

## APPENDIX 17—UTAH PUBLIC LANDS STUDY: KEY SOCIAL SURVEY FINDINGS FOR GARFIELD, PIUTE, SANPETE, SEVIER, AND WAYNE COUNTIES

---

Utah State University conducted a statewide social survey in 2007 to assess the ways in which Utah residents use and value public land resources, and their views about public land management. Random samples of residential households were selected in each of the state's 29 counties. Sampled households were contacted by mail, and a randomly selected adult from the household was asked to participate in the survey. The university distributed self-completion questionnaires to potential survey participants using a multiple-wave survey administration procedure. The discussion that follows is focused on key survey results obtained for Garfield County (n=125 survey responses), Piute County (n=28), Sanpete County (n=133), Sevier County (n=139) and Wayne County (n= 41).<sup>1</sup>

The State of Utah Public Lands Policy Coordination Office has asked that BLM refer readers to its website at <http://governor.utah.gov/publiclands> where it posts updated State of Utah socioeconomic information from time to time. The BLM does not participate in collecting or compiling this information. For purposes of this PRMP/FEIS, BLM has only relied on information specifically cited in the PRMP/FEIS text and included in this Appendix.

### ECONOMIC LINKAGES TO PUBLIC LANDS

One major focus of the survey questionnaire involved assessing the various ways in which Utah residents engage in economic activities that are linked directly or indirectly to public land resources in the state.

#### Permit-Based Economic Activities

As indicated in Table A17-1, a minority of survey respondents in each of the five counties considered in this summary reported that a portion of their household income is directly linked to activities that involve permitted uses of lands or resources administered by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), other federal agencies, or the State of Utah. The percentage of respondents indicating that some portion of their household income is derived from such permit-based activities was higher for each of the agency categories in Garfield, Piute, and Wayne counties than was the case in either Sevier County or Sanpete County. In Garfield and Piute counties, approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated that a portion of their household income is linked to permitted activities that occur on lands administered by USFS. In Garfield, Piute, and Wayne counties, approximately one-fifth of respondents reported that household income is linked to activities that occur on BLM lands.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The numbers of respondents for Piute and Wayne counties are small in part because the commercial firm that provided random samples of residential mailing addresses for the statewide survey was able to identify only 92 potentially valid residential addresses in Piute County and 145 in Wayne County. In addition, 30 of the questionnaire packets that were mailed to addresses included in the Piute County sample and 62 of those mailed to addresses in Wayne County were returned as undeliverable. As a result of these unexpectedly small sample sizes, results for Piute and Wayne counties should be interpreted cautiously.*

**Table A17-1. Percentage of survey respondents reporting that a portion of household income is directly linked to permitted use of public lands or resources.**

Agency	Garfield County	Piute County	Sanpete County	Sevier County	Wayne County
USFS	22.4%	25.9%	7.5%	14.5%	17.1%
BLM	20.0%	18.5%	4.5%	11.6%	19.5%
Other federal agency	9.6%	7.4%	3.0%	1.5%	7.3%
State of Utah	11.2%	16.0%	4.5%	7.3%	12.5%

The figures reported in Table A17-2 represent the percentages of respondents reporting these types of permit-based economic linkages to public lands who indicated that 25 percent or more of their total household income is derived from those activities. In each of the five counties, substantial proportions of the respondents who reported involvement in permitted activities indicated that a quarter or more of their household incomes is linked to activities permitted by one or more federal or state land management agencies. Such levels of economic dependence on permitted activities were highest for Garfield County respondents, who reported permitted activities on lands administered by “other federal agencies” and USFS; among Piute County respondents who reported use of state lands; among Sanpete County respondents who reported use of BLM, other federal agency, and state lands; among Sevier County respondents who use USFS, state, or other federal agency lands; and among Wayne County respondents who engage in permitted uses of USFS, other federal agency, or state lands.

**Table A17-2. Percentage of survey respondents reporting permit-based economic activities on public lands, who indicated that 25 percent or more of their household income is derived from those activities.**

Agency	Garfield County	Piute County	Sanpete County	Sevier County	Wayne County
USFS	42.9%	14.3%	40.0%	68.4%	85.7%
BLM	32.0%	20.0%	50.0%	43.7%	37.5%
Other federal agency	66.7%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%
State of Utah	21.4%	50.0%	50.0%	60.0%	60.0%

## Household Participation in Selected Commercial Activities

The next series of questions asked respondents to indicate whether they or members of their households participate in any of a number of commercial activities that are commonly associated with public land use, but can involve the use of either public or private lands. Results summarized in Table A17-3 indicate that only a minority of survey respondents in each of the five counties reported participation in any of these activities. Among Garfield County respondents, the activities reported most frequently were livestock grazing and related work (23.4% of respondents) and commercial firewood cutting (19.4%). In Piute County, participation was reported most frequently for livestock grazing and related work (29.6%) and commercial firewood cutting (25.0%). In Sanpete County, the activity reported most frequently was livestock grazing and related work (11.3%). In Sevier County, respondents most frequently reported

participation in mining coal, uranium, or other minerals (14.6%). In Wayne County, the activities reported most frequently were livestock grazing and related work (12.2%) and other miscellaneous commercial activities (19.4%).

**Table A17-3. Percentage of survey respondents reporting that they or members of their households participate in selected resource-based commercial activities, on either public or private lands.**

<b>Economic Activity</b>	<b>Garfield County</b>	<b>Piute County</b>	<b>Sanpete County</b>	<b>Sevier County</b>	<b>Wayne County</b>
Livestock grazing and related work	23.4%	29.6%	11.3%	8.8%	12.2%
Commercial firewood cutting	19.4%	25.0%	8.3%	8.0%	4.9%
Logging, post and pole cutting, or other timber-related work	8.9%	10.7%	2.3%	7.3%	7.3%
Mining coal, uranium, or other solid minerals	0.8%	7.1%	2.3%	14.6%	0.0%
Mining sand, gravel, or other construction materials	2.4%	3.6%	2.3%	5.8%	4.9%
Oil and gas exploration and development	2.4%	0.0%	4.5%	4.4%	0.0%
Operating an outfitting or guiding business	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%
Film making/commercial photography	0.8%	0.0%	2.3%	2.2%	0.0%
Other commercial activities	5.2%	4.8%	5.5%	2.4%	19.4%

## Household Involvement in Businesses Linked to Recreation/Tourism

Survey respondents were also asked whether they or any member of their household operate or work in a business linked to recreation or tourism activity that is influenced by the presence of public lands and resources. The percentages of respondents who said “yes” to this question were highest in Wayne County (51.3%), in Garfield County (40.3%), and in Piute County (33.3%). Substantially lower percentages of respondents from Sevier (8.1%) and Sanpete (5.3%) counties indicated this type of economic linkage for their households. Respondents were also asked to assess how important activities and uses linked to public lands are to the success of this business. Among respondents who reported household involvement in such businesses, the proportions who said that the influence of public lands is “extremely important” to that business were 64.0% in Garfield County, 66.7% in Piute County, 44.4% in Sanpete County, 36.4% in Sevier County, and 75.0% in Wayne County.

## Household Involvement in Businesses Linked to Commodity Production

A similar question asked about the involvement of survey participants and members of their households in businesses that provide services and supplies to farming or ranching operations, logging firms, or other commercial enterprises that use or process natural resources located on public lands. The percentage of

respondents reporting participation by a household member in such businesses was relatively low in each of the five counties: 13.8% in Garfield County, 22.2% in Piute County, 11.4% in Sanpete County, 7.3% in Sevier County, and 23.1% in Wayne County.

## Ownership of Property or Assets With Values Influenced by Nearby Public Lands

When asked whether they own land, buildings, or other assets that they believe have a monetary value that is significantly influenced by the presence and condition of nearby public lands, 54.9% of respondents in Garfield County, 74.1% in Piute County, 22.7% in Sanpete County, 28.7% in Sevier County, and 61.5% in Wayne County said “yes.” Those who did perceive the existence of such a relationship were then asked to identify specific types of assets that they own and that they believe have a value influenced by the close proximity of public lands. Respondents in all five of these counties most frequently cited the value of their permanent, year-round residential property (38.4% in Garfield County, 50.0% in Piute County, 15.8% in Sanpete County, 15.8% in Sevier County, and 48.8% in Wayne County) as being influenced by the presence and condition of nearby public lands.

## PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR OVERALL QUALITY OF LIFE

Survey participants were also asked to report how important they think 15 different types of public land resources and resource uses are for the overall quality of life experienced by people living in their communities. Table A17-4 summarizes response patterns to this series of questions for Garfield, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne counties, with a focus on the percentage of respondents from each county who indicated that they consider a particular type of resource use to be “very important” for local quality of life.

**Table A17-4. Percentage of survey respondents indicating that selected public land resource uses are "very important" to the overall quality of life in their community.**

Resource Use	Garfield County	Piute County	Sanpete County	Sevier County	Wayne County
Grazing of livestock on public lands	86.3%	80.8%	71.5%	67.2%	79.5%
Water resources used to irrigate crops and pastures	96.8%	92.6%	95.4%	92.6%	100.0%
Water resources used to supply homes and businesses	94.4%	77.8%	96.9%	91.9%	89.7%
Water resources that provide important fish/wildlife habitat	70.2%	84.6%	74.4%	79.1%	79.5%
Energy resources such as oil, gas, coal, or uranium	46.6%	47.4%	40.3%	68.2%	33.3%
Sand, gravel, or other minerals used in building and construction industries	40.5%	25.0%	25.2%	43.8%	41.7%

Resource Use	Garfield County	Piute County	Sanpete County	Sevier County	Wayne County
Forested areas that provide timber used by logging operations and lumber mills	71.8%	26.9%	47.6%	37.9%	55.3%
Areas in which trees or other vegetation provide important wildlife habitat	59.7%	63.0%	71.2%	73.5%	71.7%
Areas that attract tourism and recreational activity	75.4%	64.3%	48.1%	57.5%	76.9%
Opportunities to enjoy off-road vehicles, snowmobiling, or other motorized recreation	51.2%	78.6%	55.8%	59.6%	56.8%
Opportunities to enjoy hiking, backpacking, cross-country skiing, horseback riding, or other types of non-motorized recreation	64.5%	66.7%	55.4%	51.1%	74.4%
Opportunities to hunt for wild game	76.6%	75.0%	60.9%	69.9%	56.4%
Opportunities to fish in area lakes, streams, and rivers	77.4%	85.7%	65.9%	73.3%	64.1%
Undeveloped landscapes in which motorized access and resource development are restricted	26.7%	34.6%	34.7%	35.5%	33.3%
Areas managed to maintain biodiversity and protect habitat for sensitive or important plants or wildlife	32.2%	37.5%	41.9%	36.7%	34.2%

In Garfield County, 4 of the 15 types of public land resource use presented in this question were considered “very important” by fewer than one-half of respondents (energy resource development, sand/gravel or other construction-related mineral development, undeveloped landscapes in which motorized access and resource development are restricted, and areas managed to maintain biodiversity and protect habitat). At the same time, more than three-fourths of Garfield County respondents considered grazing of livestock on public lands; water resources used to irrigate crops and pastures; water resources used to supply homes and businesses; areas that attract tourism and recreation activity; opportunities to hunt for wild game; and opportunities to fish in area lakes, rivers, and streams to be “very important” to the local quality of life.

In Piute County, six of these resource uses were considered “very important” by fewer than one-half of the respondents (energy resources; sand, gravel, or other minerals; forested areas that provide timber for logging and lumber mills; areas that attract tourism and recreation; undeveloped landscapes in which motorized access and resource development are restricted; and areas managed to maintain biodiversity and to protect habitat). Conversely, three resource uses—water resources used to irrigate crops and pastures; water resources used to supply homes and businesses; and water resources that provide important fish or wildlife habitat—were considered “very important” to the local quality of life by more than three-fourths of Piute County respondents.

Six of these resource uses were considered “very important” by fewer than one-half of Sanpete County respondents: energy resources; sand, gravel, or other construction minerals; forested areas providing timber for logging and mill operations; areas that attract tourism and recreation; undeveloped landscapes in which motorized access and resource development are restricted; and areas managed to maintain biodiversity and protect habitat. At the same time, three-fourths or more of the respondents from Sanpete County considered water used for irrigation, water used to supply homes and business, and water providing important fish or wildlife habitat to be very important to the local quality of life.

In Sevier County, four resource uses were considered to be “very important” by fewer than one-half of respondents: sand, gravel, or other minerals; forested areas that provide timber for logging and lumber mills; undeveloped landscapes in which motorized access and resource development are restricted; and areas managed to maintain biodiversity and protect habitat. As was true in all of the counties, the three water resource categories (water used for irrigation, water used to supply homes and business, and water providing important fish or wildlife habitat) were considered very important to the local quality of life by 75 percent or more of Sevier County respondents.

Four of the resource use categories were considered to be very important to local quality of life by fewer than one-half of Wayne County respondents: energy resources; sand, gravel, or other construction minerals; undeveloped landscapes in which motorized access and resource development are restricted; and areas managed to maintain biodiversity and protect habitat. Five of the resource uses were considered very important by three-fourths or more of the respondents: grazing of livestock on public lands, water used for irrigation, water used to supply homes and business, water providing important fish or wildlife habitat, and areas that attract tourism and recreation activity.

## RECREATIONAL USES OF PUBLIC LANDS

Survey participants were also asked to report whether they had participated in any of a broad range of outdoor recreation activities and other non-commodity use activities on Utah public lands during the previous 12 months. Results from this series of questions are reported in Table A17-5 and Table A17-6. These findings clearly indicate that there is widespread participation in many of these public land activities among residents of each of the five counties considered in this summary report.

Table A17-5 reports the extent of reported participation in 30 different outdoor recreation activities. Among survey participants living in Garfield County, one-half or more reported participation during the preceding 12 months in camping, picnicking, day hiking, wildlife viewing, hunting, fishing, visiting historical sites, all-terrain vehicle (ATV) riding, and driving for pleasure/sightseeing on public lands. In Piute County, one-half or more of the limited number of survey respondents reported that they had participated in camping, picnicking, day hiking, wildlife viewing, nature photography, motor boating, hunting, fishing, visiting historical sites, ATV riding, four-wheel driving, and driving for pleasure/sightseeing. Half or more of Sanpete County respondents reported participation in camping, picnicking, day hiking, wildlife viewing, fishing, visiting historical sites, ATV riding, and driving for pleasure/sightseeing. In Sevier County the activities reported by 50 percent or more of respondents included camping, picnicking, fishing, visiting historical sites, ATV riding, and driving for pleasure/sightseeing. Finally, one-half or more of Wayne County respondents reported that during the past 12 months, they has participated in camping, picnicking, day hiking, wildlife viewing, nature photography, hunting, fishing, rock hounding, visiting historical sites, ATV riding, four-wheel driving, and driving for pleasure/sightseeing.

Responses to a question focusing on participation in a variety of non-commodity use activities on public lands are summarized in Table A17-6. Among this list of activities, Garfield County respondents were

most likely to report that they participate in collecting firewood for home use, cutting Christmas trees, gathering pinyon nuts, and collecting rocks for home landscaping. In Piute County, respondents most frequently reported that they collect firewood for home use, cut Christmas trees, collect rocks for home landscaping, and gather pinyon nuts. Sanpete County respondents most frequently reported that they collect firewood for home use. Sevier County respondents most frequently reported that they cut Christmas trees. In Wayne County, respondents were most likely to report that they collect firewood for home use, cut Christmas trees, collect rocks for home landscaping, and gather pinyon nuts. On balance, reliance on public lands for these types of non-commodity activities appears to be higher in Garfield, Piute, and Wayne counties than is the case in Sanpete County or Sevier County.

Respondents were also asked to identify from the lists presented in these questions the one or two activities that they participate in most often, and to provide detail on where they engage in those activities. Response data for these questions are currently being processed for Sanpete and Wayne counties, and as a result are not yet available for inclusion in this summary report. Among Garfield County respondents, the first of these activities listed by respondents most often involved hunting (16.4%) or fishing (14.5%). In Piute County, the first listed activity most often involved either ATV riding (37.5%) or hunting (20.8%). In Sevier County, the first-listed activities most often involved camping (26.3%) or ATV riding (16.9%). When asked to indicate where they participate in the first-listed of their “most frequently pursued” activities, 84.7% of Garfield County respondents, 83.3% of Piute County respondents, and 80.2% of Sevier County residents identified a location within the county where they live.

**Table A17-5. Percentage of survey respondents reporting participation in selected recreation activities on Utah public lands during the past 12 months.**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Garfield County</b>	<b>Piute County</b>	<b>Sanpete County</b>	<b>Sevier County</b>	<b>Wayne County</b>
Camping	64.7%	76.9%	69.5%	69.3%	73.2%
Picnicking	72.9%	84.6%	77.1%	74.3%	80.5%
Backpacking	22.6%	29.6%	21.6%	18.1%	39.5%
Day hiking	59.1%	50.0%	52.0%	46.9%	80.0%
Bird watching	33.9%	34.6%	30.2%	20.6%	39.5%
Wildlife viewing	75.0%	85.2%	65.1%	73.1%	80.0%
Nature photography	35.1%	50.0%	33.3%	39.1%	56.4%
Canoeing/kayaking	3.8%	19.2%	2.4%	3.2%	8.3%
River rafting	3.8%	11.5%	4.0%	8.7%	2.9%
Motor boating	20.4%	51.9%	24.2%	36.2%	32.4%
Jet skiing	5.8%	14.8%	9.7%	6.3%	5.4%
Swimming	30.8%	29.6%	35.5%	23.4%	24.3%
Rock climbing	13.2%	3.8%	12.1%	7.3%	25.7%
Mountain climbing	11.4%	7.4%	20.2%	22.2%	22.2%
Hang gliding	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mountain bike riding	13.2%	7.7%	16.9%	13.5%	11.1%
Hunting	56.4%	81.5%	46.5%	47.0%	56.4%
Fishing	67.5%	81.5%	63.6%	63.8%	65.9%

Activity	Garfield County	Piute County	Sanpete County	Sevier County	Wayne County
Horseback riding	40.5%	37.0%	24.6%	22.1%	22.2%
Orienteering/geo-caching	7.8%	16.0%	9.6%	11.3%	11.1%
Rock hounding	24.3%	16.0%	22.4%	21.0%	50.0%
Visiting historical sites	60.7%	57.7%	65.4%	60.8%	66.7%
Resort skiing/snowboarding	14.2%	7.7%	15.3%	6.3%	13.5%
Backcountry skiing/snowboarding	3.8%	7.7%	11.3%	1.6%	8.1%
Snowshoeing	4.8%	7.7%	4.8%	4.0%	13.5%
Snowmobiling	9.5%	15.4%	16.0%	10.4%	16.2%
ATV riding	58.1%	92.9%	53.5%	58.6%	61.5%
Dirt bike riding	10.7%	19.2%	9.7%	12.7%	13.9%
Four-wheel driving/jeeping	40.0%	66.7%	45.3%	43.6%	59.5%
Sightseeing/pleasure driving	80.0%	88.9%	82.3%	86.7%	87.8%

**Table A17-6. Percentage of survey respondents reporting participation in selected non-commodity use activities on Utah public lands during the past 12 months.**

Activity	Garfield County	Piute County	Sanpete County	Sevier County	Wayne County
Collecting firewood for home use	56.1%	50.0%	33.6%	26.2%	53.8%
Cutting Christmas trees	46.2%	46.4%	23.6%	35.1%	51.3%
Collecting material for craft projects	24.5%	22.2%	16.7%	20.2%	28.2%
Collecting rocks for home landscaping	30.4%	34.6%	19.8%	28.5%	48.8%
Collecting plants for home landscaping	17.3%	7.7%	9.6%	8.7%	15.8%
Gathering wild mushrooms	1.9%	3.8%	0.0%	2.3%	5.3%
Gathering pinyon nuts	38.6%	38.5%	9.6%	15.6%	41.0%
Gathering berries, herbs, or wild foods	19.1%	22.2%	10.4%	9.4%	13.2%
Collecting fossils, rocks, or minerals	23.4%	29.6%	18.1%	22.7%	35.9%

## ATTITUDES AND PREFERENCES REGARDING PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Two similar sets of survey questions focused on respondents' attitudes and preferences regarding the extent to which various natural resource use activities or management practices should be reduced or increased by those responsible for managing public lands in Utah. Response patterns to these questions are summarized in Table A17-7 and Table A17-8.

The data presented in Table A17-7 indicate that Garfield County respondents were considerably more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in mineral exploration and extraction, timber harvest, exploration for and development of oil and gas resources, protection of fish and wildlife habitat, thinning of forested areas to reduce wildfire risk, livestock grazing, and development of water storage and delivery systems on Utah public lands. They were also more likely to prefer a reduction in the designation of wilderness areas and in protection of endangered species. As indicated in Table A17-8, Garfield County respondents were also more likely to prefer an increase rather than a reduction in provision of road access to recreation areas, provision of hunting opportunities, development of trails for off-highway motorized recreation, development of trails for non-motorized recreation, regulations that restrict motorized vehicles to designated trails, and development of visitor facilities to increase tourism.

As indicated in Table A17-7, Piute County respondents were considerably more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in mineral exploration/extraction, timber harvest, oil and gas development, protection of fish and wildlife habitat, use of controlled burns to improve ecological conditions, thinning of forested areas to reduce wildfire risk, and development of water storage and delivery systems. They were also likely to express a preference for a reduction in the designation of wilderness areas, and a reduction in protection of endangered species. Table A17-8 reveals that Piute County respondents also were much more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in the provision of road access to recreation areas, provision of hunting opportunities, development of trails for off-highway motorized recreation, and regulations to limit the noise and emissions from snowmobiles and ATVs.

Table A17-7 reveals that Sanpete County respondents were much more likely to express a preference for increased rather than decreased emphasis on mineral exploration/extraction, timber harvest, oil and gas development, protection of fish and wildlife habitat, use of controlled burns to improve ecological conditions, thinning of forested areas to reduce wildfire risk, and development of water storage and delivery systems. Interestingly, they were also somewhat more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in protection of endangered species and in livestock grazing. As indicated in Table A17-8, respondents from Sanpete County were also considerably more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in road access to recreation areas, hunting opportunities, development of trails for non-motorized recreation, regulations that would require motorized vehicles to stay on designated trails, regulations that would limit noise and emissions from snowmobiles and ATVs, and development of visitor facilities to increase tourism.

Sevier County respondents were considerably more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in mineral exploration/extraction, timber harvest, oil and gas development, protection of fish and wildlife habitat, use of controlled burns to improve ecological conditions, thinning of forested areas to reduce wildfire risk, livestock grazing, and development of water storage and delivery systems (see Table A17-7). They were also much more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in road access to recreation areas, hunting opportunities, trails for off-highway motorized recreation, trails for non-motorized recreation, regulations that require motorized vehicles to stay on designated trails, and visitor facilities to increase tourism (Table A17-8).

Finally, the data reported in Table A17-7 reveal that Wayne County respondents were substantially more likely to express a preference for increased emphasis on mineral exploration/extraction, timber harvest, oil and gas development, protection of fish and wildlife habitat, thinning of forested areas to reduce wildfire risk, livestock grazing, and development of water storage and delivery systems. They were also considerably more likely to prefer a decrease as opposed to an increase in designation of wilderness areas. In addition, as indicated in Table A17-8, Wayne County respondents were much more likely to prefer an increase rather than a decrease in road access to recreation areas, hunting opportunities, trails for non-motorized recreation, regulations that would require motorized vehicles to stay on designated trails, regulations to limit noise and emissions from snowmobiles and ATVs, and visitor facilities for tourists.

**Table A17-7. Survey respondents' attitudes regarding the extent to which various activities occurring on Utah public land should be reduced or increased.<sup>a</sup>**

Type of use/activity	Garfield County		Plute County		Sanpete County		Sevier County		Wayne County	
	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase
Mineral exploration/extraction	11.9%	63.5%	4.8%	38.1%	15.0%	35.0%	12.6%	39.5%	19.4%	44.4%
Timber harvest	5.8%	73.6%	0.0%	46.1%	11.2%	62.4%	11.8%	48.8%	21.1%	50.0%
Designation of wilderness areas	66.7%	14.2%	46.2%	7.7%	33.1%	26.8%	46.4%	15.2%	50.0%	22.5%
Exploration for/development of oil and gas resources	9.2%	70.6%	8.0%	56.0%	17.7%	46.0%	13.6%	48.8%	24.3%	40.5%
Protection of important fish and wildlife habitat	13.1%	36.9%	18.5%	37.0%	7.1%	47.7%	4.7%	47.6%	15.0%	50.0%
Protection of endangered species	50.4%	20.5%	42.3%	26.9%	22.2%	39.7%	31.2%	24.8%	33.3%	30.7%
Use of controlled burns to improve ecological conditions	42.9%	25.2%	20.0%	48.0%	19.5%	37.3%	14.9%	31.4%	28.9%	39.5%
Thinning of forested areas to reduce wildfire risk	8.3%	70.0%	0.0%	76.0%	8.8%	67.2%	4.8%	66.9%	5.4%	67.5%
Livestock grazing	7.4%	52.1%	18.5%	18.5%	14.3%	27.0%	14.5%	29.9%	7.5%	40.0%
Designation of wild and scenic rivers	38.8%	20.7%	34.8%	13.0%	24.1%	24.2%	20.7%	22.3%	31.6%	31.6%
Developing water storage and delivery systems to meet needs of nearby communities	3.3%	84.3%	3.8%	57.7%	2.3%	78.5%	2.3%	72.7%	2.6%	76.9%

a. Original response categories were "major reduction" and "moderate reduction" (combined to create "reduce") and "major increase" and "minor increase" (combined to create "increase"). "Stay about the same" responses are not reported here.

**Table A17-8. Survey Respondents' Attitudes Regarding the Extent to Which the Emphasis Placed on Various Activities Occurring on Utah Public Land Should be Reduced or Increased by Public Land Managers.<sup>a</sup>**

Type of use/activity	Garfield County		Piute County		Sanpete County		Sevier County		Wayne County	
	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase	Reduce	Increase
Permitting of commercial guiding or outfitter services	14.8%	22.6%	19.2%	11.5%	19.7%	12.0%	25.4%	10.2%	5.3%	21.1%
Providing road access to recreation areas	7.4%	66.1%	10.7%	67.8%	12.8%	49.6%	8.3%	54.9%	12.5%	37.5%
Providing hunting opportunities	7.4%	52.9%	14.8%	44.4%	10.5%	40.3%	11.5%	50.0%	5.1%	46.1%
Developing trails for off-highway motorized recreation	21.5%	53.7%	17.9%	35.8%	28.3%	42.5%	20.9%	48.9%	30.8%	35.9%
Developing trails for hiking, biking, and other non-motorized recreation	11.7%	50.0%	11.1%	22.2%	12.1%	53.2%	17.6%	53.5%	5.0%	42.5%
Regulations that require motorized vehicles to stay on designated trails	21.3%	48.4%	18.5%	33.3%	12.5%	56.2%	13.0%	52.7%	20.0%	55.0%
Regulations that limit levels of noise and emissions from snowmobiles and ATVs	24.4%	36.1%	10.7%	39.3%	17.9%	45.5%	20.6%	37.3%	12.8%	51.2%
Developing visitor facilities to increase tourism	12.5%	51.7%	22.2%	33.3%	18.9%	36.0%	18.5%	38.5%	15.8%	42.1%

a. Original response categories were "major reduction" and "moderate reduction" (combined to create "reduce") and "major increase" and "minor increase" (combined to create "increase"). "Stay about the same" responses are not reported here.