

Comprehensive Evaluation Report

Social and Economic Section

Dixie and Fishlake National Forests

In the planning area, the social and economic conditions are intertwined to an extent that it is difficult to discuss them separately. The purpose of the Comprehensive Evaluation Report is to identify **key** conditions and trends for the social and economic resources in the area. This section will not attempt to differentiate between what is a “social” condition and what is an “economic” condition. In addition to the key conditions and trends identified here, there are many other conditions and trends that provide additional detail to the social and economic environment. During the analysis of projects, project teams will have to go to the broader data set in order to accurately write analysis of social and economic impacts.

Some conditions and trends are quantifiable with numbers. Others, particularly the social conditions and trends, are made here from qualitative observations. Those conditions and trends that we can tie to numbers often tell different stories depending upon how they are viewed. Additional social research would be helpful to better understand the social resources in this planning area. For instance, there is no known reliable research to show why people are moving to Iron and Washington counties at such a rapid rate. Future attitudinal surveys could help to quantify the role – or rather the allure – which public lands have for people moving to these and other areas.

Quantifiable data used to describe these key conditions and trends has been aggregated at the national, state, sub-state regional (usually Associations of Government), and county level. (Additional data is available at the municipality level for population and industry conditions and trends; however, it is not cited here because this report of “highlights” and “key” conditions and trends is not meant to go to the city/town government level.)

The report identifies key conditions and trends for both the Dixie and the Fishlake National Forests. The counties – Beaver, Juab, Millard, Sanpete, and Sevier – contain exclusively Fishlake areas. The counties – Kane, Iron, Washington – contain exclusively Dixie areas. Garfield, Piute, and Wayne counties have both Dixie and Fishlake areas. While Juab and Sanpete counties have areas that are managed by the Fishlake National Forest, the areas are very small¹ and do not likely play a large role in the local economies or social environments. Therefore, these two counties will not be described in detail² in the county profile section.

¹ Sanpete County has ___ acres of Fishlake NF on the Richfield Ranger District. Juab County has ___ acres of Fishlake NF located in the Canyon Range in the Fillmore Ranger District.

² Sanpete County will be included in the Manti-LaSal NF’s CER and Juab County was studied in the Uinta NF planning effort and may be looked at in the Manti-LaSal effort.

In the future as this report is revised, the Forest Service will consult and likely incorporate additional data and detail from future academic³ and government⁴ efforts to describe social and economic conditions and trends for this planning area.

For the purposes of this first rendition of a Comprehensive Evaluation Report, we consulted a variety of economic data and reports. Primarily, we have relied upon a report created by the Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (GOPB) entitled: *People and the Forests: Social-Economic Assessment Tools and Data for Forest Plan Revision (People and the Forests)*.⁵

In addition to *People and the Forests* we consulted a variety of other census data and academic research⁶. Finally, qualitative conditions and trends are derived from the collective memory of Forest Service planning participants and planning partners⁷ who have collaborated with each other in over 100 meetings, workshops, and working sessions to help develop the Dixie National Forest Revised Forest Plan and the Fishlake National Forest Revised Forest Plan⁸.

GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AND TRENDS

Extraordinary Population Growth: Utah, the State in which both the Dixie and Fishlake National Forests are located, according to the 2005 Economic Report to the Governor, is the third fastest growing state in the nation⁹.¹⁰ This fast rate of growth is

³ Utah State University is currently planning on doing some economic and social profiles for counties across the State of Utah. This is an example of the type of future assessment that we anticipate considering as we revise these conditions and trends. There are likely to be additional studies in the future that will help us refine our conditions and trends when we revise the CER.

⁴ The Forest Service does not intend at this moment to do any significant additional studies. Since we have established a relationship with the Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, we would anticipate consulting with the state and local government economists and social scientists at the point of revising the CER. For instance, we would consider the yearly Economic Report to the Governor.

⁵ This report is dated December 2003 and can be viewed on the Internet at the State website: www.utah.gov. During the study, county planning documents (County Master Plans, Economic Development Plans, Tourism Plans, Water Conservancy Plans, etc.) were analyzed for Forest Related issues that should be considered for the planning process. The report was the result of a collaborative partnership between the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Utah State Government, the Five County and Six County Associations of Government (and their constituent counties), Utah State University, and the Rocky Mountain American Indian Economic and Education Foundation. The plan covers counties where the lands of the Ashley, Dixie, Fishlake, and Manti-LaSal National Forests are located.

⁶ This included a discussion with a group of social scientists and economists at Utah State University in fall 2005.

⁷ Partners include anyone who has been frequently involved in our planning process. This would include a wide diversity of interest groups, local and state government representatives (with which we have cooperating agency agreements), forest user communities, and the general public.

⁸ Draft Revised Plans are scheduled for public release and comment in spring 2006. Final decisions are anticipated by the end of 2006.

⁹ Utah is third behind close neighbors Nevada (1) and Idaho (2).

¹⁰ Washington and Iron counties have advantages over many of the other planning area counties because of accessibility to transportation networks (including airports servicing metropolitan areas) and proximity to higher education. These two factors have been shown to spell a higher likelihood of growth and economic

very evident in some parts of the planning area (particularly in the areas near the Dixie National Forest). Other areas in the planning area are not keeping up with the State average.¹¹ Urban areas that tend to supply large amounts of forest users – namely Salt Lake City and Las Vegas – are experiencing record growth that is projected to continue.¹²¹³

According to the most recent population projections, the following condition and trend exist across the State of Utah – where this trend is extraordinary at a local level I will note it more specifically in county profiles.

Condition: As of July 1, 2005, the State of Utah has an estimate population of 2,547,389 people. This is a 2.5% or roughly a 313,000 person increase 2000 estimates.¹⁴¹⁵

Trend: The 2005 Baseline Highlights Report (BHR 2005) prepared by the demographic and economic analysis branch of GOPB projects state population to reach roughly 4,000,000 by 2030.

Population is Getting Older and More Wealthy, But Utah is Still has the Country's Youngest Population: As the baby *boom* generation reaches retirement in better health than any previous generation, Utah, and most other states in the nation, is seeing population getting older and with more wealth. More importantly, however, Utah is the youngest state in the country and will likely remain so in the foreseeable future.¹⁶

Condition: In 2005, the median population for the State of Utah is 27.

Trend: In spite of the growth of the retirement population, the projected median population for Utah will only increase to 33 by 2030.¹⁷

prosperity. The Sonoran Institute in a report entitled *Prosperity in the 21st Century West* identified ski resorts (which Iron County has), arts/restaurants/foods (all abundant in Washington and Iron Counties), and Mountains, in addition to airports and quality education opportunities as positively correlated with producer services. Areas with producer services tend to be more prosperous economically. Interestingly, indicators of potential economic prosperity are also very strong socially desirable characteristics for communities.

¹¹ According to a 2005 News Release from the Governor the growth rates for 2004-2005 in the counties in the planning area were: Washington (8.4%), Iron (6.4%) (two highest in the state), Beaver (0.5%), Millard (0.3%), Sevier (1.2%), Piute (0.1%), Garfield (1.7%), Kane (2.6%), and Wayne (-0.6%). The state average for the 2004-2005 year was 3.2%. Only Washington and Iron beat the state average.

¹² See *People and the Forests*.

¹³ These urban centers and many of their nearby “discovered” recreation centers like Park City are seeing increased ethnic diversity. If this condition and trend continue, ethnic and language diversity may become a challenge for forest management in the future.

¹⁴ April 1, 2000 census numbers were 2,233,169.

¹⁵ Utah's growth rate has been roughly double the US growth rate for much of the period between 1950 and 2000. For the period between 2000 and 2050, Utah's growth rate is projected to at least triple the US rate.

¹⁶ The BHR 2005 suggests that from 2005-2030 we can continue to expect the growth rate of the school age population to outstrip the total population growth. By 2030, however, school age population growth will be lower than the overall population growth rate. Furthermore, the average household size is expected to go from a 2005 number of 3.01 to 2.75 by 2050.

¹⁷ This condition and trend is true for the State of Utah, but it may be a bit misleading for some areas in the planning region. For instance, the St. George area has a large allure as a major retirement center. Washington County has a median age of 31.0, which makes it the tenth oldest county in the State. It will

New Economic Engines are Emerging: Many traditional sources of economic income such as natural resources and mining are projected to lose their share of the state economic output; and professional business, education, and health services are projected to grow.¹⁸ Past experience suggests that these changes can be difficult on rural communities. Ultimately, both the State and local economies will face pressure from global forces and need to become more robust, demonstrate more ingenuity, and become more diverse to meet challenges that are bound to emerge. The Forest Service will continue to provide some of the ingredients of successful economies in the region.

Condition: According to the BHR 2005, Natural Resource and Mining comprise 2% of the Utah economy in 2005. Professional and Business Services take a 13% share and Education and Health Services an 11% share.¹⁹

Trend: The BHR 2005 projects that Natural Resources and Mining will reduce to 1% of the Utah economy by 2050. Professional and Business Services will increase to 16% and Education and Health Services will increase to 24%.²⁰

Caveat: Recent oil and gas discoveries in central Utah (and other potential oil, gas, and mineral discoveries) could make the Natural Resources and Mining sectors take increased shares in the future Utah economy. It is probably still too early to speculate about how this discovery will impact economic projections.

Forests are a Factor in Quality of Life for Many Regional Residents: Many participants in the Dixie and Fishlake planning effort have suggested that for a variety of different reasons, the forestlands contribute to the high level of quality of life people enjoy in the planning area.

Condition: The Dixie and Fishlake National Forests provide opportunities for traditional family²¹ gatherings and social events.²²

Trend: The Dixie and Fishlake will continue to provide these opportunities, but with increased use and different patterns of use, it will be increasingly difficult to guarantee a quality of experience identical to past memories and experiences.

likely get older with time. Interestingly, Cedar City, north of St. George, has the third most youthful population in the state. Finally, many of the smaller agricultural oriented rural communities may see a trend toward aging populations as youth from these areas move to urban areas for education and career opportunities. For instance, Garfield, Wayne, Piute, and Kane counties have four of the seven highest median ages in the state.

¹⁸ It is important to be clear here and note that traditional and “new” economic sectors are not mutually exclusive. The Sonoran Institute tries to disavow people of this notion. Mining, logging, and agriculture can coexist with tourism and recreation.

¹⁹ In 2005, total NRM jobs = 31,459, PBS jobs = 181,034, EHS jobs = 134,218.

²⁰ 2050 projections, total NRM jobs = 29,463, PBS jobs = 556,671, EHS jobs = 801,429.

²¹ National Visitor Use Monitoring data and surveys seem to suggest that many families located along the Wasatch Front and in the Las Vegas area share this social and cultural connection with the forestlands of the Dixie and Fishlake NFs. Because the history of southern Utah and subsequently the history of the forests are inextricably connected with the history of the Mormons in Utah, many regional residents have historical ties to Southern Utah. It is no surprise that the last two elected Governors of Utah claimed roots in the planning area (Gov. Huntsman – Fillmore, Gov. Leavitt – Iron County and Wayne County).

²² A study by Dale Blahna and Steve Burr at Utah State University suggested that this was the primary reason that people felt many forest areas were “special places.”

Collaboration is Key to Getting Desired Results and Building Relationships: Forest Service planning for resource development, the protection of irreplaceable national resources (e.g. municipal watersheds), and recreational experiences impacts local, regional, and state economies. Collaboration in planning is critical to achieve desired results and maintain relationships between local, state, and Federal government agencies. There seems to be a trend that supports this collaboration, however, all participants will inevitably need to continue working hard and finding substantial agreement in order for this trend to continue.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

Tribal governments have a special relationship with the Forest Service. As sovereign nations with traditional and cultural interests in the forestlands, tribal interests are an important consideration in forest planning.

Condition: Tribal governments want to be informed about forest service actions that could possibly impact forest areas and resources – particularly heritage sites – that have cultural or traditional significance.

Trend: Increased recreation use of the forest will make the preservation of sensitive areas and the coordination with tribal governments to accomplish this goal increasingly critical.

While there are a large number of tribes that are interested in the lands of the Dixie and Fishlake,²³ the various bands of Paiute Indians, many of who reside on tribal lands throughout southern and central Utah have the most direct interests in the management of forestlands in the planning area. The Dixie and Fishlake National Forests maintain and intend to continue a working relationship with the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah.

A NOTE ON COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY

Much has been written and said about the Forest Service's role in community sustainability. Although some would like to see the CER delve into this question in great depth, it is probably not appropriate here. Suffice it to say we feel like the following condition and trend describe the Forests role and the trend for this role in the future.

Condition: Management of Forest Service lands is an important, but not a determining, ingredient in the recipe for economic and social sustainability of rural communities.

Trend: While the Forest Service continues to contribute to the sustainability of rural communities, larger regional, national, and often global factors increasingly impact the "sustainability" of rural communities. The Forest Service will likely

²³ The Confederate Tribes of Goshute, Goshute Indian Tribe, Hopi Tribe of Arizona, Navajo Nation, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Northwestern Band of Shoshone Tribe, Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians, Uintah-Ouray Tribe, Ute Indian Tribe, Ute Mountain Ute, and White Mesa Ute Council are among those nations that have expressed a cultural interest in the Dixie and Fishlake NFs.

continue to provide similar opportunities for rural communities in 2030 that it provided in 2005, however, due to constraints outside of Forest Service control traditional resource based economic endeavors and customs may decrease by 2030. Thus, “sustainable” communities will need to embrace more diversified economic strategies to survive irrespective of forest management practices.

This condition and trend present challenges for Federal land managers and local and state governments to tackle together.²⁴ Only through a coordinated effort, relying on increased collaboration and better mutual understanding will rural communities survive in the future. In short, just as many rural residents want to preserve the past and traditional lifestyles and practices, the Forest Service needs local sawmills and livestock operators to better manage the Forest’s resources.

CONDITIONS AND TRENDS RELATED TO COUNTY AREAS

Statewide analyses paint the social and economic conditions and trends with a broad brush. Each Forest and the nine primary counties (excluding Juab and Sanpete for reasons mentioned earlier) across the planning region have specific conditions and trends that are notable. Once again, this is not intended to be an exhaustive description of each county’s social and economic conditions and trends. More specifically, this document attempts to identify **key** conditions and trends for the social and economic resources in the planning area.

First, several key conditions and trends seem to be common among the counties in the planning area.

PILT Payments: All counties receive Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) from the federal government to compensate for the loss of tax revenue on Federal lands that are exempt from property taxes. The amount of these payments is determined by acreage of Federal land and revenue sharing from receipts collected from the use of this Federal land. Congress controls the amount of PILT, which is paid out each year.

Condition: Many counties rely on this money to fund a significant portion of the county budget.

Trend: Since PILT is not always funded fully by Congress; there are a number of legislative efforts to provide additional or different compensation to rural counties with large swaths of Federal land.

Rural Character and Retention of Agricultural Lands and Traditions: Most of the Dixie and Fishlake planning area is rural. Additionally, most of the local residents and

²⁴ In a 1997 address given in Portland, Oregon aimed at residents of forest-based economies of the Pacific Northwest, former Forest Service Associate Chief, George M. Leonard, suggested: “Community stability means the avoidance of radical, or abrupt, changes in the economic or social structure.” He went on to say, “We (the Forest Service) may not be able to guarantee that a community will be prosperous forever. No one can guarantee that. But we can guarantee that the actions of the Forest Service will give dependent communities the time to deal with economic changes.” Leonard described the Forest Service role as to make “decisions...designed to cushion adjustments and avoid abrupt change.”

elected official are concerned about the loss of agricultural lands and traditional practices. The forestlands will continue to provide opportunities for rural communities to have a “working” connection with the land, but larger, global trends may nonetheless make traditional lifestyles and methods of providing increasingly difficult.

Condition: Desire to keep rural traditions and lifestyle as well as a “working” connection with the land.

Trend: As land prices continue to skyrocket and globalization makes traditional industries (farming and ranching) more difficult, there seems to be a downward trend in traditional lifestyles and practices.

Second Homes: Across the country, communities and counties that have nearby accessible national forest system lands have become attractive to second homebuyers. These part-time residents seem to have a different pattern of use of forest service lands and place unique challenges upon local governments. A recent study by the Utah Rural Development Council (need data) details this condition. It is expected that this trend will continue in the future.

Per Capita Income is Lower in the Planning Area than the State Average: For most areas, per capita income is lower in the planning area than the State average. This is an identifiable condition and trend that is likely to continue in this area as long as mining and natural resource based sector continue to decline in importance and larger corporations continue to locate in urban/suburban areas. Entrepreneurialism and high tech small businesses could provide a way for these largely rural areas to compete for higher paying jobs.²⁵

All Counties are Concerned about the Protection of Municipal Watersheds: The Forests include many acres that are managed to protect municipal watersheds for nearby communities. For the most part, these watersheds remain in a clean and pristine condition. Future forest management will emphasize the protection of this pristine state, however, trends and patterns of use of forestlands will make protection increasingly difficult. Managing for quality water will be an increasingly important area of cooperation between local, state, and Federal governments in the future. For a list of municipal watersheds on Forest Service lands, please refer to the water resources section of the CER.

Forest plans are meant to provide direction in cooperation with county and state planning efforts. A coordinated effort is necessary to achieve optimal economic results. These **county profiles** in the CER can help forest managers to more effectively consider the social and economic factors pertinent to project decisions. Profiles are not exhaustive, nor are they written to clearly differentiate between conditions and trends.

²⁵ Other places in the country that have experienced success with entrepreneurialism and high tech small businesses tend to be fueled by “newcomers” to the area seeking better quality of life away from urban areas. Attracting these “newcomers” to the planning area could be one way of spurring economic development. This strategy can have painful and controversial impacts to small communities.

(In the future, it may be relevant and insightful to view conditions and trends either by individual forest or by regions (mostly likely using the Five County and Six County Associations of Government as regional areas). We chose to look at individual counties because the data and qualitative observations are more meaningful at this level. Broad regional views might mask the true key conditions and trends at the county level. This being said, it is probably fair to say that the key conditions and trends for the Dixie and the Fishlake National Forests are slightly different. Those differences should come out in the county descriptions.)

Beaver County: Beaver County population centers around three communities²⁶ on the east end of the county. Most of the land to the west of the towns is managed by the BLM. There are close to 150,000 acres of national forest land in the county. Much of this forestland is located in a unique high alpine setting of the Tushar mountain range. From 2005-2050, Beaver County population is projected to grow at a rate of 2.1%, which exceeds the state average.²⁷

While agriculture has been a large part of the Beaver County economy, small family operations are giving way – at least in part – to large corporate farms like the Circle Four Farms.²⁸ Beyond the developments at Circle Four Farms, government employment is the largest industry in the county. This is likely to continue. If global markets change, there may be opportunities to increase minerals development in the county. County officials see a trend toward energy development (geothermal, wind, and solar) and transportation opportunities (taking advantage of the I-15 corridor). Finally, leveraging recreation opportunities (most notably Elk Meadows Ski Area and the Paiute ATV Trail) on or near Forest Service lands could provide future economic development. County officials are interested in maintaining the rural character of the county and protecting valuable agricultural resources.

Garfield County: Garfield County – the fifth largest county in the state – has the highest percentage²⁹ of Federal land in the State of Utah. This Federal land includes over one million acres of national forest land, which is the highest number of acres in any county in the State of Utah. Garfield County also contains large swaths of other Federal land including but not exclusively areas within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Bryce Canyon National Park, Capitol Reef National Park, and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. There is only about 170,000 acres of private land in the county. Public lands provide both challenges and opportunities for economic development in the county. The county is sparsely populated and is projected to grow below the State average.³⁰

²⁶ Beaver, Minersville, and Milford.

²⁷ 2005 BPR.

²⁸ According to the Sonoran Institute, Beaver County is the only county in the entire western United States including the Pacific states where farm income as a share of total income has increased. Citation: Ben Alexander, Sonoran Institute workshop in Wayne County, 2004. This condition defies national trends.

²⁹ 90%. Wayne County, also in the planning area, is 85.6%. Kane County is third at 85.4%. Morgan County in northern Utah has the smallest percentage of Federal land at 4.6%.

³⁰ County population is projected to grow from 2005-2050 at a 1.0% rate.

According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis in 2003, Garfield County residents had one of the five lowest levels of total personal income in the State. Also, according to 2003 Utah Department of Workforce Services information, Garfield County had the second highest unemployment rate in the State.³¹ Slow job growth and unemployment are recurrent problems for county leaders. Traditionally, county residents have relied primarily upon ranching and timber. While there is a desire to retain these traditional sources of economic opportunity, services related to recreation and tourism are growing quickly in the county³². While these services (mostly related to leisure and hospitality) represent the largest sector in the Garfield County economy, government jobs (the sector ranked second) make up a much higher percentage of payroll wages.³³ There is a perception that leisure and hospitality jobs will not pay as much as jobs in other more traditional sectors.³⁴

Iron County: For the planning area, Iron County has largest acreage of available private lands. Nonetheless, well over 50% of the county is Federal land over 200,000 of which is managed by the Forest Service. Most notably, Iron County is one of the fastest growing areas of the State. In 2004-2005 according to a News Release by the State Governor, Iron County grew at a rate of 6.4% (only beaten by its neighbor to the south Washington County – 8.4%).³⁵ Population in Iron County is projected to grow from 40,212 in 2005 to 103,920 in 2050 – a 2.3% increase (one half a percent above the Statewide projection).

Government is the largest sector of the Iron County economy. During the planning period, the service sector is projected to grow fastest.³⁶ Overall, Iron County has a relatively balanced and broad-based economy. County businesses have learned to leverage the unique geographic location (with close proximity to several national parks

³¹ The 10.8% unemployment rate was second highest to Emery County's 11.0%.

³² Services are projected to increase from a 30.1% share in the Garfield County economy in 2005 to a 37.8% share in 2030.

³³ See county profile in *People and the Forest*.

³⁴ In the book entitled *Visions of the Grand Staircase-Escalante*, (and compiled at the time of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument planning process in the 1990s) Gail Blattenberger and David Keefe acknowledge, "Minimum wages plus tips at Ruby's Inn are what the locals (in Garfield County) envisage from the service industry, but high tech service enterprises are also viable given an investment in communications infrastructure." They also suggest that while based on past performance "economic well-being" is clearly an issue in the area (Kane and Garfield counties), "Extractive industries are not an optimal or even a viable solution to the economic situation in these counties." Furthermore, "change will certainly come to these economies" and be met with "resistance (because of) the desire for a land-based economy (which is) seen as crucial to the quality of life in the rural West." The trick according to Blattenberger and Kiefer is to "find ways of preserving our land-based Western heritage and lifestyle (which are so important to rural residents) along with the natural treasures of the countryside." Roughly ten years later, we seem to face the same conditions, trends, attitudes, fears, opportunities, and challenges.

³⁵ The News Release suggests, "The southwestern counties of Washington and Iron, where the urban cities of St. George and Cedar City are located, experienced rapid growth in 2005. These are considered high amenity counties, offering a diversity of educational, tourism, retirement, and economic opportunities for local residents. Both Iron and Washington counties experienced population growth over twice the state rate in 2005."

³⁶ The *People and the Forests* report projects services to grow from a 21.6% share in the Iron County economy to a 25.5% share in 2030. Government jobs are projected to retain about a 21% share.

and other public lands), Southern Utah University, and the Utah Shakespearean Festival to support economic development and growth. There is concern that rapid growth may compromise high quality of life that county residents have come to appreciate. Mineral development of iron ore could provide future growth.³⁷ Despite a robust economy and high growth rate, Iron County continues to struggle with issues of poverty.³⁸

Kane County: Kane County is another county that is dominated by Federal land.³⁹ Although almost 90% of the county is managed by Federal land management agencies, the Forest Service manages only about 125,000 acres. While it did not exceed the state average (an average skewed too high by extraordinary numbers in Iron and Washington Counties), the Kane County population growth rate of 2.6% was the tenth highest in the State.⁴⁰ State population projections anticipate that Kane County will continue to grow below the state average of 1.8%.⁴¹ Nonetheless, much of the growth in Kane County will likely be found in areas adjacent to national forest service lands. For example, Duck Creek Village is one of the largest communities directly adjacent to forest service lands in the planning area. This area continues to grow rapidly creating challenges for both the county⁴² and the Forest Service.

Some of the economic fortunes of Kane County seem to be improving, Bureau of Economic Analysis figures show that Kane County had one of the higher percent changes in personal income from 2000-2003.⁴³ As with many other counties in the planning area, Kane County is projected to rely more heavily upon the service sector in the future. As in Garfield County, the leisure and hospitality sector provides the most jobs in the county, but the government sector makes the largest contribution to payroll wages.⁴⁴

Millard County: Millard County⁴⁵, located along I-15 just south of the Wasatch Front urban areas, has more BLM managed lands than any other county in the State. In addition to almost three million acres of BLM land in the county, there are over 350,000 acres of Forest Service land in the county in the Canyon and Pahvant ranges. Despite the large amount of land under Federal management, Millard County has a relatively large amount of private land⁴⁶ much of which is under agricultural⁴⁷ cultivation. The county is

³⁷ There is a proposal to reopen historic iron mines west of Cedar City. It remains to be seen whether this development will proceed.

³⁸ According to *People and the Forests*, the Iron County poverty rate in 1999 doubled the State rate. Furthermore, in the period from 1989-1999 Iron County saw its poverty rate increase, while the State of Utah saw a decrease in population in poverty.

³⁹ The majority of this land is BLM.

⁴⁰ It appears that Kane County may be seeing spillover from Iron and Washington counties. Additionally, much of the county growth is in the Duck Creek area near the national forest.

⁴¹ From 2005-2050, Kane County's projected growth rate is 1.4%.

⁴² "A substantial amount of lands in the higher elevation forest lands have been developed for recreation homes and cabins, and many are being used year-round," explains the 1999 Kane County General Plan. The Plan also stipulates that the county does not intend to provide municipal level services to these areas.

⁴³ Baby boomers migrating to Kane County may be causing this change.

⁴⁴ See *People and the Forests* report.

⁴⁵ Millard County is the third largest county in the State behind only San Juan (1) and Tooele (2) counties.

⁴⁶ Almost 600,000 acres.

⁴⁷ Largely dairies and alfalfa operations.

projected to grow at about the same rate as the rest of the State from now to 2050.⁴⁸ More recent growth rates have been more conservative – 0.3% in 2004-05.

Government and utilities are by far the largest contributing sectors – both in terms of jobs and wages – to the Millard County economy. The Intermountain Power Project (IPP) located in Delta is a large part of the county economy.⁴⁹ Expansion of IPP will mean more jobs and wages for the county. Non-farm small businesses are projected to provide the most job growth in Millard County between 2005 and 2030.⁵⁰ The county has seen significant growth in recent years in agricultural processing. A trend towards “value-added agricultural” businesses may continue in the future. Water is described by the Millard County General Plan as the “lifeblood” of the county.

Piute County: Piute County is one of the state’s smallest counties by land area and the second smallest by population. About 75% of the county is under Federal management. The county shares the unique Tushar mountain range with Beaver and Sevier counties. While population actually decreased from 1990 to 2002⁵¹, the county is projected to sustain a population growth rate of about 0.7% from 2005 to 2050.⁵²

Residents of Piute County have the second lowest total personal income in the state. Recent data collected by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, however, suggest an upturn in personal income numbers for the county.⁵³ The government sector is the largest sector of the Piute County economy. Agriculture has traditionally occupied a large percentage of the economy.⁵⁴ Because these agriculture jobs do not tend to pay well, many county residents hold multiple jobs to pay the bills. Unlike many counties future projections for service growth in Piute County are modest.⁵⁵ While county poverty numbers far exceed state averages, the county has seen a decrease in poverty recently.⁵⁶ In the past, mining was a large part of the Piute County economy. Although most prognosticators seem to doubt the likelihood of such an occurrence, if market conditions were to change, mineral development could become a larger contributing sector in the Piute County economy. Finally, recreation along the Paiute ATV trail located on the Fishlake National Forest is big contributor to the Piute County tourism economy. Marysvale has become a capital for motorized recreation in the region. The county views promotion of tourism while

⁴⁸ Millard County’s growth rate is projected to be 1.7% just under the 1.8% state average over the 45-year period.

⁴⁹ IPP is the largest contributor to county tax revenue.

⁵⁰ See *People and the Forests*.

⁵¹ See *People and the Forests*.

⁵² 2005 BPR.

⁵³ From 2000 to 2003, Piute County saw personal income numbers increase by 6%, the fourth fastest rate in the state (only trailing Uintah (1), Washington (2), and Rich (3) counties).

⁵⁴ In 1980, agricultural employment made up 31.4% of the economy. By 2002, agriculture’s share had increased to 34.9%. But in 2030, agriculture is projected to decline to 23.9%. Small business, government, services, transportation and public utilities are largely expected to take up the slack.

⁵⁵ See *People and the Forests*.

⁵⁶ See *People and the Forests*.

maintaining quality of life and rural character as a major economic development challenge.⁵⁷

Sevier County: Sevier County has over 700,000 acres of Forest Service land.⁵⁸ If you include BLM and NPS land in the county Federal lands occupy 76% of the county. From 2005-2050, the county is projected to grow at less than 1.0% growth rate, which is almost a percent lower than the state average.

Traditionally, Sevier County is an agricultural area. Agriculture seems to be declining and the service sector seems to be becoming increasingly important. According to the Sevier County General Plan, 1998, "Preserving, protecting, and promoting increased use of recreational resources is a fundamental policy of [the county general plan] because [this activity] affects local businesses more than any other factor."⁵⁹ Proximity to I-70 may provide the county with development opportunities. Oil, recently discovered in the county, could radically alter the economic fortunes of this county. The Fishlake National Forest headquarters are located in Sevier County.

Washington County: Washington County located in the far southwest corner of the State contains almost 75% Federal land. There are about 350,000 acres of Forest Service managed land including a large Wilderness area within the Pine Valley Mountains north of St. George. The lack of future developable private lands to accommodate projected growth is a major issue for county leaders. Due to nice weather and quality of life (which would include proximity to public lands⁶⁰), for the past several years⁶¹, Washington County has been the fastest growing county in the State.⁶² In 2004-05, the county grew at a rate of 8.4%.⁶³⁶⁴ Incredibly, the county is projected to sustain a 3.9% growth rate through 2050. Total population is projected to increase from the 125,010 people in 2005 to 607,334 people by 2050.⁶⁵ Conflicts over the availability of private land, water, and open space will be a key trend in this area.⁶⁶

The trade, transportation, and utilities sector is currently the largest industry in Washington County.⁶⁷ In the period from 1980 to 2002, many traditional industries⁶⁸ all

⁵⁷ Piute County Recreation and Tourism Plan, 1998.

⁵⁸ Sevier County contains the second largest acreages of National Forest land in the State of Utah. Garfield County, also in the planning area, is first.

⁵⁹ See *People and the Forests*.

⁶⁰ It is unclear how much of an impact the Forest Service managed lands contribute to bringing people to relocate in the region. This is an area for future research.

⁶¹ This trend of growth due to tourism and winter residences dates back to the 1960s.

⁶² This growth is located throughout the county. Interestingly, Washington, Hurricane, Ivins, and Santa Clara growth rates (all exceeding 10% annual growth from 2000 to 2002) all outstrip St. George.

⁶³ See Governor's News Release on population projections.

⁶⁴ According to the Washington County Economic Development Strategic Plan, from 1990 to 1994, Washington County was the fourth fastest growing county in the United States.

⁶⁵ See *People and the Forests* and recent populations projects released in a 2005 News Release from the Utah State Governor.

⁶⁶ See *People and the Forests* profile of Washington County particularly the summary of plans for Washington County area.

⁶⁷ *People and the Forests*.

but disappeared as a share of the county economy. In the same period, government employment was almost cut in half as well. Services took up the slack by almost doubling. Between 2005 and 2030, government employment will likely remain the same and services will continue to grow, while traditional industries will likely continue to struggle.⁶⁹ Health and education services are expected to grow to meet the demands of newcomers to the county. Like Iron County, Washington County has an enviable job growth rate and a relatively diverse economic base. Per capita income in Washington County more closely approaches state averages. Low wages in the tourism industry are a concern for county officials. Despite lagging behind state averages for wage income, buoyed by retirees, Washington County residents have the fifth highest total personal income in the state. Total personal income increased at the second fastest rate in the state during the period from 2000-2003.⁷⁰

Much of the Washington County General Plan is focused on public lands issues. County leaders will continue to seek working relationships with Federal agencies to improve management of these areas that are viewed as critical to the county economy.

Wayne County: Wayne County has the second highest percentage of Federal land of any county in the state. There are about 160,000 acres of national forest land split between the Dixie and Fishlake National Forests. Although it is only the 10th smallest county in the state, it contains the second fewest acres of private land in the state (trailing only Daggett County by about 8,000 acres⁷¹). In 2004-2005, Wayne County was only one of three counties to register negative population growth. From 2005 to 2050, the county is projected to almost double in population and grow at a 1.2% growth rate.⁷² (This data is in conflict with *People and the Forests*. Did some of the counties see their projects modified downward?)

Education and health services is the largest sector in the Wayne County economy followed closely by government.⁷³ Education and health services maintains its lead over government in payroll wages. Since 1980 agriculture has decreased dramatically and services have increased. This trend is projected to continue into 2030.⁷⁴ While agriculture continues to decline, it is an important part of the county's tradition and custom, many county residents work multiple jobs to keep the traditions of the past alive. The County General Plan identifies tourism promotion for economic development;

⁶⁸ Agriculture went from almost 5% of the economy to 1%.

⁶⁹ *People and the Forests*.

⁷⁰ See data from Bureau of Economic Analysis. Washington County's personal income growth rate trailed only Uintah County that reported what looked like "fishy" numbers to me.

⁷¹ Daggett County is about four times smaller than Wayne County.

⁷² 2005 BPR.

⁷³ This sector is buoyed by Aspen Health Services a wilderness therapy program that is a major county employer. Aspen uses the abundant public lands (including Forest lands) to run its program.

⁷⁴ In 1980, agriculture made up 26.9% of the economy, while services took only a 3.5% share. By 2002, agriculture had declined to 13.8% and services had increased to 24.9%. In 2030, *People and the Forests* projects that agriculture will take a 6.5% share, while services will have increased to 30.3%. You can see this increase in the increasingly popular tourist venues of Torrey at the gateway to Capitol Reef National Park.

however, there is concern over preserving quality of life while implementing this strategy.

Wayne County continues to struggle with issues of poverty.⁷⁵ Total personal income in Wayne County is the fourth lowest in the State. Furthermore, growth rates of total personal income were second to last in the State from 2000-2003.⁷⁶

FOREST CONSUMPTIVE RESOURCE ECONOMIC TRENDS

Data on Logging

Data on Grazing

Data on Hunting

Data on Oil and Gas

Data on Minerals and Coal

FOREST RECREATION CONDITION AND TRENDS

Data on Recreation Use and correlated conditions and trends for community services

OTHER CONDITIONS AND TRENDS THE MAY BE SOCIAL CONDITIONS

Data on Municipal Watersheds – integrate with watershed conditions and trends

Data on Wildland Urban Interface Areas – integrate with fire conditions and trends

⁷⁵ *People and the Forests* cites that 1999 poverty rates in the county exceeded 15% almost one and half times the state average.

⁷⁶ See Bureau of Economic Analysis numbers.