- Building visitor center and nice campgrounds at Lilly Bluff Overlook. Would be an excellent spot for gift shop and canoe rental. The campgrounds would stay packed and the shop would sell a lot of camping items, some food, snacks, drinks, and such would be a very good way for the park to make some money
- Campground with showers and electric
- Clean out area around the third swimming hole. To open the campsite back up at Lilly Bridge.
- Clear air, water and work with rock climbers of the area - etc. (East Tennessee Climbing Station)
- Climber coffee to promote good habits (LNT) hardware education (signs for bad bolts) and to meet the staff regularly like Joshua Tree
- Climbers would really like to see the bolting moratorium lifted; the Obed could be a world class destination with more, harder routes.
- Climbing
- Climbing gear store
- Climbing infrastructure - trails, additional development of cliff line
- Commercial white water trips overnight, backcountry camping
- Continue as is
- Continued joint efforts with ETCC. Review of bolting moratorium and expanded climbing opportunities.
- Continued maintenance of all current facilities
- Continued maintenance on climbing areas and climbing access trails!
- Continued support and working with the community. Future development of outdoor activities to help bring money to Obed communities through recreation.
- Develop fall climbing potential by lifting the bolting moratorium on sport climbing
o Don't overbuild, provide trash and recycling receptacles to promote cleanup
o Education of the waters, and what species of fish inhabit them
o Emergency station
o Finding a balance between use and conservation. Currently bolting of routes is not allowed and I believe for good reasons. Take a look at what irresponsible use has done to the Red River Gorge. Some climbers/users are responsible and are key in continuing the conservation of recreation, yet all too often many lack the education or understanding to recreate in natural areas.

o Fix the steps by the bridge emergency phone access
o Free stuff? Brochures, key rings, etc.
o Guard rails on main roads!

o I don't know, it's great maybe - more equipment for trail day

o I would propose to limit fees to the people who come from out of state and out of town. The folks from around here are poor and it is our heritage. We have history here and most of our ancestors at one time owned the land that the park service now uses.

o I would push for keeping the area clean. It's annoying to get into deep woods and find trash out there.

o Improve conservation/restoration of native flora and fauna. Expand acreage. Limit/eliminate private property holdings. Prohibit all motorized recreation. Lobby congress to relocate defense spending to national parks. Work with climber associations (access fund, SEC) to promote responsible use of public restrooms by climbers/educate climbers preserve access to climbing.

o Indian trails and history

o It's great the way it is!

o Keep as is, seems to be running good

o Keep it natural

o Keep it natural; for areas needed for population (camping, toilets) keep open and clean

o Keep it wild and scenic with few regulations. Allow bolting again on a permit basis.

o Keep park pristine and clean update restrooms (Nemo)

o Keep student/junior park rangers. They help so much!

o Keep stupid people out! Keep park beautiful. Rock climbing very important.

o Keep the environment as pristine as possible. Live LNT.

o Keep the excellent staff and maintain backcountry trails and Rock Creek Campground. Keep the rivers primitive.

o Keep up the great work

o Keep up your pride in your visitor center and your park area - both beautiful

o Lift the moratorium on bolting new sport climbing routes

o Lifting the bolting ban

o Maintain access, protect, encourage use

o Maintain Lilly Bridge as is; organize volunteer trash pickup days at Nemo and other sites; facilitate volunteer trash pick up. Maybe graffiti removal if possible.

o Maintain the park, improve restrooms, prosecute vandals

o Make trails available for handicap at least one

o Map at front of trails with breakdown of climbing routes

o Maybe add more marking on the trails

o More advertising (local)

o More campsites at Lilly Bluff and more picnic areas at bridge

o More clear/easily navigated website information

o More detailed info on all hiking trails
o More developed campsites
o More funding for trail work and a guard rail on Barnett Bridge Rd south of the bridge at the switchback
o More hiking trails
o More involved in communities of Morgan County
o More moderate trails
o More opportunities for camping
o More ranger or trained volunteer-led programs on the natural/cultural histories of the OBED and surrounding area. Increased ranger presence at park for questions.

o Mountain biking trail
o Need more awareness beyond Morgan County - increase awareness and marketing through the media, perhaps state tourism or regional NPS or something!

o Nicer toilets at Lilly Bluff. Not so tall off the ground. Uncomfortable.

o No alcohol allowed. Ranger on duty for policing and questions.

o Nothing - you guys are doing a great job

o Nothing major. Keep up the good work!

o Obed is a wonderful place. Need more publicity and promotion.

o Opening of new climbing areas. Also allowing for new route development in already established climbing areas. (Lifting the boating moratorium)

o Pre-established bear hangs for backcountry sites. See Great Smokies as example.

o Preservation of the undeveloped nature of the park. i.e. non-commercialized.

o Remove the ban on bolting or allow a few select locals bolt new routes and replace gear there is huge potential at Obed to attract people worldwide. It just has to be allowed to grow.

o Some (but not too expensive) development of other cliff lines and areas for bouldering, sport, or food climbing

o Somehow stop the trash issue, noticed a lot of alcohol containers everywhere! Riverbanks, campsites, hiking trails.

o The trails to crags (especially South Clear) could be marked better. For new people to the area it is a little confusing and leads to off-trail wandering.

o To preserve Obed WSR just the way it is. I would enforce fines on loitering. My children and I have had to pick up other people’s trash near the creek (under the bridge) a few times.

o Trail maintenance

o Trails by river

o Trash cans at trailheads - I would purchase these items if made in my country - otherwise I do not

o Unknown at this time

o Varieties of programs and events

o We had no complaints. It's a beautiful area and thanks to our ranger we got to experience a lot in a short time.

o When you have exhibits - maybe have a drink - food that matches - kids love to see or try things? If you are talking about native berries - have one to taste.
Question 25
Is there anything else your personal group would like to tell us about your visit to Obed WSR?

- Absolutely wonderful as always
- Activities for the junior ranger program were a bit easy for our 10-year-old granddaughter who has been earning junior ranger patches and badges for 5 years.
- All were sad to leave
- An awesome place, some of the most pristine river scenery in the country!
- Beautiful - serene
- Beautiful area. Quiet, not crowded.
- Beautiful place!
- Beautiful! We will be back.
- Better road signs. We got lost even with the map.
- Blow down trees on trails should be cleared. Rangers should remove unleashed dogs from park.
- Children and grandkids come spend time here when they get off work
- Climbers
- Cumberland trail section was poorly marked - poor condition - lots of blowdowns
- Enjoyed Lilly Bluff very much. Point trail is gorgeous! Would like more info on other trails and climbing areas.
- Enjoyed Native American talk and exhibit, like to see and hear more
- Excellent ranger - Bill knowledgeable, very informative, helpful, and friendly
- Good sport climbing and WW boating
- Great climbing! Not all climbers are as respectful for the area as others. Engage these good climbers and we can all participate in making Obed an even better place to climb. Thanks!
- Great job; keep it up
- Great park. Friendly rangers. Have thoroughly enjoyed over last seven years and will continue to visit frequently.
- Had a wonderful day. View was great for the wedding.
- I apologize for my failure to complete the remainder of this questionnaire. I find it a bit tedious. In my opinion Obed WSR is one of the most well maintained and pleasant scenic camping and recreation areas in the east TN area. As a former Boy Scout and a wilderness enthusiast both, I find the park area to be a wonderful place to both enjoy the beauty and wonders of nature, in its most pure setting that this day and age can possibly allow, and also provide a place to educate my children and show them the treasures to behold about the true wilderness. In my opinion there is nothing that needs to be changed about the wildlife/forestry departments practices and procedures in maintaining or making the Obed WSR the best it can possibly be, and the most enjoyable outdoor setting in the area!
- I appreciate the wonderful relationship between the rangers and the climbing community
- I came to say goodbye. Through my life I came here to Obed to refresh my spirit from the traumas of life. Goodbye old friend! Your memories I will carry with me. May you forever live!
- I drove from Young Harris GA to Knoxville to west up with a friend to go climbing
- I enjoy a variety of activities there - mostly hiking
- I like having Obed WSR very close to where I live
- I love the Obed! It's my second home. I'll do whatever it takes to help.
- I spent a nice day! Thank you - I think you are doing a good job.
- I used the park map to get to Lilly Bluff overlook. I almost turned around - need more signs! Was fooled by map!
I'm glad this area is protected from recreational sprawl.
In area on business; checked on park for boy scout outdoor opportunities/activities
In love with the place
It was awesome! Thanks for the perfect weather and great climbing!
It was very enjoyable
It was wonderful! Thank you!
Keep horses out!
Keep up the awesome work!
Keep up the good work
Love being able to roam here and climb. Very fortunate to have this area close by.
Love the bathroom facility at Lilly Bridge
Love the climbing! Bolts are like roads, they are unfortunate but if we didn't have them no one would be here.
Love the park. Can't wait to come back and climb in more areas.
Love this place! Rangers here are awesome.
Morgan Country, Tennessee is our home county. There are few things we don't know or haven't seen in the Obed Wild and Scenic River Park. We love the area! I hope and pray the park will always be there! Sorry this is late; it was missing for some time.
Nature at its best!
No - enjoyed our visit
Obed is a wonderful experience. Heard of recent issues with park service staff, which was concerning, but usually I have never had a problem. I try to donate and help as much as possible to make the community stronger. Thanks!
Person (young lady) in visitor center very helpful.
Please lift the bolting ban. We need more routes.
Rangers we have talked with to over the years very friendly, helpful
Relaxing afternoon - small hike/walk, thank you (America is beautiful) (Sorry about losing first study)
Rock climbing rules! Do not get fat America!
Tennessee rocks, thanks
Thank you for keeping climbing sites open. We pick up trash found by others, trying to do our part in keeping it open.
Thanks
Thanks
Thanks for being climber friendly!
Thanks! It's awesome! Fun climbing and swimming!
Thanks! There are many bad carbon - steel bolts that will need to be replaced
The Lilly Pad is a great local business. They care about and maintain park ethics.
The Obed is a fantastic resource. Thank you for everything!
The Obed is excellent - keep it pristine and natural like it is!
The Obed is my favorite place in Tennessee!
The Obed rocks!
The park was beautiful and the climbing was great
The ranger at the visitor center was informative, personable, and very effective. Great information and suggestions.
The rangers are professional and courteous and contribute immensely to the good reputation of the Obed within the outdoor community
• The staff are experts!
• This is a great place for teaching climbing. Climbing safety, etc. for scouts. Great park!
• This survey seems too extensive
• Very interesting visit
• Visiting is always good and my experiences with the rangers have always been positive
• Visitor center exhibit, was excellent
• We always enjoy the park's beautiful sites and thank you for preserving it for us, keep up the good work
• We had an awesome time. The rangers are the friendliest and most helpful ever!
• We live within one mile of the park and we like taking friends to the Obed outlook and taking pictures, the pines were especially beautiful in snow.
• We love climbing at the Obed. Thanks for making it such a wonderful place!
• We really enjoyed it - trails were maintained well
• We really enjoyed visiting the various areas of the park. Thanks so much guys!
• We very much enjoyed the visitor center's ranger. Very friendly and helpful. Loved the climbing and swimming! Absolutely beautiful area.
• We will be back for more climbing
• What a beautiful place - fantastic climbing opportunities! Thank you!
• Would have done traditional rock or sport climbing, but didn't have gear or partner. It was beautiful. I'll be coming back someday. Thanks.
Appendix 1: The Questionnaire
Appendix 2: Decision Rules for Checking Non-response Bias

There are several methods for checking non-response bias. However, the most common way is to use some demographic indicators to compare between respondents and Nonrespondents (Dey 1997; Salant and Dillman 1994; Dillman and Carley-Baxter 2000; Dillman, 2007; Stoop 2004). In this study, we used five variables: group type, group size, age of the group member (at least 16 years old) completing the survey, whether the park was the primary destination for the visit, and the proximity of the visitor’s place of residence to the park to check for non-response bias.

Chi-square tests were used to detect the difference in the response rates among different group types, whether the park was the primary destination for this visit, and visitor’s place of residence and proximity to the park. The hypothesis was that there is no significant difference across different categories (or groups) between respondents and Nonrespondents. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the difference between respondents and Nonrespondents is judged to be insignificant.

Two independent-sample T-tests were used to test the differences between respondent’s and Nonrespondent’s average age and group size. The p-values represent the significance levels of these tests. If p-value is greater than 0.05, the two groups are judged to be insignificantly different.

Therefore, the hypotheses for checking non-response bias are:

1. Respondents from different group types are equally represented
2. Respondents and Nonrespondents are not significantly different in terms of proximity from their home to the park
3. Respondents and Nonrespondents are not significantly different in terms of reason for visiting the park
4. Average age of respondents – average age of Nonrespondents = 0
5. Average group size of respondents – average group size of Nonrespondents = 0

As shown in Tables 3 to 6, the p-values for respondent/Nonrespondent comparisons for average age, group size, and group type are less than 0.05, indicating significant differences between respondents and Nonrespondents. Respondents at younger age range (less than 45 years old), and visitors who traveled alone appear to be less responsive to the survey. Due to these differences the results of the survey may have some nonresponse bias and need to be interpreted with caution.
References


The Department of the Interior protects and manages the nation’s natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources; and honors its special responsibilities to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and affiliated Island Communities.