

Iron County

Local Planning Summary

Prepared for the:
**Dixie, Fishlake & Manti-La Sal National Forests
Forest Plan Revision
Social and Economic Assessment**



**Utah Governor's Office
of Planning and Budget**
116 State Capitol
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
(801) 538-1027
www.planning.utah.gov

**November
2003**

IRON COUNTY, GENERAL PLAN, 1995

<p>Summary & Key Issues</p>	<p>The first goal of the Iron County General Plan is to “retain control of issues which effect the County’s custom, culture, and economic stability”. The County’s economy has traditionally been largely dependent on business activities involving federal and state lands (i.e. agriculture, tourism, and mining). The University has brought growth to the service sector as well. The County is projected to experience high population and employment growth, and the County has developed an urban growth boundary.</p>
<p>Historical Abstract</p>	<p>The County’s vast reserves of iron ore lead to marginally successful mining until demand blossomed with the outbreak of World War II. Development of the railroad and local airport was an economic boon for the County, and later, I-15 made a great impact on Cedar City. As a result, population has grown steadily.</p>
<p>Economic Values</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cedar City has historically been a popular transportation hub for access to the National Parks (Zion, Bryce Canyon, Grand Canyon North Rim, and Cedar Breaks), (p.7). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The County’s economy is largely dependent on business activities on federal and state lands, (p.17). • The County is committed to allowing the extraction of ores within the County, (p.22). • The County economy experienced strong growth in the 1990s, (p.83). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job growth in Cedar City was 11.7%, and retail sales grew 13.6% in 1994.
<p>Environmental Values</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cedar, Parowan, and Escalante Valley groundwater aquifer levels are an area of concern, (p.18).
<p>Social & Cultural Values</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive planning is intended to preserve the agricultural and rural quality of the County, (p.20).

<p>Tribal-Specific Issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Tribal land is zoned “Agriculture 20”, (p.113 & Zoning Map).
<p>Forest-Specific Issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Forest land is zoned “Agriculture 20”, (p.113 & Zoning Map). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lots are minimum of 20acres. ○ All private lands that are surrounded by Forest are zoned similarly.
<p>Public Lands Issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first goal of the Iron County General Plan is to “retain control of issues which effect the County’s custom, culture, and economic stability”, (p.2). • The largest blocks of private land in the southern half of the State are located in the County, (p.7). • Private land constitutes 29% of the total County area, (p.7). • The County has adopted an urban growth boundary strategy. Most areas designated for growth are adjacent to the current incorporated areas, and will expand away from forests. However, the boundaries around Parowan and Kanarraville will grow towards the public lands, (p.25 & 41).
<p>Regional Demographic Issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County is projected to experience high population and employment growth in the next 20years, (p.16). • Southern Utah University was the fastest growing University in the State (in mid 1990s), (p.70).

CENTRAL IRON COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT (CICWCD)
Water Management & Conservation Plan, 1999

<p>Summary & Key Issues</p>	<p>Iron County has experienced a steady increase in population and irrigated croplands since 1970, and this has contributed to the need for better water management. In 1996, the CICWCD was established. The District covers about 1,380 square miles in Iron County, and includes the majority of the County’s population incorporated areas of Cedar City, Enoch, and Kanarraville, (but does not include Brian Head, Parowan, or New Castle). The District’s Water Management & Conservation Plan details a five-phase implementation schedule.</p>
<p>Historical Abstract</p>	<p>The Water Conservancy District was established in 1996, and was given the authority to raise revenue bonds and tax real property (0.0001%). This amount can be increased (to 0.0002%) if improvements are constructed.</p>
<p>Economic Values</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water rights in the area are already over-allocated. The District is looking for opportunities to obtain water rights because they can reduce the risk of over-mining the groundwater aquifers, (p.2-1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The collateral benefit to this approach will be a strengthening of existing water rights in the valley, (assuming that “extra” rights acquired by the District will be retired). • Considering conservation-oriented billing rates, (p.5-1).
<p>Environmental Values</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District is trying to promote more efficient agricultural irrigation, manage nitrate build-up, and build / acquire infrastructure, (p.5-6).
<p>Regional Demographic Issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iron County has experienced a steady population increase since 1970, (p.1-8). • Residential indoor water use is higher than the State average, but institutional / industrial uses are lower, (p.E-1).

