

## Appendix A6:

### Local Planning Review

One of the primary goals of the Social-Economic Assessment is to better understand the communities in Southern Utah and their relationship to surrounding National Forests. The work of collaborative planning is essentially turning the social-economic *product* into a *process*. Several tools were used in this assessment not only to better understand the communities, but to involve them as well.

The proposed approach for better understanding these communities was three-pronged. First, a standard compilation of economic and demographic trends in each county was created. Second, local planning documents were reviewed to understand the most pressing issues. Third, workshops in the region were planned to discuss conclusions drawn from the “long-distance” research and to gather a sense of current issues and challenges not evident in the data or plans.

#### *Planning at Different Scales*

Planning in Utah is done at a number of levels. The depth and breadth of the issues considered by various authorities are largely relative to the geographic size of their jurisdiction. For example, decision makers at a municipal level give detailed consideration to their issues because they are intimately aware of the affects on, and are directly accountable to, the end users. Conversely, decision makers at the federal level may be charged with relatively more wide-ranging responsibilities such as management of an ecosystem or implantation of a specific law or policy (such as the endangered species act or roadless initiative).

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA) recommends that the Forest Service coordinate their planning efforts with local agencies when conducting federal land planning. This is important because State and local decision makers rarely fail to recognize the symbiotic relationship they have to their public lands neighbors because they are largely dependant on them. Federal land-related authorities should carefully consider local planning not just because the State and local communities are significantly affected by decisions, but because they can provide a better understanding of the affects and linkages involved in the outcome. Overlooking them, would be like building a puzzle and considering one piece less important than the others.

State and local planning documents are imperative to Forest planning because they are essential instruments that help identify issues related to public lands. The State and local plans provide information that is likely more established and representative of the community. These plans complete the puzzle of the public interests picture, along with surveys, interviews, and public comments.

Of course, local plans have limitations too. Planning is an arduous and time-consuming task — especially for rural communities with very limited administrative resources. Many of the plans provided by the counties for this study were “old” or “incomplete” in the sense that they don’t include many of the issues that are now common and significant.

A6

For example, several of the general plans that were written in the mid-1990s make no mention of OHV uses, they project a robust economy, and don't mention "wilderness" at all. Some water plans give just a passing mention of the impact of a drought. Most economic development plans assume stable growth in the national economy, forecasting tourism levels with no thought to potential downturns or terrorist threats. Moreover, most county plans give a substantial account of their early settlement history, but only a few of them can explain their economic projections and intentions in the context of historic trends and emerging opportunities.

### ***Local Plan Review Process***

Over eighty local-level and fifteen state-level documents were reviewed as part of this study. The topics of the plans can be categorized as follows:

- **Historical Abstract:** a brief review of the legal authority behind the plan, as well as any outstanding issues that initiated the need for the plan.
- **Economic Values:** any identified economic values such as desire to promote or preserve a certain type of industry, any forest-related economic relationships.
- **Environmental Values:** any issues related to the environment generally, including locally desired landscape conditions, and water issues.
- **Social & Cultural Values:** contains comments relating to the social conditions or community character.
- **Tribal-Specific Issues:** any specific mention of issues related to the American Indians, their lands, or their interface with other groups. (Very few of the plans mentioned the Tribes, and those that did said very little).
- **Forest-Specific Issues:** any mention of issues related to the Forests specifically, including watershed issues, fire concerns, desired conditions.
- **Public Lands Issues:** references to public lands management other than forest-specific issues.
- **Regional Demographic Issues:** demographic trends that were contained in the plans were summarized, but specific figures may not have been included due to the age of the data.

### ***Summary of Most Common Issues in Local Plans***

The most common issues are summarized here and highlighted in *Figure A4-1*. The source of each issue is referenced to the planning document in which it was found. These summaries are also included in the "Overview" and "Planning Summary" in each County Profile in *Section 4—Profiles* of this assessment.

Figure A4-1: Recurring Issues Found In State &amp; Local Plans

Issue	Plan
The County is seeing growth of the <b>tourism</b> market.	2a, 2b, 3a, 4a, 5a, 5c, 5e, 6a, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8c, 11c, 13a, 13b, 14a, 15a, 15c, 17a, 17b, 18a, 24d
The local economy has traditionally been largely dependent on business activities involving federal and state lands (i.e. <b>mining</b> ).	1a, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3d, 4a, 5a, 5c, 6a, 6d, 7a, 7b, 8a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a, 13c, 15a, 17a, 24c
Preserve the <b>agricultural and rural quality</b> of the County.	1a, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3d, 5a, 5c, 6a, 7b, 8a, 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 12c, 14a, 14b, 14d, 15a, 15c, 17a, 17b, 18a,
<b>Water resources</b> are allocated beyond the naturally-occurring water resources of the area.	2a, 3a, 3b, 6a, 6c, 7a, 13a, 14a, 15a, 17d, 27a
A primary goal is to retain <b>control of issues</b> which effect the County's custom, culture, and economic stability.	1a, 2a, 3a, 5a, 6a, 6d, 8a, 10a, 13a, 13b, 14a, 17a, 18a
County is very interested in achieving an ongoing, working <b>relationship</b> with federal agencies.	2a, 3a, 3c, 3d, 5a, 5c, 7a, 8a, 9a, 13a, 14a, 15c, 17a, 24f

Generally speaking, there is substantially more publicly-controlled land in southern Utah than privately-controlled land. Planning in local communities is inherently tied to National Forest System lands by the community interests in protecting watersheds, wildlife habitat, and natural resources. A common discussion in many local plans is an ongoing dependence on public lands for many economic resources and jobs, as well as socially important activities or traditions.

Many plans discuss traditional industry and employment reliant on National Forest lands, such as mining, grazing, timber harvesting, while also highlighting an emerging trend in tourism. “The County is seeing growth of the tourism market” is a phrase that is in almost all of the planning documents. The plans note that travel-related employment is substantial, but the wages are not necessarily family-sustaining. The State-level plans reinforce the local conception that wildlife-related recreation expenditures contribute significantly to the economy. There is an acknowledgment that tourism provides a mechanism for moving money into a county, but service sector wages are low and seasonal in many places. Furthermore, tax revenues can be quickly negated because of the inadequate reimbursement for emergency and law enforcement expenditures.

Most counties are concerned about preserving the agricultural and rural quality of their lifestyle, but the plans give a sense that they don't control their own destiny for a number of reasons. Principally, traditional jobs such as agriculture and mining are being replaced by service jobs because of technology and market conditions. As important, however, is the perception that access to public lands is being reduced or converted from extractive use such as grazing, mining, and logging in response to environmental and recreation interests.

Utah is the second-most arid state, and water resources in many areas are allocated beyond the naturally-occurring water resources of the area. Communities recognize that Utah's high elevation forests are the principal source of water and are critical recharge areas for most ground water supplies. Locals are also concerned about surface water level management.

The plans reviewed indicate that residents feel disenfranchised from the land use decisions of the Federal and State governments. Many say that while they are dependent on public lands, they have very little say in how they are managed. Therefore, a primary goal of several of the plans is to establish control of issues which effect the County's custom, culture, and economic stability. To accomplish this, Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) staff members were invited to be on most of the planning steering committees. The counties state that they are very interested in achieving an ongoing, working relationship with federal agencies.

Most plans state that the counties support a multiple-use, sustained yield philosophy for management of public lands, but there is a wide variation in the plans' discussion of exactly what that means. Many of the communities feel access to public lands, for roads and industry and economic development will ensure local economic diversity. They feel an ongoing, working relationship with federal agencies is critical to promote these interests.

Generally speaking, there is a wide range of planning discussion on the local economy. There is a great deal of apprehension about unemployment, the need to diversify the economic base, and the level of household income from service-sector jobs. There were a few concerns about growth, with more than one mention of implementing an urban growth boundary, but for the most part, there was not a lot of mention in the county plans about the ability to provide services and solidify the local tax base.

### **Plans Reviewed:**

1. Beaver County
  - a. Beaver County General Plan, 1998 (Amended)
  - b. Five County AOG, Beaver County Fact Sheet, 1999
  - c. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
2. Carbon County
  - a. Public Lands & Resources, Carbon County, Master Plan Revision, 2003
  - b. Carbon County, Master Plan, 1997
  - c. Goals & Objectives for Carbon County Tourism
  - d. Development Code of Carbon County, 2003
  - e. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
3. Emery County
  - a. Emery County General Plan, 1996
  - b. Emery Water Conservancy District, Water Management Plan, 1999
  - c. Emery County Business & Economic Development Assessment, 2001
  - d. Economic Diversification Action Plan, 1995
  - e. Emery Water Conservancy District, Water Management Plan, 1999
  - f. Economic & Fiscal Impacts of Coalbed Gas Drilling in Central Utah, 1995
  - g. Castle Valley Railroad Regional Economic Impact & Market Potential of the Emery Mine, 2002
  - h. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988

4. Garfield County
  - a. Garfield County General Plan, 1995
  - b. Five County AOG, Garfield County Fact Sheet, 1999
  - c. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
5. Grand County
  - a. Grand County General Plan Update, 2003
  - b. Grand County Land Use Code, 2003
  - c. Grand County General Plan, 1996
  - d. Grand Water & Sewer Service Agency, Water Management and Conservation Plan, 1999
  - e. Moab Travel Council, Marketing Plan, 2003
  - f. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
6. Iron County
  - a. Iron County General Plan, 1995
  - b. Iron County Zoning Ordinance, 1998
  - c. Central Iron County Water Conservancy District, Water Mgt Plan, 1999
  - d. Five County AOG, Iron County Fact Sheet, 1999
  - e. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
7. Juab County
  - a. Juab County General Plan, 1996
  - b. Juab County Economic Development Plan, 1993
  - c. Juab County, Juab County Action Plan, 1994
  - d. Six County AOG, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
  - e. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
8. Kane County
  - a. Kane County, General Plan, 1998
  - b. Kane County Zoning & Subdivision Ordinances, 1998
  - c. Kane County Economic Development Strategic Plan
  - d. Kane Co. Water Conservancy District, Draft Water Resources Master Plan, 1997
  - e. Five County AOG, Kane County Fact Sheet, 1999
  - f. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
9. Mesa County (CO)
  - a. Mesa Countywide Land Use Plan, 2000
  - b. Mesa County 2003 Environmental Scan
  - c. Mesa County Strategic Plan, 2001
  - d. Mesa County Area Profile (online), 2003
10. Millard County
  - a. Millard County, General Plan, 1998
  - b. Millard County Regional Water Master Plan, 1999
  - c. Six County AOG, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
  - d. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
11. Montrose County (CO)
  - a. Montrose County Master Plan, 2001
  - b. Montrose Economic Development Corporation, (website 2003)
  - c. Montrose Visitors and Convention Bureau, (website 2003)
  - d. RPI Consulting, Montrose Co. Development Impact Analysis, 2002

12. Piute County
  - a. Piute County General Plan, 1994
  - b. Piute County Zoning Map
  - c. Piute County Recreation and Tourism Plan, 1998
  - d. Six County AOG, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
  - e. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
13. San Juan County
  - a. San Juan County General Plan, 1996 (*also "Master Plan", 1996*)
  - b. San Juan County Visitor Services, 2003 Sales & Marketing Plan
  - c. A Photographic History of Vegetation and Stream Channel Changes In San Juan County, 2000
  - d. Review of the BLM Wilderness "Re-inventory in the State of Utah"
  - e. San Juan County Community Development, Business & Personal Relocation Information, 2003
  - f. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
14. Sanpete County
  - a. Sanpete County, General Plan, 1997
  - b. Sanpete County, Title 14 Zoning, 2001
  - c. Sanpete County, Subdivision Ordinance, 1998
  - d. Sanpete Regional Heritage Tourism Project, 1996
  - e. Sanpete County Action Plan for Economic Development, 1993
  - f. Six County AOG, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
  - g. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
15. Sevier County
  - a. Sevier County General Plan, 1998
  - b. Sevier County Zoning Ordinance
  - c. Creating Our Future, Sevier Economic Development Strategic Plan
  - d. Six County AOG, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
  - e. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
16. Utah County
  - a. Utah County Master Plan, 1980
  - b. Utah County General Plan, 1997
17. Washington County
  - a. Washington County General Plan, 1994
  - b. Washington County, Coordination Plan for Washington County's Urbanizing Region, 1997
  - c. Washington County Economic Development, Strategic Plan
  - d. Five County AOG, Washington County Fact Sheet, 1999
  - e. Washington County Water Conservancy District, Water Conservation Plan, 1998
  - f. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988
18. Wayne County
  - a. Wayne County General Plan, 1994
  - b. Wayne County, Water Development Program
  - c. Wayne County Travel Council, Capital Reef Area Travel Guide
  - d. Six County AOG, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
  - e. Utah State Historical Society, Beehive History: Utah Counties. 1988

19. Six County Association of Governments
  - a. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2000
20. Utah Department of Natural Resources
  - a. Community Fire Planning Guidance Document (Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands)
  - b. National Fire Plan, 2003 (USDA & DOI)
  - c. Practical Guide to Reclamation In Utah (Division of Oil, Gas, & Mining)
  - d. Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Program, 2003
  - e. Utah's Forest Water Quality Guidelines, 2001
  - f. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Strategic Plan: 1998-2003
21. Utah Department of Transportation
  - a. Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, 2003
22. Utah Division Of State History
  - a. Preserving Our Past Through Heritage Tourism, 1995
23. Utah Division of Water Resources
  - a. State Water Plan, 2001

### ***Collaborative Workshops***

In order to verify the issues raised in these plans and better understand pressing current issues, a series of workshops were held with the local communities surrounding the forests. The first were organized in conjunction with the Associations of Governments of the region, and the second were organized with the counties directly. These workshops were not noticed public meetings, but the organizers were allowed to invite interested stakeholders as they wished. Thus, the comments received are not intended to be all-inclusive. This additional review by each county and regional experts established a reliable perspective of the issues facing local communities as they relate to the National Forests. The observations made from these efforts are also a source of the findings in Section 2 of this Assessment.

The first series of workshops were held at:

Southeastern Utah AOG Board Meeting	Aug. 21, SEUALG, Price
Five-County AOG Nat. Resources Committee	Aug. 27, SUU, Cedar City
Six-County AOG Legislative Day	Sep. 3, Statehouse, Fillmore

The goals for this series of workshops were to:

- Review and comment on information collected to date
- Help identify priority social and economic issues to highlight in the assessment
- Discuss the process and product with the Forest Service and project team
- Help build the assessment content and final format.

The second series of workshops were conducted at:

Carbon and Emery Counties	Nov. 18, County Courthouse, Price
Grand and San Juan Counties	Nov. 19, County Courthouse, Monticello
Mesa and Montrose Counties	Nov. 20, Tri-State Building, Montrose, CO
Sevier County	Nov. 20, Sevier County Admin., Richfield
Sanpete County	Nov. 20, County Courthouse, Manti
Millard County	Nov. 24, Old County Fillmore
Washington County	Nov. 24, County Admin., St. George

A6

Iron and Beaver Counties	Nov. 24, County Courthouse, Parowan
Wayne County	Dec. 1, County Courthouse, Loa
Kane and Garfield Counties	Dec. 2, County Courthouse Panguitch
Piute County	Dec. 2, County Courthouse, Junction
Juab County	Dec. 4, County Commission Chambers, Nephi

The goals for this series of workshops were to:

- Report on progress to date in the plan revision and social-economic assessment
- Review and discuss major findings of the social-economic assessment
- Present draft document and gather input on it.

Many of the comments received in these workshops are included in the *Section 2—Findings* and in *Section 3A—Perspectives* and *Section 3B—Recommendations*.