

Local Government Planning Project

General Plan

for

WAYNE COUNTY

May 2, 1994

Funding for this project has been provided by:
The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board
and
The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	1
GENERAL PLAN SCOPE.	1
HISTORY.	2
PROCESS/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	3
Natural Resource/Land Use Subcommittee	4
Economic Development Subcommittee	4
Infrastructure Subcommittee	5
CHAPTER 2: VALUES, GOALS, AND POLICIES	9
PROCESS BY WHICH VALUE/GOAL STATEMENTS WERE FORMULATED	9
WAYNE COUNTY VALUE/GOAL STATEMENTS	10
WAYNE COUNTY POLICIES	13
CHAPTER 3: POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TASKS.	16
WAYNE COUNTY POLICIES	17
Preserve Traditional Multiple Use of Resources.	17
Protect Private Property Rights Through the Development of Land Use Regulations.	23
Preserve and Expand Existing Water Rights.	27
Ensure that National Park Boundaries are not Expanded Solely Through National Park or Congressional Decision.	29
Explore Tourism and Recreational Opportunities Within the County.	31
BLM and USFS Rangelands Should be Managed and Improved Using Effective Range Improvement Methods.	33
Retain and Expand Agricultural Businesses.	36
Establish and Maintain Upper Limits on Big Game Herd Sizes.	40
Attract New Businesses into the Area.	43
PROCESS BY WHICH POLICY STATEMENTS WERE FORMULATED	44
Natural Resources/Land Use Subcommittee Process	44
Economic Development Subcommittee Process	44
Infrastructure Subcommittee Process	47
CHAPTER 4: ONGOING PLANNING PROCESS GUIDELINES.	48
PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS	48
NATURAL RESOURCE/LAND USE COMMITTEE	49
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE	52
INFRASTRUCTURE REPRESENTATION AND COORDINATION	53
APPENDIX A: PUBLIC MEETING VOTING RESULTS	55
APPENDIX B: NATURAL RESOURCES.	58

NATURAL RESOURCES PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN WAYNE COUNTY	58
Federal Natural Resource Planning in Utah	58
State Natural Resource Planning in Utah	61
NATURAL RESOURCE ITEM RANKING	65
NATURAL RESOURCE/LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE GROUPING AND ISSUE PRIORITY.	66
NATURAL RESOURCE/LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE OPTIONS	68
FEDERAL AND STATE PUBLIC LAND MANAGERS AND ADDRESSES	71
APPENDIX C: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.	74
ECONOMIC PROFILE OF WAYNE COUNTY.	74
Indications of Economic Activity	74
Economic Base	77
BENEFITS AND COSTS OF THE PREFERRED POLICIES.	89
WAYNE COUNTY POTENTIAL ECONOMIC POLICIES	92
APPENDIX D: INFRASTRUCTURE	96
INFRASTRUCTURE AREAS OF FOCUS.	96
BACKGROUND INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION	98
Development And Zoning	98
Environmental Health	99
Law Enforcement and Public Safety.	100
Public and Private Utilities	101
Transportation	102
Water and Water Resources	104
Geologic Resources.	105
Education and Healthcare Facilities	107
Human/Health Care Services Facilities	109
INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES	112
COMMUNITY DESCRIPTIONS	116

TABLES

TABLE #1: ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC INDICATORS, WAYNE COUNTY75
TABLE #2: RECREATION VISITS TO SELECTED NATIONAL PARKS81
TABLE #3: ESTIMATED VALUE OF TOURSIM, WAYNE COUNTY83
TABLE #4: AVERAGE WAGE AND ESTIMATED MULTIPLIER 1991, WAYNE COUNTY84
TABLE #5: BLM GRAZING BY ALLOTMENT85
TABLE #6: BLM GRAZING BY ALLOTMENT86
TABLE #7: AUMS, FISHLAKE NATIONAL FOREST87
TABLE #8: AUMS, DIXIE NATIONAL FOREST87
TABLE #9: WAYNE COUNTY AUMs88
TABLE #10: AIRPORT FACILITIES INVENTORY	103
TABLE #11: MINERAL OCCURRENCES IN WAYNE COUNTY	106
TABLE #12: COMPARATIVE STATISTICS FOR WAYNE SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1989-1990	109

FIGURES

FIGURE #1: TOTAL PERSONAL INCOME75
FIGURE #2: NET BUSINESS GROWTH, WAYNE COUNTY76
FIGURE #3: NET BUSINESS GROWTH BY INDUSTRY, WAYNE COUNTY76
FIGURE #4: GROSS TAXABLE SALES, WAYNE COUNTY77
FIGURE #5: SOURCES OF INCOME, WAYNE COUNTY78
FIGURE #6: 1987 AGRICULTURAL SALES BY COMMODITY, WAYNE COUNTY79
FIGURE #7: EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, WAYNE COUNTY82

MAPS

WAYNE COUNTY	6
WAYNE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OWNERSHIP	7
PROPOSED WILDERNESS AREAS IN SOUTH CENTRAL UTAH	8

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The Wayne County General Plan is an effort on the part of the citizens of Wayne County to define the values and the goals of the county and to identify the means by which to meet those goals. A general plan can help the county achieve well-being for its inhabitants by maintaining and enhancing their quality of life. The plan focuses attention on present and future needs and resources of the county. Upon completion of the plan, Wayne County will be provided with a document which addresses county issues and provides approaches to accomplish specific goals and objectives.

Utah State Statute provides for the development of county level general plans under Title 17-27-301. Components which may be addressed include land use, transportation and circulation, environmental issues, public services and facilities, rehabilitation and redevelopment, economic concerns, recommendations for plan implementation, and "any other elements that the county considers appropriate." In this plan, Wayne County has focused on issues raised by the public during a public scoping meeting. Beyond a summary of more general information, some components of other general plans are not addressed in detail.

The purpose of the Wayne County General Plan is two-fold. First, it should be used to assess and address the (a) federal, state, and private land issues, (b) economic development strategies, and (c) infrastructure service requirements for the future. With respect to this purpose, changes are to be expected within Wayne County over the life-span of this plan document. Because of this, periodic review of the plan and its goals and objectives should be done so that the goals and values defined within the plan may be evaluated in terms of their priority and timeliness. Priorities within the county and issues that the county must face will most likely change over time. In order for this plan to be a valuable tool to the government and citizens of Wayne County, re-evaluation of the goals and alternatives outlined in this document must be an integral part of the planning process in the future.

Second, this plan is offered not only as a resource upon which to base decisions in the present, but also as an example of the planning process itself and the importance of the process to the well-being of the county and its residents and decisions to be made in the future. As mentioned above, the goals and objectives in Wayne County will necessarily change over time. An important aspect of this plan is that it provides the citizens of Wayne County a guide for affecting state and federal planning processes and economic development strategies regardless of the changing goals within the county.

GENERAL PLAN SCOPE

Wayne County is located in south central Utah, lying within the Colorado Plateau. The Fremont

River flows into the county from Fish Lake and then east to join the Colorado River. Expansive rangelands contribute to the economic importance of sheep and cattle ranching within Wayne County. The United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the National Park Service manage significant amounts of land in the county and thus provide many economic and recreational opportunities and help to make grazing and tourism important parts of the Wayne County economic base.

The area encompassed by this plan is the entire land area of Wayne County, approximately 2460 square miles. Included within the borders of Wayne County are lands administered by both state and federal agencies. The Bureau of Land Management's Henry Mountain Resource Area, the United States Department of Agriculture's Dixie National Forest and Fishlake National Forest, and the National Park Service's Capitol Reef and Canyonlands National Parks and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area all are at least partially located within Wayne County. Because 97 percent of the land area in Wayne County is publicly owned, it is extremely important that consideration be given to coordination and consistency with the federal and state resource management plans that exist for these areas. It is the intent of Wayne County to prepare a document which clearly and concisely states county issues and objectives and influences the federal planning process. This plan will benefit both county officials and public land managers during public land planning efforts and decision making processes.

HISTORY

Wayne County was created in May of 1892 and was formed from an area which was formerly part of Piute County. Because of its remote location and limited resources, most of the towns within Wayne County were not settled until after 1880.

During the Great Depression, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) provided funds to build a county courthouse in Loa. Prior to this, county officials met in private homes and rented quarters and later converted a store into office space. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), another federal program established during the depression, operated three camps in the county. The CCC built roads, campgrounds, and small water projects. Modern highways now make it easy for tourists to drive to the many scenic attractions in Wayne County. Residents have access to medical and other services in Richfield, 50 miles away.

Raising livestock is the oldest industry in Wayne County. Beef cattle have had the most economic impact and produced the most income, but dairy cows, sheep, and poultry have all contributed to the local economy in the past. Historically, getting cattle to market was difficult. Until good roads were built in the 1930's, stock was driven 100 miles north to the railroad at Nephi and later to a Denver & Rio Grande branch line in Sevier County. The creation of National Forests in the early 1900s and the Taylor Grazing Act reduced the number of cattle and sheep grazed in Wayne County.¹

Just as the upper valley of Wayne County was settled because of its lush grasslands for cattle and sheep, the lower part was settled as a result of the interest in mining. The small prospector of

¹ *Beehive History 14*. Utah State Historical Society.

Hanksville located the mines, extracted the ore, and if they proved valuable, the property was bought by one of the major mining companies. This is similar to what happened throughout much of the United States.

Another mine of great interest to the people of the Hanksville area is the Temple Mountain Mine, located seven miles west of Highway 24 and 23 miles north of Hanksville. It was named for its spires which protrude up from the San Rafael Swell. While active, this mine was the best uranium producer in Utah, but now lies idle. Two hundred million dollars worth of uranium was extracted from this mine during the atomic age.

In the spring of 1877 the first sawmill was brought into the valley. It was powered by water from U.M. Creek. Soon after, another mill was set up in the valley which produced lumber and shingles. Because of the great demand for building materials in Wayne County, several other mills were built and began operating by the turn of the century. Later, sawmills also began providing timbers for coal mining, and that remains the main product produced today.² A more complete history of Wayne County can be found in the book *Rainbow Views*, © 1953, Daughters of the Utah Pioneers of Wayne County, Fourth Edition 1985, printed by Art City Publishing Company, Springville, Utah.

The municipalities located within Wayne County include Bicknell, Loa, Lyman, Torrey, and various unincorporated areas, including Caineville, Fremont, Fruita, Grover, Hanksville, and Teasdale. The 1990 population of Wayne County according to the U.S. Census Bureau was 2177 persons with a majority of those people residing in the city of Loa (about 20 percent of the total county population).

PROCESS/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and the Utah Association of Counties recognized a need for county level land use planning in many Utah counties. Under Utah state law, a general plan must address certain social, economical, and environmental issues. The law also requires a minimum level of public participation. The Wayne County General Plan went beyond that minimum level of participation to provide the citizens of the county with the opportunity to both serve on the county steering committee for the plan or participate in any of the public meetings. The first public meeting was conducted on November 19, 1992 in Loa. This meeting served as a "scoping" meeting where residents of the county had the opportunity to identify issues which they believed were important to the county. The issues identified during this meeting served as the basis for the work of the subcommittees. Subsequent public meetings will allow the public opportunity to comment on the plan.

An important aspect of the Wayne County General Plan has been the constant involvement of county residents, locally elected officials, and various federal and state agencies. A county steering committee was formed in November of 1992 and served as the decision-making body in reference to what would be included in the plan document. This steering committee further divided into subcommittees based on functional areas of the plan: natural resources, economic development, and

²*Rainbow Views: A History of Wayne County*. Daughters of Utah Pioneers of Wayne County, Fourth Edition, 1985. Art City Publishing Company, Springdale, UT.

infrastructure. Much of this draft plan will be divided on this basis.

Assisting these subcommittees were professional planning consultants with expertise in each of the respective areas. The planning project team consisted of: Bear West, Inc. working with the natural resource issues; Executive Alliance Group in the economic development area; Eckhoff, Watson and Preator Engineering addressing infrastructure issues; and LeeRoy Farrell acting as the project coordinator. It was in these subcommittees that county goals and values were defined and recommendations were made as to what alternatives could realistically be achieved. Below is a brief explanation of each subcommittee.

Natural Resource/Land Use Subcommittee

The general purpose of the natural resource/land use subcommittee was to evaluate natural resource issues as identified and prioritized by county citizens. In addition to those issues identified at the public scoping meeting, the subcommittee addressed other natural resource/land use issues as they were identified during subcommittee work sessions. Beyond these responsibilities, the subcommittee performed numerous other tasks: they became familiar with federal and state land/resource decision making processes; they determined how the county can most effectively influence public land/resource decisions; they evaluated existing county development/zoning ordinances; and they proposed options addressing natural resource/land use issues for steering committee review and final plan consideration.

The individuals involved in the natural resource/land use subcommittee made for a highly participatory subcommittee. Membership included individuals representing a wide variety of interests: county citizens and residents employed in several traditional resource uses such as timber harvesting, mining, and grazing; individuals from the recreation/tourism industry; individuals with recreational/sportsman interests; representatives from several companies developing resources within the county; and public land and resource managers - several from federal agencies such as the BLM, USFS, and the National Parks system. State agencies included the Division of State Lands and Forestry, State Parks, and the Division of Wildlife Resources. This diverse membership allowed the committee to address and evaluate each issue from a variety of perspectives. Well attended meetings throughout the process reflect the subcommittee's commitment to the project.

The subcommittee met on November 19th, January 20th, February 24th, March 31st, April 21st, and with the full County Steering Committee on November 19th, April 28th, and September 2nd.

Economic Development Subcommittee

The responsibilities of the economic development subcommittee were divided into four categories. First, they were to determine county economic development goals. Second, they were to determine the direction for future economic development efforts. Third, they were to identify the county's greatest opportunities to strengthen the economy. And fourth, they were to determine the strategies necessary to take advantage of those opportunities.

Over a period of six months, the economic development subcommittee met in a series of three intensive work sessions. In the course of each of these work sessions, information was analyzed, economic policies considered, and decisions made regarding the direction the county should take in order to achieve the desired economic future. Through this process, the subcommittee determined which economic policy options were the most feasible for the county to pursue. These decisions were then reviewed by the entire steering committee, modified, and further refined. The economic development portions of the plan were integrated with those developed by the other two subcommittees. These decisions represent what the committee feels are the best policy options to achieve the economic growth that is vital to the long term stability of the county.

The subcommittee met on November 19th, January 13th, February 23rd, April 1st, and with the full County Steering Committee on November 19th, April 28th, and September 2nd.


Infrastructure Subcommittee

The infrastructure subcommittee for Wayne County had a slightly different approach and charge. That was to play a supportive role in evaluating the strategies developed by the other two committees. A secondary role was to determine and identify deficiencies or critical needs in county infrastructure. Individuals in the infrastructure subcommittee, having special expertise or a desire to work on a particular infrastructure element, were asked to serve as resource people. The entire group was divided into separate sub-groups which concentrated on very specific infrastructure elements. Assignments included collecting information relative to their individual area of focus, identifying critical needs, and prioritizing those needs.


At the infrastructure subcommittee's second meeting, each sub-group was asked to present the issues and critical needs for their particular area of focus. Many common concerns and needs were identified. Often the individuals presenting the sub-group's issues and concerns also gave potential solutions and recommended courses of action. In some cases, approximate costs of the potential solution were given. Through these presentations, the entire subcommittee more aware of the particular programs, procedures, problems, funding needs, etc. relating to infrastructure areas of focus. As part of the value and goal development process, key issues not specifically presented by the individual members were identified and discussed.

The subcommittee met on November 19th, January 20th, with the economic development subcommittee on February 23rd, and with the full County Steering Committee on November 19th, April 28th, and September 2nd.

WAYNE COUNTY



**WAYNE COUNTY
ADMINISTRATIVE OWNERSHIP**




LEGEND

	BLM Resource Area Boundary		Bureau of Land Management 889,259 acres (56%)
	Private Land 42,773 acres (3%)		United States Forest Service 163,191 acres (10%)
	Incorporated Area		National Park Service 279,174 acres (18%)
	State School Trust Land 208,271 acres (13%)		National Recreation Area (Included in National Park area)
	State Park 0 acres		Forest Service & BLM Wilderness Area

Source for acreages: BLM, Richfield District Office

PROPOSED WILDERNESS AREAS IN SOUTH CENTRAL UTAH



 BLM Proposed Wilderness Areas

Chapter 2

VALUES, GOALS, AND POLICIES

The steering committee in Wayne County recognizes that planning has the potential to help the county achieve its desired future. If development which is inconsistent with the governing values and goals of the county is allowed to occur, the time and energy spent on this project by the citizens of the county would be wasted. For this reason, the goals and values of a county must be specifically defined prior to any objectives or alternatives being determined. There is a significant and well-defined custom and culture within Wayne County as identified in this plan. This culture is the fundamental basis against which all new activities and developments must be measured. The steering committee has carefully evaluated the options considered through this effort in order to ensure that a harmony exists between alternatives outlined in this plan and the preferred sense of what the county should and can become. Following the value/goal statements is a listing of the policies that the steering committee in Wayne County believed should be considered both by county officials and residents. Of the policies listed, those of highest priority are described in more detail in Chapter 3.

PROCESS BY WHICH VALUE/GOAL STATEMENTS WERE FORMULATED

During the initial public workshop held in November, county citizens identified issues they felt were critical to future county development. After a listing of ideas from meeting participants, each resident was given the opportunity to vote for the five "issue statements" they believed were most important. Results were tallied and the issues ranked accordingly. The results of this ranking are listed in Appendix A.

Issue statements were grouped into categories and a "value/goal statement" was developed for each of these categories. A value/goal statement has two components: a "custom/culture" element, which relates to a county value, and a "future direction element", which states the county's future objectives. An example of a value/goal statement would be: "A rural lifestyle is a benefit enjoyed by many county residents (custom/culture element). Therefore, any future recreational development should not adversely impact this asset (future direction element)." The value/goal statements developed for each category focus on specific county priorities within that category.

Each subcommittee used the results of the public scoping session when constructing value/goal statements for their particular areas--i.e., economic development, natural resources, and infrastructure. Although the subcommittees followed different processes, the values and goals identified for Wayne County were very similar among the groups. These statements combine traditional county values with present county issues and challenges.

As part of the process for defining value/goal statements, the natural resource subcommittee prioritized the issue statements produced at the public meeting. Each issue statement was designated a high, medium, or low county priority. The results are listed in Appendix B.

WAYNE COUNTY VALUE/GOAL STATEMENTS

EDUCATION

We believe that a quality education for all citizens in the county is an essential priority for our future. *Therefore*, we are committed to both improving and maintaining school facilities and instructional excellence in all our schools and preserving the tax base that supports our schools.

QUALITY OF LIFE

We value our current customs, culture, and quality of life and are committed to deterring those aspects that will detract from it. *Therefore*, we are dedicated to improving our basic services, infrastructure, and facilities necessary for sustaining a healthy life.

DIVERSIFIED ECONOMY

We value our diverse economy which provides a variety of opportunities for individuals and families to have meaningful employment. *Therefore*, we are committed to expanding a balanced mix of job opportunities for both entry level and career positions, and expanding and strengthening our business and industry base.

LIVESTOCK/AGRICULTURE/PRIVATE LAND

The origins and traditions of the county are based on the livestock and agriculture industries. These industries have historically provided a major contribution to the county economic base and provide the very foundation supporting the county's custom and culture. These industries currently contribute significantly to the county's lifestyle and economic base and are heavily dependent on the use and availability of public lands and resources. We view the use of these lands as a traditional property right. *Therefore*, we require that: resource management plans provide for range improvements; current grazing and stocking rates on public lands be preserved; county water rights be maintained; and public land timber harvesting be continued. Three percent of Wayne County is private land. Most of the value of this private land is tied directly to public lands, i.e. grazing, water rights, timber, mining, and visitation by tourists. Because the tax base of this county is tied directly to public lands, Wayne County reminds all public land managers--including Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and State Lands--of their responsibility to the citizens of Wayne County to consider any impact their public land decisions will have on the private property of Wayne County. Furthermore, Wayne County requires all federal land managing agencies to abide by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) when dealing with all issues impacting Wayne County.

TOURISM/RECREATION RESOURCES

The variety of natural resources within the county provides a number of diverse recreational opportunities. While traditional recreational activities centered around hunting, camping and fishing, visitation to National Parks within the area is increasing and the demand for additional

recreational opportunities such as mountain biking, recreational wildlife viewing, and commercial trail riding is rising. *Therefore*, it is our intent that recreational growth be carefully planned to:

- balance recreational developments with the county's ability to provide essential services (law enforcement, emergency services, water, waste management, and search and rescue);
- ensure other important economic resources are not sacrificed for the benefit of recreational development;
- preserve the county's custom and culture.

WILDLIFE RESOURCES

The diversity and abundance of wildlife within the county is an important element of the county's tradition and culture. Wildlife resources provide a variety of recreational opportunities and potential economic benefits. *Therefore*, we require that wildlife resources be comprehensively managed in ways which optimize wildlife resource opportunities in coordination with agriculture, livestock, timber, recreation, and other important economic interests.

ZONING AND LAND USE/PUBLIC REVENUE

Historically, the county has exercised little regulatory control over growth and development within the county. In the recent past, areas in the county have experienced significant growth principally related to tourism and recreation homes. As a result of this increased development, the county has recognized the need to provide direction for growth and development. *Therefore*, we desire to improve the coordination between the county and other local governments and to develop ordinances that establish limited land use zoning for commercial, residential, and industrial development. These guidelines should include adequate ordinances for building permits and property value assessments. We also recognize the need to consider innovative cost recovery methods and measures which place the burden of paying for such services on the service benefactor.

PUBLIC LANDS

Ninety-seven percent of the land within the county is public land. County industries, such as agriculture, mining, tourism, and recreation depend on these lands and their accompanying resources for economic stability. *Therefore*, it is in the county's best interest that:

- BLM and USFS range lands be managed and improved using accepted traditional range improvement/conservation practices;
- state school lands are managed to promote the growth of county development;
- no net increase in federal ownership as a result of state school land/federal land

exchanges within the county;

- state school trust sections within the parks are exchanged for other federal lands within the county;
- all transportation routes on public lands, i.e. primitive rights-of-way, trails, roads, canals, ditches, pipelines, transmission lines, livestock driveways, and any other traditional use should be protected;
- no involuntary transfer of private lands to public ownership if such transfers result in a tax revenue and value loss;
- National Park boundaries (buffer zones) should not be expanded nor should view sheds extend beyond current park boundaries;
- State school trust lands should not be consolidated, checkerboard should be maintained on BLM lands;
- the county supports privatization of land;
- transfers of private lands to federal or state ownership should not result in a net "private land" acreage loss.

RESOURCES

We depend on an abundance of natural resources such as timber, clean air, water, minerals, open range, wildlife and beautiful landscape. Developing these resources benefits the county economically. *Therefore*, it is the county's desire that each resource be managed for the optimal economic return, but in ways which do not sacrifice the county's natural aesthetic values.

WAYNE COUNTY POLICIES

Each subcommittee generated a list of options which they believed were viable possibilities for the county to pursue. Due to limited resources, not all of the options identified by the subcommittees can be pursued at this time. Below are listed all of the options identified by the natural resource/land use and economic development subcommittees. The items in bold were those identified by the steering committee as being the highest priority for Wayne County. In the next chapter is a detailed description of the those "preferred" policies and the tasks necessary to implement them. Because a major role of the infrastructure subcommittee was to evaluate the options of the other two subcommittees in terms of their infrastructure-related requirements, those options identified by the infrastructure subcommittee are not listed below. They are listed in Appendix D for future consideration by county policy makers.

It is important to remember that all options should be reviewed periodically as the county grows in planning experience and expertise. The county may at any time it so chooses, amend, rearrange, or discard any of these priorities no longer beneficial for the county to pursue. The main purpose of the planning process is not to determine the "perfect" solution to all the county's concerns, but to establish a process by which the citizens and government leaders of the county can identify these issues and outline a systematic way of addressing them.

- *Wayne County supports preserving traditional multiple use of resources.*
- *Wayne County supports protecting private property rights, as well as county interests and values, through the development of land use regulations.*
- *Wayne County wishes to preserve and expand existing water rights.*
- *The citizens of Wayne County believe that National Park boundaries (buffers) should not be expanded solely through National Park or Congressional decisions.*
- *Wayne County supports exploring tourism and recreational opportunities in the county.*
- *Wayne County believes BLM and USFS rangelands should be managed and improved using all effective traditional range improvement methods.*
- *Wayne County supports retaining and expanding agricultural businesses, specifically:*
 - *Livestock*
 - *Dairy and cheese industry*
 - *Timber related industries*

- *Commercial fisheries*
- *Wayne County supports establishing and maintaining upper limits on big game herd sizes.*
- *Wayne County supports the efforts necessary to attract new businesses into the area.*
- *Wayne County supports pursuing an increase in Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILTs) by the federal government.*
- *Wayne County believes that the federal government should cover emergency/law enforcement costs.*
- *Wayne County supports raising tourist taxes (transient room tax, etc.)*
- *Wayne County supports increasing predator control.*
- *Wayne County supports increasing the number of cougar permits.*
- *Wayne County supports the concept of county sovereignty.*
- *Wayne County wishes to use referendums as tools to provide formal input to land management plans, access to professionals.*
- *Wayne County supports exploring the challenging of federal and state regulations - building inspectors, water quality, solid waste.*
- *Wayne County supports developing a communication mechanism between the county commission and mayors.*
- *Wayne County wishes to establish ordinances for building permits.*
- *Wayne County supports establishing a policy statement supporting no involuntary transfer of private land to federal/state ownership if such transfers result in a tax or revenue loss.*
- *Wayne County supports maintaining the existing retail businesses.*
- *Wayne County wishes to retain existing retail businesses and expand their current operations.*
- *Wayne County seeks to organize the county's tourism and recreation promotion.*
- *Wayne County wishes to create new attractions and recreational facilities within the county.*

- *Wayne County seeks to support its local contractors by bidding county work to them. If the work does not require a bidding process, then seek local contractors.*
- *Wayne County desires to maintain its current agricultural businesses.*
- *Wayne County supports maintaining the number of Animal Unit Months (AUMs) within the county.*
- *Wayne County supports providing general information throughout the county on business creation.*
- *Wayne County supports providing direct assistance and consulting to entrepreneurs to assist them in starting and operating their businesses.*
- *Wayne County wishes to develop a brochure regarding business opportunities within the county.*
- *Wayne County supports creating a county Economic Development Office with staff support.*
- *Wayne County supports expanding the fisheries business by helping to develop new markets for the product.*
- *Wayne County seeks to maintain the current level of timber harvest of 4 million board feet.*
- *Wayne County supports restructuring timber sale contracts to eliminate the discrimination of our local mills caused by the current sale size, and administration.*

Chapter 3

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TASKS

Often considered the core of the planning document, "policies and implementation tasks" are alternatives that the Wayne County Steering Committee has chosen to pursue with respect to natural resources, economic development, and infrastructure. This chapter not only describes in detail the nine policies being recommended by the steering committee, but also outlines the process by which those alternatives were formulated and evaluated. Due to limited county resources, the number of policies that can be pursued and implemented must be prioritized. The subcommittees considered many options for future county direction. After a prioritization of those policies, more detailed implementation tasks were prepared to indicate how to accomplish those preferred policies.

The list of implementation tasks indicate what actions must be undertaken in order to effect the preferred policy. These tasks have been carefully developed after consideration of the capability of the county in accomplishing each policy. They do not represent all that will be done in the pursuit of that policy, but do reflect what must be done if the policy is to be implemented. At the end of this chapter is a discussion of how the policy statements were determined by each of the three subcommittees.

WAYNE COUNTY POLICIES

WAYNE COUNTY SUPPORTS PRESERVING TRADITIONAL MULTIPLE USE OF RESOURCES.

The county reiterates their support for traditional multiple use of resources. Specific resource uses discussed during the natural resource/land use subcommittee work sessions included public land grazing, timber harvesting, and mineral development. The county supports these traditional resource uses and feels that these uses should take precedence when conflicts between competing uses arise, e.g. wildlife versus livestock, timber harvesting versus recreation, etc.

In order for the Wayne County Commission to protect its tax base, especially revenues that come from the private use of federal and state lands, Wayne County also requires all federal and state public land and natural resource managers to consider the impact of management decisions on Wayne County custom and culture and economic base. Local governments will be included in any and all federal and state land use/resource management plans during the decision-making process. As required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the Bureau of Land Management must correlate their management decisions with county plans and policies to the fullest extent possible.

Implementation tasks:

- Organize the Wayne County Natural Resource/Land Use Committee as recommended by the county's project steering committee and as outlined in Chapter 4, Ongoing Planning Process Guidelines.
- Actively participate in federal and state resource management decisions. Members of the county's natural resource/land use committee should:
 - advise the county commissioners concerning county-impacting resource use issues. Input from the county commissioners should be forwarded to other state agencies and organizations, e.g. send copy of recommendations/comments to the Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee, the Department of Natural Resources, and the Governor's Office.
 - gather and prepare valid data relative to the negative impacts on the county of reducing or discontinuing traditional resource uses, such as mining, grazing, and timber harvesting.
 - submit written recommendations and county position statements, through the county commission, to key decision makers.

- participate in federal and state resource planning processes during the scoping/issues identification and draft plan review/comment periods.
- notify interested county residents of current or proposed activities and solicit their input when formulating county comments/responses.
- invite Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, and National Park Service managers to present statements on how their decisions will impact Wayne County citizens, private property, and custom and culture.
- review federal and state resource management plans with respect to resource stewardship and use. This would include assessing resource type, amount, and location.
- visit with local and regional resource managers. Increased interaction between managers and the general county populace improves relationships and will allow the county to have "frontline" input and issue clarification.
- maintain contact with key decision makers throughout the decision-making process. Federal and state resource processes should be monitored to ensure that the county's natural resource concerns and interests are heard and adequately addressed.
- request being placed on agency newsletter mailing lists.

Issues impacting Wayne County in terms of traditional resource uses:

PPC = Preplanning Contract, MSA = Management Situation Analysis, NOI = Notice of Intent, RMP = Resource Management Plan, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, ROD = Record of Decision

Bureau of Land Management

Henry Mountain Resource Area - RMP/EIS: 1994; Final RMP/EIS: 1994; ROD: 1995.

United States Forest Service

Dixie National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1994; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1997.

Fishlake National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1993; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1996.

National Park Service

Canyonlands National Park - GMP/EIS process: 1994; Backcountry MPs: updated every two years.

Capital Reef National Park - General Management Plan process: 1993; Final GMP: 1995.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area - General Management Plan process: late

1990s; DCPs: ongoing.

Division of State Parks and Recreation

Statewide: The 1992 Utah SCORP: revision 1997.

The Utah Division of Parks & Recreation Long Range Plan: 1986, revision 1993.

General Management Plans (newly initiate Park Operational Plans): 1993 -depending on individual park or recreation area.

Statewide Trails Master Plan: 1993 - on going.

Division of Wildlife Resources

Wildlife: Big Game Management Plans: elk 1993; deer 1995.

Habitat Management Plans: currently in the analysis process. Once this is completed, the division will initiate an intensive habitat study on the majority of these properties.

Property Acquisitions Under Consideration:

Wayne County - land exchange near Bicknell to straighten K.E. Bullock Wildlife Management Area boundaries.

Henry Mountain BLM buffalo for cattle grazing allotment exchange.

Division of State Lands and Forestry

Proposed recreational lot sale on Piute/Wayne County line south of Fish Lake (state section T27S, R1E, Section 1).

Included are recommendations by Wayne County for upcoming management plans.

Parker Mountain Complex

1. Wayne County supports the multiple use concept on Parker Mountain with common sense environmentalism. We support livestock grazing, sheep and cattle, as established and with allotments as in place, Bicknell winter, Bicknell spring, cyclone, Loa winter and Torsa Flat, and the seasons of use, number and dates, as has been established prior to drought conditions. We support a controlled number of wildlife, antelope, deer, and elk. We favor and want to protect all water rights and privileges, ponds, reservoirs, springs, and pipelines, for the benefit of wildlife and livestock.
2. Concerning the management strategy for the antelope, we support a controlled number of antelope at no more than 400 head. We believe the signed agreement between the BLM, permittees, and the DWR of a herd of 400 head of antelope should be enforced with hunts, special hunts, and trapping to keep the herd at 400

head. Wildlife are on the range the entire twelve months and livestock is moved every month from pasture to pasture. The wildlife has a great impact on the area and should be managed as agreed.

3. We feel that deer doing damage to private property should be removed by special hunts and other means necessary to protect private property. Elk numbers should be kept in balance with current livestock numbers and time of use as stated on grazing permits. Elk numbers should be controlled by regular and special hunts including the hunting of cow elk.
4. We support allotment boundaries as established and livestock numbers and time of use as prior to drought conditions.
5. Water rights and privileges should be recognized and honored on BLM land and private land in riparian areas, streams, and rivers. All dams, diversions, and ditches should be protected for irrigation company, private, recreational, and other uses.
6. State, federal, and private land should be operated with a "good neighbor" policy with dialogue and cooperation to solve any concerns or problems with respect to the rights of others.
7. Wayne County has over 600 miles of county roads. Three hundred of these miles are west of Capitol Reef National Park. We feel all roads and highways, bridges, flumes and culverts should be recognized and honored and be well maintained and improved as finances will allow, with 60 to 100 feet of right-of-way allowed wherever possible. No obstructions or gates are to be put in place unless agreed by all concerned.
8. We feel any land exchanges should be a benefit to all parties and terms should be agreed to by all state, federal, and local officials, private concerns, and other parties when needed.
9. Where possible and necessary, any public land needed by towns or cities for expansion purposes should be provided if it does not infringe on others with established use.

Fremont River Complex

1. Wayne County does not favor any land being designated as wilderness in Wayne County. With the need for energy increasing and the amount of coal reserve, oil shale, and tar sands in the Fremont River Complex area and around Caineville and Hanksville, we feel these lands should be available for production as needed. We favor the multiple use concept.
2. Special designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) should not

be considered at this time. We feel ACEC designation to be too restrictive for the multiple use concept.

3. We feel that Wayne County does not have any rivers or streams that qualify for Wild and Scenic River designation. We feel this designation is too restrictive and would interfere with water rights up stream. When dealing with rivers and streams, we feel all dam diversions, ditches, and other waterways and rights must be recognized and honored by any management plan.
4. We feel any land exchange should be a benefit to all, including state, federal, and local officials, private parties, and other parties where needed. All transactions should be brought to the attention of county officials before the exchange takes place.
5. Historical and cultural values are of great importance to Wayne County. All historical and cultural values and uses should be identified, recognized, and honored.
6. Salinity problems should be addressed by federal entities who possess the means to solve the problems.
7. Wayne County has over 600 miles of county roads. Three hundred of these miles are west of Capitol Reef National Park. We feel all roads and highways, bridges, flumes and culverts should be recognized and honored and be well maintained and improved as finances will allow, with 60 to 100 feet of right-of-way allowed wherever possible. No obstructions or gates are to be put in place unless agreed by all concerned.
8. The impact of increased recreation should be managed to protect the environment as other uses are. We believe in the "pack-it-in, pack-it-out" concept.

When you manage resources, you manage people and their lifestyle. We believe all resources should be managed for the multiple use concept, grazing, mining, and timber. We also favor the current formula for establishing grazing fees on BLM and Forest Service land.

Henry Mountain Complex

1. Wayne County feels all land designated as Wilderness Study Areas should be released immediately and opened as needed for mineral exploration. Sustain the multiple use concept.
2. Bison are a part of the region, and should be managed not to exceed a herd of 200 head.
3. The BLM should be allowed to manage the National Park Service lands as though

they were regular BLM land except for the ACEC near the campground, visitor center, etc.

4. Management of the Big Horn Sheep should continue as they are presently being managed.
5. Recreation, hunting, hiking, boating, camping, and fourwheeling should be managed to protect the environment as other uses are. We support a policy of "pack-it-in, pack-it-out".
6. Special designation such as ACEC should be designated only in the National Parks where there is heavy pressure by visitors. We do not feel the Fremont River meets the criteria as a Wild and Scenic River because the eastern portion of the river, where it joins the Dirty Devil, has been dry in some summer months. Private water rights in the area should be protected. We support the multiple use concept relative to water rights.
7. Water is a critical resource in the Henry Mountain area. It should be used as it has been used and with protection for all the rights and privileges of the people with established use for agriculture, wildlife, livestock, and special spring development for human consumption. The riparian area should be treated with common sense environmental concern.
8. State land interaction should be done to the advantage of all parties--state, federal, local, and private. Improvements should be recognized that have been done by leasee and individuals. County commissioners should be notified of any transaction that would affect the county.
9. Salinity is a major concern and is being addressed by the federal government.
10. Wayne County has over 600 miles of county roads. Three hundred of these miles are in the Henry Mountain Resource Area. All road rights-of-way should be respected and improved as finances will allow with 60 to 100 feet of right-of-way allowed wherever possible. Transportation is important to all people, whether the mode is walking, driving, or four-wheeling off-road vehicles. The area should be treated with common sense environmentalism.

We endorse and sustain the multiple use concept of management.

WAYNE COUNTY SUPPORTS PROTECTING PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS, AS WELL AS COUNTY INTERESTS AND VALUES, THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND USE REGULATIONS.

Wayne County firmly believes that private property rights should be protected. However, preserving private property rights does not necessarily mean allowing individuals to do whatever they want, however they want, wherever they want.

In recent years, Wayne County has become an increasingly popular location for recreational and retirement homes. With no county land use regulations in place to specify land uses within unincorporated areas, much of this development has gone unchecked.

During the initial public scoping meeting, "developing county building/land use regulations" was identified by county citizens as the fifth most critical issue facing the county. Many residents view adopting county land use regulations as a way to protect private property rights while preserving the county's rural lifestyle and atmosphere.

The county proposes that a set of land use ordinances, tailored to Wayne County's specific development goals and personality, be drafted and adopted.

The county may adopt and/or amend land use ordinances by following the requirements outlined in Utah Code sections 17-27-402 and 17-27-403. Additional tasks which facilitate accomplishing this objective are also included.

Utah Code 17-27-402:

Preparation and adoption.

- (1) The planning commission shall prepare and recommend to the legislative body a proposed zoning ordinance, including both the full text of the zoning ordinance and maps, that represents the commission's recommendations for zoning all or any part of the area within the county.
- (2)
 - (a) The legislative body shall hold a public hearing on the proposed zoning ordinance recommended to it by the planning commission.
 - (b) The legislative body shall provide reasonable notice of the public hearing at least 14 days before the date of the hearing.
- (3) After the public hearing, the legislative body may:
 - (a) adopt the zoning ordinance as proposed; or
 - (b) amend the zoning ordinance and adopt or reject the zoning ordinance as amended; or

(c) reject the ordinance.

17-27-403:

Amendments and rezoning.

(1) (a) The legislative body may amend:

(i) the number, shape, boundaries, and/or area of any zoning district;

(ii) any regulation of or within the zoning district; or

(iii) any other provision of the zoning ordinance.

(b) The legislative body may not make any amendments authorized by this subsection unless the amendment was proposed by the planning commission or it is first submitted to the planning commission for its approval, disapproval, or recommendations.

(2) The legislative body shall comply with the procedure specified in Section 17-27-402 in preparing and adopting an amendment to the zoning ordinance or the zoning map.

Additional Tasks:

- instruct the planning commission on the various types and levels of building/land use regulations which the county could adopt and implement:
 - a formal request from the county commissioners to the Six County AOG (Association of Governments) for planning commission training and instruction. AOG instructional format may include reviewing the materials, "Workbooks and Video Tapes for Utah Communities," prepared by the University of Utah's Center for Public Administration. Applicable course materials include the workbooks *The Planning Process and the General Plan*, *The Planning Commission, Zoning and the Zoning Ordinance*, and *Special Zoning Methods-Tools for Zoning Flexibility*. Through this exercise the planning commission can gain a firm understanding of land use regulations and how they can be used to assist the county in reaching its development objectives. With AOG assistance, the planning commission should also discuss several specific approaches most likely to affect Wayne County's land use issues.
- When creating their building/land use ordinances, the county will follow a process similar to the one used in developing the Wayne County General Plan: issue identification, public input and goal formulation, data gathering and analysis, data synthesis and summary, and finally, regulation concept and format.

In relation to Wayne County's desire to develop a building/land use ordinance, this process would include:

- reviewing the goals, objectives, and policies of the county's general plan. Building/land use regulations should support and be consistent with "adopted" county objectives.
- using planning maps and research data to help with analysis. Existing land use maps from federal, state, and regional agencies are excellent places to start. Other information which may be helpful includes floodplain analysis (floodplain maps can be ordered from the Federal Emergency Management Agency at 1-800-333-1363), studies which identify natural hazard potential, population and economic analyses (including the county services provision costs), housing inventories, and future development projections. Various studies showing existing and future capacities of infrastructure elements are also readily available from utility companies, school districts, and local municipalities. It may be beneficial to "brainstorm" for a few minutes, listing the types of information which would be valuable and possible sources to contact. It is important to remember that we are not gathering information for information's sake. Concentrate on gathering and analyzing only the most relevant material.
- providing opportunities for citizen participation. It is important for Wayne County's building/land use ordinance to reflect the citizens' view and, to the extent possible, the county's cultural values. Through the use of public involvement activities similar to those followed in developing the County General Plan, identify the level and type of land use/building regulations desired by county citizens. Either the County Planning Commission or the Wayne County Natural Resource/Land Use Committee (outlined in Chapter 4, Ongoing Planning Process Guidelines) could lead this effort. Activities could include a public scoping meeting and several group work-sessions.
- drafting the ordinance. It is recommended that the planning commission use both the technical expertise of a qualified land use planner and the counsel of a legal advisor when drafting their initial land use ordinance. Wayne County may again call on the expertise of the Six County AOG and the State Office of Planning and Budget for assistance in this area.
- being faithful to the process. Take the time to develop a land use plan tailored to Wayne County's needs, desires, and personality. Although it is tempting to use models or borrowed ordinances from other counties, these ordinances may fail to address Wayne County issues. Several counties have learned this lesson the hard way. After adopting model regulations, these counties are often left dissatisfied. More often than not, they find that the ordinances prepared for another jurisdiction are far more complex than necessary, address inappropriate issues, or fail to adequately accomplish what the county had anticipated. While it may be helpful to review other ordinances or models for ideas and suggestions, it is not advisable to

"change a few words" and adopt them.

- preparing for the public hearing. When the drafting and review is complete, the proposed ordinance should be returned to the planning commission for any necessary changes. Following this final review, the planning commission should assist the county commissioners in preparing for the required public hearing. This preparation should include reviewing the proposed ordinance with the governing body and clarifying any questions which arise.

WAYNE COUNTY WISHES TO PRESERVE AND EXPAND EXISTING WATER RIGHTS.

Implementation Tasks:

- Organize the Wayne County Infrastructure Committee as recommended by the county's project steering committee and as outlined in Chapter 4, Ongoing Planning Process Guidelines.
- Actively participate with the Division of Water Resources in the *State Water Plan West Colorado River Basin Report* and work in coordination with the local communities and area water user groups (including Fremont, Road Creek, Torrey, Sand Creek, Teasdale, Hanksville, and Grover Irrigation Companies and Caineville Canal Company).
- Coordinate with the Wayne County Water Conservancy District to develop and implement an improved water management/conservation program. The Infrastructure Committee together with the members of the Wayne County Water Conservancy District should:
 - continue development of and planning for the Caineville area reservoir (or alternative site) to develop approximately 50,000 to 60,000 acre feet of water;
 - develop a water management plan;
 - develop a water conservation plan and expand water usage through water conservation savings;
 - expand the power and authority of the Water Conservancy District in order to take advantage of water savings resulting from a comprehensive County Water Management/Conservation Program;
 - involve environmental groups in the planning effort in order to identify and address key concerns;
 - involve and coordinate with federal and state offices of Wildlife, Fish, and Game and Soils Conservation/Agriculture agencies, etc. Attend meetings and provide input to federal and state decision makers as directed and approved by the county commission;
 - obtain involvement from all affected parties, including the general public.
 - preserve and maintain public and private water rights and water resources.

- Explore alternative water resources and water rights acquisition through:
 - water conservation and management;
 - underground water resources, specifically the Navajo Sandstone formation underlying the Caineville area which has the potential of 25,000 to 50,000 acre feet per year over a limited 25 year period;
 - high basin reservoir expansion or new construction to conserve water losses and evaporation.

THE CITIZENS OF WAYNE COUNTY BELIEVE THAT NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARIES (BUFFERS) SHOULD NOT BE EXPANDED SOLELY THROUGH NATIONAL PARK OR CONGRESSIONAL DECISIONS.

Current National Park management statutes do not require county approval or participation in National Park boundary expansion. However, during a park plan revision process, a park must assess current boundary lines in respect to fulfilling park mandate. The issue of park boundary alteration is formally addressed during the issue identification and proposed alternative stages of the planning process. Both periods provide opportunities for public comment. Wayne County will actively participate in any boundary adjustment decision to the fullest extent possible.

The county also feels that the National Park Service should not be allowed to inappropriately influence land use decisions and practices on lands outside park boundaries. It is the desire of the county that federal land managers improve their coordination in land use decisions and practices on public lands adjacent to park boundaries.

Implementation Tasks:

- Organize the Wayne County Natural Resource/Land Use Committee as recommended by the county's project steering committee and as outlined in Chapter 4, Ongoing Planning Process Guidelines.
- Actively participate in Capital Reef and Canyonlands planning processes. Members of the county's natural resource/land use committee should:
 - advise the county commissioners concerning county-impacting park boundary expansion or "buffer zone" issues.
 - submit written recommendations and county position statements, through the county commission, to key decision makers. Formal input from county commissioners should be forwarded to other state agencies and organizations e.g., send copy of recommendations/comments to the Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee, the Utah Department of Natural Resources, and the Governor's Office.
 - notify interested county residents of current or proposed activities and solicit their input when formulating county comments/responses.
 - participate in park planning processes during the scoping/issues identification and draft plan review/comment periods.
 - request being placed on park newsletter mailing lists.
 - attend Capital Reef and Canyonlands public meetings and work sessions as needed.

- review park management plans with respect to county priorities and concerns. This would include assessing any amendments or consequences of remaining status quo.
- invite park planning personnel to county planning meetings, to receive park information on impacts to county economy and custom and culture. Interaction between managers and the general county populace improves relationships and will allow the county to have "frontline" input and issue clarification.
- maintain contact with key decision makers throughout the decision-making process. Ensure county interests are given adequate attention throughout all stages of the process.

Issues impacting Wayne County in terms of National Park boundary expansion and "buffer zone" issues:

PPC = Preplanning Contract, MSA = Management Situation Analysis, NOI = Notice of Intent, RMP = Resource Management Plan, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, ROD = Record of Decision

National Park Service

Capital Reef National Park - General Management Plan process: 1993; Final GMP: 1995.

Canyonlands National Park - GMP/EIS process: 1994; Backcountry MPs: updated every two years.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area - General Management Plan Process: late 1990s; DCPs: ongoing.

Bureau of Land Management

Henry Mountain Resource Area - RMP/EIS: 1994; Final RMP/EIS: 1994; ROD: 1995.

United States Forest Service

Dixie National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1994; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1997.

Fishlake National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1993; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1996.

WAYNE COUNTY SUPPORTS EXPLORING TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE COUNTY.

Wayne County wishes to increase retention (length of stay) of tourists in the county through the development of new facilities and services that accommodate and encourage visitors to stay longer in the county. This should include developing the county's recreational capabilities and improving the existing recreational opportunities of the county. A critical aspect of exploring tourism opportunities in Wayne County is the Wayne County Travel Council.

The Wayne County Travel Council's primary objective is to promote tourism in Wayne County. Included among the Council's activities are building an information booth at the junction of Highways 12 and 24 which will be staffed during the tourist season, and publishing a directory of all businesses in the county along with brochures and advertising ranging from local and regional, to national publications. The Travel Council is a nonprofit organization and is funded by transient room tax revenue, which by state mandate is directed to be used in the promotion of tourism, with a percentage available for restoration projects. The Travel Council has and will continue to work closely with the Wayne County Planning Commission and County Commission on tourism related issues.

Implementation Tasks:

- Develop marketing materials which effectively promote the tourism and recreational aspects of the county. Implementation Responsibility: Travel Council.
- Contact and develop a relationship with all state and regional tourism marketing organizations. Ensure that the interests of the county are represented in these groups. Implementation Responsibility: Utah Travel Council, local Travel Council.
- Conduct an inventory of all of the county's recreation and tourist attractions and facilities. Determine the level and types of development and the improvements that are most needed in each facility. Implementation Responsibility: Travel Council, Chamber of Commerce.
- In conjunction with the state, develop and pass legislation that provides more effective mechanisms for counties to generate revenue from tourists and visitors to their region. Implementation Responsibility: Travel Council, Chamber of Commerce.
- Establish a funding priority for improvements to recreation and tourist attractions. Regularly allocate the funds that are generated to these facilities and activities in accordance with the funding priority. Special consideration should be given to Mill Meadows. Implementation Responsibility: Travel Council, Chamber of Commerce.
- Develop a specific marketing plan for the facilities and activities associated with Hale Theater and the Arts and Culture at Capitol Reef. This plan should include

targeted groups of customers to contact and a strategy to extend the operating season.

- Implement the marketing plan for the Hale Theater to extend their season and the Arts and Culture at Capitol Reef. This effort should build on the related efforts of the National Park Service, etc.
- Conduct an assessment of the most likely and most attractive recreational improvements which could be developed within the county. This should include a full consideration of a Pioneer Days Celebration, tourist shops, etc.
- Prioritize the new projects to be developed and initiate a development plan for each.
- Create the financial mechanisms that are necessary to generate the public funds needed to cover the costs associated with providing services to an increased number of tourists.
- Explore methods for the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service to help pay for county-provided services.

WAYNE COUNTY BELIEVES BLM AND USFS RANGELANDS SHOULD BE MANAGED AND IMPROVED USING ALL EFFECTIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENT METHODS.

The county reiterates their support for managing BLM and USFS rangelands using all effective range improvement and management practices. Specific practices discussed during the natural resource/land use subcommittee work sessions included but not limited to burning, chaining, and reseeded. Wayne County desires that federal and state public land and natural resource managers consider the implementation of traditional range improvement/management practices during their planning processes.

Wayne County will comment on federal and state land use/resource management plans during the decision-making process. As required by FLPMA, the Bureau of Land Management must correlate their management decisions with county plans/policies to the fullest extent possible.

The county's Natural Resource/Land Use Committee will actively participate in all federal and state public land/resource decision-making process by attending public scoping meetings, submitting written recommendations, and following the county's priorities each step of the decision-making process.

Implementation tasks:

- Organize the Wayne County Natural Resource/Land Use Committee as recommended by the county's project steering committee and as outlined in Chapter 4, Ongoing Planning Process Guidelines.
- Actively participate in federal and state resource management decisions. Members of the county's natural resource/land use committee should:
 - advise the county commissioners concerning county-impacting resource use issues. Input from the county commissioners as government officials should be passed on to other state agencies and organizations, e.g. send copy of recommendations/comments to the Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee, the Department of Natural Resources, and the Governor's Office.
 - gather and prepare valid data relative to the benefits of traditional range management practices. This data can be reviewed with agency personnel for their input and comment (Utah State University extension, Capital Reef grazing study).
 - submit written recommendations and county position statements, through the county commission, to key decision makers.
 - participate in federal and state resource planning processes during the scoping/issues identification and draft plan review/comment periods.

- notify interested county residents of current or proposed activities and solicit their input when formulating county comments/responses.
- attend Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service resource planning meetings and work sessions as needed.
- review federal and state range management plans with respect to range management and improvement. This would include assessing reported range conditions, proposing plan amendments where needed, etc.
- visit with local and regional range managers. These informal occasions allow the county to have "frontline" input and issue clarification.
- maintain contact with key decision makers throughout the decision-making process. Federal and state range management and improvement decisions should be monitored to ensure the county's interests are heard and adequately addressed.
- participate in USFS Forest Plan review process.
- request being placed on agency newsletter mailing lists.

Issues impacting Wayne County in terms of public land range management and improvement:

PPC = Preplanning Contract, MSA = Management Situation Analysis, NOI = Notice of Intent, RMP = Resource Management Plan, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, ROD = Record of Decision

Bureau of Land Management

Henry Mountain Resource Area - RMP/EIS: 1994; Final RMP/EIS: 1994; ROD: 1995.

United States Forest Service

Dixie National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1994; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1997.

Fishlake National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1993; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1996.

National Park Service

Canyonlands National Park - GMP/EIS process: 1994; Backcountry MPs: updated every two years.

Capital Reef National Park - General Management Plan process: 1993; Final GMP: 1995.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area - General Management Plan process: late 1990s; DCPs: ongoing.

Division of State Parks and Recreation

Statewide: The 1992 Utah SCORP: revision 1997.

The Utah Division of Parks & Recreation Long Range Plan: 1986, revision 1993.

General Management Plans (newly initiate Park Operational Plans): 1993 -depending on individual park or recreation area.

Statewide Trails Master Plan: 1993 - ongoing.

Division of Wildlife Resources

Wildlife: Big Game Management Plans: elk 1993; deer 1995.

Habitat Management Plans: currently in the analysis process. Once this is completed, the division will initiate an intensive habitat study on the majority of these properties.

WAYNE COUNTY SUPPORTS RETAINING AND EXPANDING AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES, SPECIFICALLY:

- **LIVESTOCK**
 - **DAIRY AND CHEESE INDUSTRY**
 - **TIMBER RELATED INDUSTRIES**
 - **COMMERCIAL FISHERIES**
-

General Agricultural Implementation Tasks:

- Develop and update a prioritized list of development projects for each of the county's agricultural businesses.
- Identify and update a list of federal, state, and regional agencies as well as private entities which can serve as resources in implementing the county's agricultural development projects.

Livestock Industry: Wayne County supports retaining and expanding livestock related industries by ensuring that the number of AUMs be maintained in order for the agricultural businesses to also be maintained, and retain all water rights that are so critical to agriculture in Wayne County. Current AUMs are defined in Table #s 5-9 on pages 85-88 of this document.

Implementation Tasks:

- Establish an AUM monitoring group. This group may be a part of the Natural Resources Committee (see Chapter 4) and would collect relevant information regarding AUMs. The purpose of this group is to monitor the number of AUMs within the county and be alert to any adjustments in that number. Implementation Responsibility: Utah Wool Growers Association, grazing associations, Natural Resource Committee.
- Take advantage of existing organizations such as the Farm Bureau and the Soil Conservation District for this purpose. Implementation Responsibility: Farm Bureau, Soil Conservation District.
- Ensure effective representation of the county's interest in this matter with the federal government. This may involve retaining legal counsel, employing lobbyists, or designating an individual or group in the county capable of performing this function. Implementation Responsibility: Utah State University Extension Agent.
- Identify livestock-related value-added business opportunities such as processing, by-product, etc. which could be feasible to pursue locally and prepare a plan to induce development.
- Regularly conduct an analysis of the economic impact of the agriculture businesses on the county and what effect changes in the number of AUMs will have on that

value. Use this information in a presentation to federal representatives. Implementation Responsibility: USU Extension Agent, Department of Agriculture.

- Promote development of water storage facilities within the county. Implementation Responsibility: county commission.

Dairy and Cheese Industry: Wayne County supports expanding the dairy and cheese industry; including two components. First, expand the direct markets for dairy and cheese produced by Wayne County businesses. And second, expand businesses that use the dairy and cheese products in production of other food items.

Implementation Tasks:

- Identify all markets that the current dairy and cheese industry within the county serves. Implementation Responsibility: Dairy Council.
- Organize the dairy and cheese business owners within the county in order to collectively pursue new markets. Implementation Responsibility: Dairy Council.
- Coordinate the efforts of promoting the dairy and cheese industry with those efforts undertaken by the state and regional entities. Implementation Responsibility: Department of Agriculture.
- Pursue foreign cheese and dairy marketing opportunities through the resources and expertise of the state. Implementation Responsibility: state agencies.
- Identify value added businesses that utilize dairy and cheese products in their processes and would be interested in purchasing the raw materials from local operations. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office.
- Identify those value-added businesses that may be interested in locating within the county in order to increase access to the raw supplies for their products. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office.
- Aggressively contact and market to these value-added businesses that have been targeted. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office.

Timber Related Industries: Wayne County supports maintaining and expanding the level of timber harvesting within the county so that it supports a retention and expansion of timber-related businesses within the region. The county recognizes the value and contribution made by the county's timber industry and encourages the federal government to let smaller timber harvesting contracts within the county.

A group of interested timber operators have organized and issued the following:

*Southern Utah Independent Forest Products Association
for Rural Development*

The purpose of this association is to find economic sustainability for the forest products industry in the rural areas of southern Utah. This association will work to develop relationships with organizations which might find mutual benefit in creating an economic and ecological sustainable forest products industry in southern Utah. The association believes it is possible for the existing small timber mills and associated businesses to sustain their livelihoods while not depleting the timber resource or degrading the ecosystems. The association is concerned that current forest practices may not provide for an economic and ecological sustainable future.

This association recognizes the need to establish a plan which embraces and encompasses the needs of all individuals and groups which share concerns in our public and private forest. The efforts described within this association will be more effective as an organization than as individual and sporadic efforts. It will represent a concerned community effort to create a balance of ecologically managed forests and preserve the custom and culture of the local area. There are several issues which the association is currently addressing: small timber sales, value-added products, and cooperative timber purchasing.

The debate regarding forest management has been centered on below cost sales, actual sales costs, size of sale, and ecosystem management practices. The current sale practice excludes many economic and ecologic concerns in the rural areas.

Firstly, timber sales need to be conducted in a manner that is in scale with the local ability to accommodate the timber quantity of the sales. Secondly, the need to increase sale cost to what is actual cost must concur with the development of value-added processes which will be able to absorb these increases in cost. Thirdly, a cooperative purchasing ability needs to be examined and determined whether appropriate and feasible.

Implementation Tasks:

- Analyze and regularly monitor the economic impact of the timber industry on the county in terms of employment, wages, taxes, etc.
- Initiate a lobbying effort on behalf of the county that is directed at influencing the number of small contracts for timber harvest.
- Regularly contact the local timber businesses to assess their needs, be apprised of their developments, and determine in advance the problems and concerns they are facing.
- Obtain Forest Service Diversification Grant. Implementation Responsibility: county commission in conjunction with District Ranger.

- Recruit support from the timber-using mines in Carbon, Emery, and Sevier Counties. Implementation Responsibility: county commission.
- Organize the independent sawmills in the area in order to coordinate their pursuit of timber contracts. Implementation Responsibility: local sawmills and county commission.
- Develop intergovernmental support with other counties for timber sales. Implementation Responsibility: county commission.
- Develop value-added businesses related to timber resources.

Commercial Fisheries: retain and expand local commercial fisheries by assisting in the development of new markets. An adequate supply of nonconsumptive water rights must be obtained and secured in order for this industry to continue to grow and expand. The industry is also dependent on a customer base outside the county. The cultivation of this base will require the support of the county, state, and region.

Implementation Tasks:

- Initiate a regular review with the commercial fisheries owners so that their concerns, obstacles to success, and issues to be resolved may be addressed. Assist them in each of these matters. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office.
- Establish effective linkages with the State of Utah's efforts to ensure the quality of the local water supply. Ensure that the interests and impacts on this industry are considered in all discussions.
- Establish linkages with the State of Utah's efforts and those of the region to promote on an expanded scale Utah's fisheries business.
- Establish a marketing effort to promote to new markets the products of the local fisheries business. Implementation Responsibility: DCED.
- Pursue the acquisition and preservation of public and private non-consumptive water rights. Implementation Responsibility: county commission, Wayne County Water Conservancy District.

WAYNE COUNTY SUPPORTS ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING UPPER LIMITS ON BIG GAME HERD SIZES.

Implementation tasks:

- Organize the Wayne County Natural Resource/Land Use Committee as recommended by the county's project steering committee and as outlined in Chapter 4, Ongoing Planning Process Guidelines.
- Actively participate in the state's management of big game. Members of the county's natural resource/land use committee should:
 - advise the county commissioners concerning county-impacting wildlife issues. Input from the county commissioners should be forwarded to other state agencies and organizations, e.g. send copy of recommendations/comments to the Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee, the Utah Department of Natural Resources, and the Governor's Office.
 - submit written recommendations and county position statements, through the county commission, to key decision makers.
 - notify interested county residents of current or proposed activities and solicit their input when formulating county comments/responses.
 - participate in federal and state resource planning processes during the scoping/issues identification and draft plan review/comment periods.
 - attend Division of Wildlife, Board of Big Game Control, and Utah Wildlife Board Resources public meetings, as needed.
 - review federal and state resource management plans with respect to wildlife management. This would include assessing wildlife types, numbers, and location.
 - visit with local and regional wildlife managers. Increased interaction between managers and the general county populace improves relationships and will allow the county to have "frontline" input and issue clarification.
 - maintain contact with key decision makers throughout the decision making process. Ensure county interests are given adequate attention throughout all stages of the process.
 - request being placed on agency newsletter mailing lists.

Current activities impacting Wayne County in terms of wildlife management:

PPC = Preplanning Contract, MSA = Management Situation Analysis, NOI = Notice of Intent, RMP = Resource Management Plan, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, ROD = Record of Decision

Bureau of Land Management

Henry Mountain Resource Area - RMP/EIS: 1994; Final RMP/EIS: 1994; ROD: 1995.

United States Forest Service

Dixie National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1994; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1997.

Fishlake National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1993; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1996.

National Park Service

Canyonlands National Park - GMP/EIS process: 1994; Backcountry MPs: updated every two years.

Capital Reef National Park - General Management Plan process: 1993; Final GMP: 1995.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area - General Management Plan process: late 1990s; DCPs: ongoing.

Division of State Parks and Recreation

Statewide: The 1992 Utah SCORP: revision 1997.

The Utah Division of Parks & Recreation Long Range Plan: 1986, revision 1993.

General Management Plans (newly initiate Park Operational Plans): 1993 -depending on individual park or recreation area.

Division of Wildlife Resources

Wildlife: Big Game Management Plans: elk 1993; deer 1995.

Habitat Management Plans: currently in the analysis process. Once this is completed, the division will initiate an intensive habitat study on the majority of DWR owned properties.

Board of Big Game Control meetings: notification given to county.

Utah Wildlife Board meetings: notification given to county.

Property Acquisitions Under Consideration:

Wayne County - land exchange near Bicknell to straighten K.E. Bullock Wildlife Management Area boundaries.

Henry Mountain BLM buffalo for cattle grazing allotment exchange.

Division of State Lands and Forestry

Proposed recreational lot sale on Piute/Wayne County line south of Fish Lake (state section T27S, R1E, Section 1). The State of Utah is currently attempting to acquire Section 2 from the BLM.

WAYNE COUNTY SUPPORTS THE EFFORTS NECESSARY TO ATTRACT NEW BUSINESSES INTO THE AREA.

Attracting new businesses into the county includes identifying those which are consistent with and supportive of the county's values, customs, and culture. This option involves promotion of the county as an attractive place to locate a business and creation of an Economic Development Office with staff support and on-going funding. This office would engage in general and direct marketing efforts of the county.

Implementation Tasks:

- Develop general marketing material that communicates the advantages of locating a business within the county. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office.
- Circulate the general marketing material for the county to those agencies and organizations that are involved in business attraction efforts. This includes the State of Utah and the Association of Governments. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office, Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED).
- Create an economic development advisory council (see Chapter 4). The purpose of the council is to oversee the implementation of the various aspects of the plan. Implementation Responsibility: county commission, SUU.
- Organize an Economic Development Office including staff resources. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Advisory Council.
- Identify and obtain on-going funding sources for the support of the office. Implementation Responsibility: county commission, Association of Governments.
- Establish policies and procedures with the Economic Development Office that will promote the regular marketing of the county, direct marketing efforts, and follow up on interested leads. Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Advisory Council.
- Develop a general marketing plan for the promotion of the county to those businesses and industries that may consider locating within the county (to include value-added, timber, dairy). Implementation Responsibility: Economic Development Office.
- Investigate the use of Community Impact Funds.
- Capitalize on services to higher education through Mineral Lease Funds. Implementation Responsibility: Utah State University.

PROCESS BY WHICH POLICY STATEMENTS WERE FORMULATED

Natural Resources/Land Use Subcommittee Process

The initial step in generating options for the natural resources subcommittee was to collect relevant data from several different sources. This exercise utilized the data bases of both federal (Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, United States Forest Service) and state (Division of State Lands and Forestry, Division of Wildlife Resources, Parks and Recreation) agencies. The level of data collected and reviewed was determined by the scope and direction of the subcommittee's value/goal statements (see Chapter 2). Additional information included a brief explanation of the regulatory procedures for each federal and state agency with jurisdiction over resources within the county.

The subcommittee developed a range of reasonable policies which were aimed at accomplishing those objectives more broadly defined in the county's value/goal statements.

An important part of identifying policies for the county to pursue was the determination of the policy feasibility. This involved identifying and exploring the resources and action steps required to implement each policy. Subcommittee members weighed the cost and benefit of each option before determining which ones best satisfied the subcommittee's value/goal statement intent. Included in this process was an assessment of the county's limited resources in terms of population, political support, and finances.

Considering all feasible policy options, the subcommittee recommended several courses of action. Reflecting on the county's limited resources, the subcommittee identified these actions as a focus for the county over the next few years. These actions were proposed as the subcommittee's "preferred plan" and were reviewed/discussed by the entire steering committee during the April steering committee work meeting.

- Using the value/goal statements as guidelines, the subcommittee explored preliminary policy options for each category. This exercise generated 58 possible options. These are listed by category in Appendix B.
- The subcommittee evaluated each policy for its applicability to overall county objectives. The subcommittee also considered existing county resources (people, political, financial).
- During these discussions, several policies emerged as subcommittee "preferred" policies. From those, the subcommittee selected six for steering committee review and final plan consideration.

Economic Development Subcommittee Process

A wide range of economic policy options was considered by the economic development subcommittee. The committee members were given three specific assignments to assist them in

identifying and evaluating each of their proposed options. These included:

- **SWOTS (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) Analysis**
This analysis consisted of considering all of the county's strengths, weaknesses, future opportunities, and existing threats. The purpose of this exercise was to identify new policies on which the county can build. It was also important to understand what threats the county is facing in terms of its economy and be sensitive to weaknesses that have an effect on a particular economic policy.
- **Brainstorm of Options**
The committee members participated in a detailed brainstorming session to identify new opportunities for economic development. The basis of this activity was the combined expertise of the committee members. These members represented the business and industrial sectors of the county. Through their combined knowledge, they were able to determine some of the opportunities that the county faces.
- **Outside Industry and Economic Development Expertise**
The project consultants provided an outside viewpoint concerning trends in specific industries. In addition, the consultants ensured that the committee considered all four aspects of economic development. Specifically:
 - business attraction,
 - creation of new businesses,
 - retention of existing businesses, and
 - expansion of existing businesses.

Following these exercises, the list of policies was narrowed and presented in a format for detailed consideration (See Appendix C).

Specific economic options were then selected by the committee and are the preferred areas of economic focus for the county. Each of the preferred options is briefly described. The selection of the preferred policy options was in part based on the costs and benefits associated with each of them. This benefit/cost consideration was important in order to accurately assess what each policy would generate within the county and what resources would be required to accomplish it. All of the policies considered were evaluated using this benefit/cost analysis. It is important to note that the analysis is somewhat subjective and based on past experiences with the development of related options. The committee did not use this analysis to make their decisions but only to assist them in their considerations. A detailed explanation of the benefits/costs model that was used in the evaluation of the policies is given in Appendix C.

Associated with many of the implementation tasks is an identification of the agency or organization that will take the lead in implementing the tasks. These agencies have been selected by the committee because of their capability, related activities or emphasis in areas associated with the tasks. As the plan is implemented throughout the county, it will be essential for these agencies and organizations to assume the leadership in this implementation. For many of the tasks, no organization has been assigned implementation responsibility. In the considerations made by the committee, no agency or organization could be identified that was in the position to assume this

responsibility. It will be imperative that these tasks not be overlooked and that the capability be created within the county to implement these efforts.

Resources required to implement tasks

In order for the county to successfully accomplish its plan for economic development, critical county resources must be committed. These resources extend beyond those normally considered to be under the direction of the county commission. They extend to the resources that are available from the county at large and include:

- **People:** This resource consists of the citizens within the county. Specifically considered are the time and talents of the people, their willingness to get involved in projects, and their capabilities in managing and pursuing the necessary activities. In some cases it may even include acquiring additional capabilities that are now unavailable within the county.
- **Political Support:** Some activities and actions that are needed to develop the economy of the county will require change: changes in policies, implementation of new programs, and reallocation of scarce resources. The momentum that will be necessary to bring about the change will be affected by the level of political support within the county.
- **Money:** This resource consists of the funds that are available within the county to be used to support economic development activities. Not only are county funds considered an element of this resource, but also the resources that are associated with other public and private entities of the county.

Selected Level of County Economic Development Effort

There is a direct relationship between the level of effort that the county is prepared to make in economic development and the benefits that will be received. It is essential that the county clearly understands what level of effort it is prepared to make prior to considering the range of economic policy options that can be pursued. The subcommittee carefully considered the level of effort they felt the county as a whole is prepared to make in support of economic development. An evaluation of the county's current efforts was made and a review of what will be necessary to achieve the desired success. A description of the effort level considered by the subcommittee for each of the resources is provided in Appendix C.

It is important to note that the level of effort that is selected exceeds by some margin the current level of effort and resources committed to economic development. This undertaking will require a continued commitment of the county to the goals and vision expressed in this plan.

Infrastructure Subcommittee Process

The infrastructure subcommittee developed a wide range of policies and specific needs for Wayne County. The Wayne County infrastructure subcommittee identified approximately twelve different categories or elements in the infrastructure, human/social services and education areas. These twelve categories were reduced to seven in order to reduce some of the areas where duplication existed, and also to allow at least a minimum of two individuals per infrastructure sub-group. Individuals volunteered or were assigned to a specific sub-group based upon their individual expertise or interest in a particular area. Committee members on each sub-group were asked to help collect information, identify critical needs and help to rank or prioritize those needs. Committee members acted as resource people for their specific assignment such as transportation, water, environmental health, utilities, education, human services, healthcare, etc. A complete list of infrastructure areas of focus are provided in Appendix D.

Based upon each sub-group's effort, the essential needs of the various infrastructure, human/social and education areas were presented and discussed at the second infrastructure subcommittee meeting. Specific county infrastructure options, needs, and even implementation projects were identified. Projects specific to infrastructure which are not included in "Wayne County Policies" are listed in Appendix D.

The infrastructure subcommittee's next assignment was to collectively review the specific county recommended actions or strategies developed by the natural resource/land use and economic development committees for infrastructure needs to support the proposed policy. Also, a preliminary assessment was made to determine if infrastructure impacts were significant and how they might be offset or financed.

The last phase of the planning effort for the infrastructure subcommittee was to rank or prioritize the 20 to 30 different needs and options into four or five initial top priorities. In the case of Wayne County, this was accomplished by using the general steering committee as an advisory ranking or selection board.

Chapter 4

ONGOING PLANNING PROCESS GUIDELINES

PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS

The Wayne County General Plan, as a published document adopted by county leaders, becomes an official policy statement for the county. Therefore, it should accurately and adequately establish and articulate the county's ambitions and future goals. Wayne County may make plan modifications which further refine and tailor the plan to fit the county's personality and development objectives. Plan amendments should be made whenever the county wishes to define additional development objectives, refine existing objectives, and/or delete ineffective or inadequate objectives or policies.

The county may amend an adopted general plan by following the general plan adoption/amendment steps outlined in the County Land Use Development and Management Act. These requirements, contained in Utah Code sections 17-27-303 and 17-27-304, are as follows:

- (1) (a) After completing a proposed general plan for all or part of the area within the county, the planning commission shall schedule and hold a public hearing on the proposed plan (or proposed plan amendments).
- (b) The planning commission shall provide reasonable notice of the public hearing at least 14 days before the date of the hearing.
- (c) After the public hearing, the planning commission may make changes to the proposed general plan (or proposed plan amendments).
- (2) The planning commission shall then forward the proposed general plan (or proposed plan amendments) to the legislative body.
- (3) (a) The legislative body shall hold a public hearing on the proposed general plan (or proposed plan amendments) recommended to it by the planning commission.
- (b) The legislative body shall provide reasonable notice of the public hearing at least 14 days before the date of the hearing.
- (4) After the public hearing, the legislative body may make modifications to the proposed general plan (or plan amendments) that it considers appropriate.
- (5) The legislative body may:
 - (a) adopt the proposed general plan (or proposed plan amendment) without (further) amendment;

- (b) amend the proposed general plan (or plan amendments) and adopt or reject it as amended; or
 - (c) reject the proposed general plan (or proposed plan amendments).
- (6) (a) The general plan is an advisory guide for land use decisions.
- (b) The legislative body may adopt an ordinance mandating compliance with the general plan.

The successful implementation of the Wayne County General Plan is dependent upon public involvement, participation and support. While county policy makers will decide the direction the county should proceed, the input of knowledgeable and supportive people is essential to good planning. Through the planning process, Wayne County elected officials and residents have gained valuable experience through planning activities. The knowledge and experience acquired by these individuals is a great county resource. The steering committee for the Wayne County General Plan proposes that three county-wide on-going committees be formed and that they be used to address priorities and concerns within the county. The following section is a detailed description of those proposed committees.

NATURAL RESOURCE/LAND USE COMMITTEE

Description

As per Utah Code 17-5-80, "The boards of county commissioners of the respective counties within the state are authorized and empowered to provide for the development of the county's mineral, water, manpower, industrial, historical, cultural, and other resources." Utah Code 71-5-81 states that the county commissioners of any county are "authorized and empowered to appoint, by resolution, an unpaid commission of three or more members, to be known as the county resource development committee."

The county's natural resource/land use subcommittee discussed organizing a "resource development committee" similar to the one authorized by state code. The subcommittee's "resource development committee" recommendations, as outlined below, are consistent with the provisions outlined in Utah Code 17-5-81, 17-5-82, and 17-5-83.

The county's natural resource/land use subcommittee, with the support of the project's county steering committee, recommend that the county commissioners act to create a county resource development board. Situations which warrant such a committee include: limited interaction taking place between public land/resource managers and county officials and residents; the county having limited resources and time available to respond to federal/state agency "county" input requests; and the county often being "reactive" to federal and state decisions or proposals which impact the county.

Purpose

- a) to utilize the authority granted to the county commissioners regarding county resource development activities,
- b) to utilize a knowledgeable core of county individuals which can be used as a resource to assist county officials in addressing natural resource, wildlife, and public land issues,
- c) to be active participants in federal and state decision-making processes,
- d) to discuss natural resource/land use issues in an open, positive forum,
- e) to resolve conflicts at the local level where applicable and appropriate,
- f) to build partnerships between the county, federal and state agencies, private landowners, and special interest groups.

Through monthly meetings the committee will:

- a) address land use/resource issues as assigned by the county commission and/or the county planning commission (solicit interested party input for use in preparing county responses to federal and state natural resource/land use decisions, prepare preliminary grant applications, etc.).
- b) identify and prioritize county land/resource use issues, concerns, and future objectives.

Structure

- a) a balanced participation of all interested parties with at least one representative from each. Membership should include representatives from, but not limited to the:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| • general county populace | • recreational interests |
| • cattlemen | • wool growers |
| • Farm Bureau | • media |
| • county/local officials | • timber industry |
| • water | • energy |
| • minerals/mining interests | • conservation interests |
| • wildlife interests | • environmental community |

ex officio (non-voting) members:

- Bureau of Land Management
- United States Forest Service
- State Lands and Forestry

- National Parks Service
 - Division of Wildlife Resources
 - Division of State Parks
 - Division of Water Resources
- b) one chairman, secretary
 - c) ad hoc subcommittees as needed
 - d) opportunity for other specialists to be invited - special guests, resource persons/agencies, etc.

Committee Recommendations

- a) The committee will send recommendations to the county commission and the county planning commission.
- b) The committee will coordinate with the Association of Governments, the State of Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee, and other state and local offices as necessary.
- c) The committee will review any county plan amendments and submit recommendations to the county commission and county planning commission.

Opportunity

It is hoped that the Natural Resource/Land Use Committee concept can build upon the cooperative atmosphere established by the existing Landowner/Wildlife County Committee. The proposed committee will continue to address the wildlife issues as well as all other natural resource/public land use issues within the county.

This committee concept will allow for the open interchange of positive ideas and create a forum within which county natural resource/land use issues and opportunities may be constructively discussed.

The committee serves as a resource for local government officials. Through committee assistance, officials can more adequately address a wider variety of natural resource/land use issues and in a more thorough manner. County participation in federal and state planning processes can be increased as both the committee and government officials begin to understand these processes and identify proactive county roles.

Focused on concise and clearly stated county natural resource/public land use objectives, the county can assume a "proactive" proposal role versus the customary "reactive" role. In a proactive environment, the county can more effectively participate in and influence county-impacting, federal and state natural resource and land use decisions.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Description

The committee feels strongly that the success of this effort is not only dependent on identifying the direction that economic development activities of the county should go, but to continue to build on the momentum that this project has created. The committee therefore recommends that an ongoing Economic Development Advisory Committee be established within the county.

Purpose

- a) to provide coordination and oversight of the implementation of this economic development plan. The committee would meet with each of the organizations that have been assigned implementation responsibility to educate, inform, and coordinate their specific activities.
- b) to interface with elected officials. The committee members would meet periodically with county and other elected officials. The purpose of these meetings would be to provide input into governmental decisions and actions and ensure that they are in harmony with the direction of the economic development efforts.
- c) to provide staff oversight. To the extent that professional staff or economic development offices are established within the county, this committee would be able to provide oversight to those functions and serve as an advisory board to those efforts.
- d) to regularly review the economic development plan. This plan is not static. It will need to be changed and reconsidered on a regular basis. Adjustments to the plan will need to be made. This committee is in a position to make these considerations and adjustment.

Structure

The format and membership of this committee should be detailed by the county commission. The committee wishes to recognize that this project has developed an educated group of county leaders and should be considered as members of this advisory committee.

Opportunity

This plan by itself has little if any force or impact. It is only through people that the plan will be effective in bringing about change and developing the county's economy. This committee recognizes the great need for current and future leaders within the county that can step forward and support and promote this plan. The cultivation of these leaders must be deliberate, direct, and constant. The citizens of the county must participate in achieving the future that is preferred and is reflected in this plan.

INFRASTRUCTURE REPRESENTATION AND COORDINATION

Description

Infrastructure, including law enforcement, education, human services, and health care services representatives have valuable understanding and experience that have been used in the formulation of the county's General Plan. It is suggested that the major areas of the infrastructure subcommittee be represented on either the Natural Resources Development Committee or the Economic Development Advisory Committee or accommodated as a separate subcommittee to the main committee. Many of the individuals that served on the infrastructure subcommittee are extremely knowledgeable in their particular areas.

Purpose

While many of the elements of the county infrastructure are part of paid local and county staff responsibilities, some of the options identified by the steering committee warrant special attention. In the area of infrastructure, there are many elements that are essential to the success of the plan.

- a) New organic and animal disposal sites should be explored by the committee. If each individual municipality within Wayne County provides an organic/animal disposal site, a substantial cost savings could be realized by reducing the collection, handling, transportation, and disposal of organic and animal waste.
- b) The county and/or cities are in need of lagoons for the disposal and treatment of septic tank sludge.
- c) There are several sites where hydroelectric generation could be developed in the future, one being the dam at the existing Mill Meadow Reservoir north of Fremont.
- d) Law enforcement needs within the county must be addressed.

Structure

The format and membership of this committee should be detailed by the county commission. The infrastructure subcommittee wishes to recognize that this project has developed an educated group of county leaders that have the interest and could be considered as members of this advisory committee.

Opportunity

Through other activities similar to the initial three proposed, significant county benefits are possible. The benefits include improved education, more tourism and recreational opportunities, and a cleaner environment through the elimination of dump sites.

APPENDIX A
NOVEMBER 19, 1993 PUBLIC MEETING
VOTING RESULTS

APPENDIX A
NOVEMBER 19, 1993 PUBLIC MEETING
VOTING RESULTS

Number of Votes	Item
31	maintain multi-use
25	new school facilities to support students
22	complete Torrey reservoir
19	identify dollar value of different county assets (timber, recreation, livestock, etc.)
17	develop county building plan standards-ordinances-regulations-zoning requirements
12	provide for our own kids, population growth
11	preserve private property rights
11	enhance agriculture
9	plan growth in law enforcement to meet population fluctuations
9	increase and fix-up signs at interchange of I-70 at Fremont junction 72
7	more predator control
7	rehabilitate and develop state and federal grazing lands
6	restore payment-in-lieu of taxes on state lands
6	increase in family supporting jobs
6	keep existing businesses healthy
5	maintain and increase tourism for destination stays
5	proper health care for senior citizens
5	focus federal, state, and local attention on one project and get it done.
5	more local control rather than federal or state
4	develop, emphasize and enhance recreational opportunities
4	improve emergency medical services
4	preserve, maintain and increase water resources
4	keep wilderness out
3	develop businesses for the retirement community
3	plan and develop water resources for future growth
3	monitor and control wildlife numbers and types
2	schools to prepare students to go into job market or higher education
2	increase fish and game opportunities
2	resolve national park buffer-zone issue
2	determine how much growth can occur with natural resources
2	develop comprehensive economic plan
2	smaller timber contracts fairer to smaller businesses
2	County to participate in building assistance programs to build job base and also take advantage of other programs.
2	County voice in endangered species legislation
1	develop good museum
1	control recreational use to keep county pristine
1	preserve quality of rural lifestyle

- 1 support state, federal and local job opportunities
- 1 develop infrastructure to support growth
- 1 develop infrastructure cost of new development
- 1 upgrade phone system and increase long distance range
- 1 close unused logging roads
- 1 need a planning commission
- 1 solve wilderness issue
- 0 develop comprehensive tourist marketing plan
- 0 preserve heritage of county
- 0 consider problems of seasonal employees
- 0 identify existing job wage base
- 0 plan is a success
- 0 pave old Fish Lake Road
- 0 Forest Service to maintain roads
- 0 outside user fee for medical use
- 0 leave all existing roads open
- 0 keep government out of building plan standards-ordinances regulations-zoning requirements
- 0 maintain land between Canyonlands and Capital Reef as BLM

APPENDIX B
NATURAL RESOURCES

APPENDIX B

NATURAL RESOURCES

An important part of any general plan is an analysis of the existing circumstances in the planning area. Wayne County does not have a master plan or zoning ordinance. A plan was developed in 1977, but was never approved or adopted by the county commission.

NATURAL RESOURCES PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN WAYNE COUNTY

Federal Natural Resource Planning in Utah

Sixty-five percent of Utah's surface land area is federally owned or managed. Rural counties have the highest percentage of federal land ownership. Approximately 83 percent of Wayne County is federally owned. Since such a large portion of the land in rural Utah is owned by the federal government, federal land management and resource planning efforts carry implications for local planning-related activities and influence the scope of local planning documents.

Federal agency land/resource planning is usually a three-stage process. First, the foundation is set by gathering the data necessary to establish an inventory of commodity and non-commodity resources. The second stage is the creation of an integrated plan. This means the plan must be developed with the participation of the local public and professionals from appropriate disciplines. The third stage is implementation. On a site-specific basis, agency activities include contracting for development, providing for construction of roads and other facilities, monitoring performance, and enforcing against infractions. Federal plans must also include a plan amendment procedure.

Bureau of Land Management

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages federal land and resources under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). Resource Management Plans (RMPs) are the primary mechanism for implementing the "multiple use/sustainable yield" and other guidance outlined in FLPMA.

Each RMP provides a ten-year management direction and establishes action guidelines for an area of BLM land called a Resource Area (RA). RMPs also contain the standards and criteria used to govern subsequent specific decisions.

The planning process for an RMP begins with a Preplanning Contract (PPC). A PPC represents an agreement between the BLM, state agencies and local jurisdictions on how the RMP will be prepared. Following the PPC, a management situation analysis (MSA) is undertaken. A MSA includes an inventory and analysis of existing conditions within the Resource Area. To initiate a plan, start the RMP process, and solicit public participation, the publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) begins preparation of each RMP (or plan amendment).

The BLM planning process includes the following steps: identification of issues, development of planning criteria, inventory of data and information collection, analysis of the management situation, formulation of alternatives, estimation of effects of alternatives, selection of the preferred alternative, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and the selection of a resource management plan. Each plan requires approximately four years to complete. Monitoring and evaluation occurs throughout the RMP process and continues after the plan is completed.

Other BLM plans include Recreation Management Plans (land-based recreation plans limited to recreational activities consistent with other management prescriptions contained in the RMP), Activity Plans (plans which focus on specific areas within the larger resource area boundaries), and Plan Amendments.

Bureau of Land Management planning activities in Wayne County:

- Henry Mountain Resource Area - RMP/EIS: 1994; Final RMP/EIS: 1994; Record of Decision: 1995.

Forest Service

Under the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), the Forest Service prepares Forest Plans at the national forest or ranger district level. The Forest Plan represents the selected alternative based on the various considerations which have been addressed in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Forest Plans have an effective life of ten to fifteen years. Forest Plans may be revised or amended whenever the Forest Supervisor determines that conditions or demands in the area covered by the plan have changed significantly.

During the planning process, forest planners are required to issue draft plans for public and interagency review. Forest Plans require approximately three years to complete and, at a minimum, are required to address the following resource integration issues: timber resource land suitability, vegetation management practices, timber resource sale schedule, evaluation of roadless areas, wilderness management, fish and wildlife resources, grazing resources, recreational resources, mineral resources, water and soil resources, and cultural and historical resources. Conditions addressed in the Forest Plan are reviewed at least every five years.

United States Forest Service planning activities in Wayne County:

- Dixie National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1994; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1997.
- Fishlake National Forest - Forest Plan process: 1993; Draft Forest Plan/EIS: 1996.

National Park Service

The primary planning document of the National Park Service (NPS) is the General Management Plan (GMP). The parks' governing principle is the single-use policy that emphasizes scenic resource preservation. GMPs are prepared and implemented at the individual park level and generally have a ten-year cycle. The GMP planning process follows a format similar to that outlined in FLPMA

and NFMA. However, the NPS is under no legal obligation to emphasize or even address multiple use or sustained yield issues.

Other National Park Service plans include Development Concept Plans (DCP) and Resource Management Plans (RMP). A DCP has no time frame and is similar to a plan written at a city or county level. A DCP focuses on a specific land use or resource management issue particular to a specific area within a national park (e.g., visitor facilities or in-park operations). The RMP is a performance-budget plan and is updated every three years. Additional plans which are often sub-components of a GMP include Cultural Resource Plans, Statements of Management (completed every two years), Backcountry Plans, and Wilderness Plans.

The purposes and legal mandates mentioned in proclamations and laws establishing or expanding Capitol Reef National Park as a unit of the National Park system include the following:

- To manage the park's scenery, natural and cultural resources, and wildlife in a manner consistent with the 1915 Organic Act.
- To conserve and protect geologic wonders (for example, the Waterpocket Fold, Cathedral Valley, narrow canyons, evidence of ancient sand dune deposits) and objects of geologic and scientific value, while maintaining valid existing rights.
- To administer, protect, and develop the park for the enjoyment of natural, cultural, and scientific resources in a manner that leaves them unimpaired.
- To provide for the trailing of livestock across the lands included in Capitol Reef, consistent with legislation and proclamations while conserving and protecting resources.
- To grant rights-of-way along any component of the park unless such easements and rights-of-way would have significant adverse effects on protection of park resources.
- To manage recommended wilderness to protect wilderness values until Congress acts.
- To provide for a continuation of existing grazing consistent with the 1971 and later laws.

Other legislation affecting the National Park System, such as, but not limited to, the 1916 Organic Act, the Wilderness Act, National Environmental Policy Act, Archeological Resources Protection Act, Historic Preservation Act, and Endangered Species Act also influence the management of Capitol Reef National Park.

National Park Service planning activities in Wayne County:

- Canyonlands National Park - General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement process: 1994; Backcountry Management Plans: updated every two years.
- Capital Reef National Park - General Management Plan process: 1993; Final GMP:

1995.

- Glen Canyon National Recreation Area - General Management Plan process: late 1990s; DCPs: ongoing.

State Natural Resource Planning in Utah

As noted, over 65 percent of Utah's surface land area is federally owned or managed. Of the remaining 35 percent, close to one-quarter is owned or managed by the state. In rural counties, the state is the second largest land owner. Since such a large portion of the non-federal land in rural Utah is owned by the state government, state land management and resource planning efforts carry implications for local planning-related activities and influence the scope of local planning documents.

Due to the state's interest in land use/resource management in these areas, rural counties can utilize the planning resources of state to facilitate and complement their own efforts. Several land managers and agencies conduct land use/resource development/management efforts within Wayne County. An overview of several agencies specifically addressed during the course of this plan follows.

Division of State Parks and Recreation

Mission: "To acknowledge and facilitate the critical role recreation plays in the 'quality of life' of our citizens and non-residents; enhance the economic vitality of our state; provide a broad spectrum of high quality park and recreational resources; enforce state boating and off-highway vehicle laws; regulate, protect, and interpret the natural and historic resources in our park system; provide technical assistance and matching grants for outdoor recreational development and establishment of statewide and local motorized and non-motorized trails; thus Preserving the Past and Serving the future."

State statute requires the Division of Parks and Recreation to formulate and implement long range planning efforts. Current division policy extends beyond this requirement and "encourages improved partnerships between state parks and their surrounding communities."

Within the past year, the division has completed a State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). This plan identifies critical recreational needs, demand, user preferences, and issues for the next five years. Issues addressed within the 1992 Utah SCORP include establishing a stable source of funding for outdoor recreation development, developing a comprehensive plan for all of Utah's natural resources, improving park access and infrastructure, and improving interagency coordination and cooperation.

The Division is also initiating a State Park Long Range Plan. This plan will clarify long term missions, operational planning, and solicit staff and agency comments and division objective recommendations. These plans are scheduled to be revised every 5 years and incorporate interim studies--e.g., visitor use studies, SCORP recommendations, Governor's programs, etc.

On a site or park-specific basis, the division is implementing Park Operational Plans. These plans will establish adequate park management continuity regardless of changes in park personnel. These plans will be formulated through a process which allows more public input and participation in park management decisions.

The division also participates with state and local government agencies through co-sponsored events and activities. In 1992 alone, the division took part in over 300 such activities.

In 1992, the division also awarded over \$1.2 million in matching grants to several counties, the USFS, and the BLM. These monies went towards projects qualifying under either the Recreational Trails Grant, the OHV Matching Grant, the Land/Water Conservation Fund, or the Riverway Enhancement Fund.

Division of State Parks and Recreation planning activities in Wayne County:

- Statewide:
 - The 1992 Utah State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan: revision 1997.
 - The Utah Division of Parks & Recreation Long Range Plan: 1986, revision 1993.
 - General Management Plans (newly initiated Park Operational Plans): 1993 -depending on individual park or recreation area.
 - Statewide Trails Master Plan: 1993 - on going.

Division of Wildlife Resources

Mission: "To assure the future of protected wildlife for its intrinsic, scientific, educational and recreational values through protection, propagation, management, conservation and distribution throughout the State and to identify and recognize diverse public interests in the State's wildlife resources and implement programs consistent with those interests."

Two policy-making citizen boards exist as guiding authorities to the Division in its wildlife responsibilities. The Wildlife Board functions in this capacity in all wildlife matters except big game. Laws, unique to Utah, place the responsibility of big game, its harvest and use, under the Board of Big Game Control.

Both boards are required by law (Wildlife Board - Section 23-14-4 and the Board of Big Game Control - Section 23-14-6) to conduct several public meetings during their decision making processes. These meetings are opportunities for counties and individuals alike to have their wildlife management concerns heard and addressed.

The Division of Wildlife Resources not only has responsibility for all wildlife management within

the state, but for habitat management on all DWR owned lands as well. Concerning land acquisition and management, the division separates its planning efforts into two phases: physically identify and control, and long-term management goals. In both phases the county has an opportunity to voice their opinion. Utah Code 23-21-22 stipulates that the DWR must meet with the county commission in an open public forum to discuss any proposed acquisition within the county and to address as much as possible the concerns or comments expressed by the county officials. Concerning the second phase, long-term planning, the division provides ample opportunity for county and community involvement.

Division of Wildlife Resources planning activities in Wayne County:

- Statewide:
 - Wildlife: Big Game Management Plans: elk 1993; deer 1995.
 - Habitat Management Plans: currently in the analysis process, once this is completed, the division will initiate an intensive habitat study on the majority of these properties.
- Property Acquisitions Under Consideration:
 - Land exchange near Bicknell to straighten K.E. Bullock Wildlife Management Area boundaries.
- Henry Mountain BLM buffalo for cattle grazing allotment exchange.

Division of State Lands and Forestry

"The Division of State Lands and Forestry manages Utah's school and institutional trust land to generate revenue for the trust beneficiaries, provides fire protection for non-federal wildlands, provides conservation-oriented technical assistance to private landowners in managing private forest land and other lands, and manages Utah's sovereign lands in the public interest." Under State Code 65A-1-2, the division, as the state school lands trustee, "has a duty of undivided loyalty in managing trust lands to provide economic support for the trust beneficiary. Trust resources cannot be diverted to any other purpose."

State Code 65A-2-2 requires that management plans be developed for state lands. 65A-2-4 requires the division to "adopt rules for notifying and consulting with interested parties" during the state land management planning process. Interested parties include trust beneficiaries, the general public and resources users, as well as federal, state, and local governments. During this process the board must provide reasonable public notice and comment periods; and respond to all commenting parties, giving the rationale for the acceptance or nonacceptance of those comments.

The division utilizes three main types of management plans:

- General or Comprehensive Management Plans: plans which guide the

implementation of trust land management objectives on school and institutional trust lands;

- Resource Plans: plans prepared for a specific resource such as mining, timber, grazing or real estate;
- Site Specific Plans: plans providing specific actions on specific parcels of state land.

Beyond the initial creation of a plan, interested parties also have the opportunity to participate in any General or Comprehensive Management Plan amendment or termination. Through such avenues as public petitions calling for Declaratory Orders and Consistency Reviews, the county may request division clarification of specific plan objectives or actions.

Division of State Lands and Forestry planning activities in Wayne County:

- Proposed recreational lot sale on Piute/Wayne County line south of Fish Lake (state section T27S, R1E, Section 1).

Division of Water Resources

"The Division of Water Resources' mission is to promote the orderly and timely planning, conservation, development, utilization, and protection of Utah's water resources to enhance the quality of life for the citizens of the state." To achieve it's mission, the Division is responsible for 1) interstate streams, 2) water development, 3) water education, 4) water conservation, 5) water supply/use data, and 6) water planning within the state.

The Water Planning section is responsible for the State Water Plan. The State Water Plan, prepared and distributed in early 1990, provided the foundation and overall direction to establish and implement the state policy framework of water management. As part of the state water planning process, more detailed plans are prepared for each of the 11 hydrology basins in the state. These hydrologic basin plans will identify potential conservation and development projects and describe alternatives to satisfy the problems, needs, and demands. Final selection of alternatives will rest with the local decision-making body. The success of this planning process is enhanced through public involvement, resulting in broader support to implement recommendations.

Division of Water Resources planning activities in Wayne County:

- West Colorado Basin Plan (State Water Plan) 1994-95.

NATURAL RESOURCE ITEM RANKING

Number of Votes	Item
31	Maintain multi-use
19	Identify dollar value of different county assets (timber, recreation, livestock)
17	Develop county building plan standards-ordinances-regulations-zoning
11	Preserve private property rights
7	More predator control
7	Rehabilitate and develop state and federal grazing lands
6	Restore payment-in-lieu of taxes on state lands
5	Maintain and increase tourism for destination stays
5	Focus federal, state, and local attention on one project and get it done
5	More local control rather than federal or state
4	Develop, emphasize, and enhance recreational opportunities
4	Preserve, maintain, and increase water resource
4	Keep wilderness out
3	Monitor and control wildlife (numbers and types)
2	Increase fish and game opportunities
2	Resolve national park buffer -zone issue
2	Determine how much growth can occur with natural resources
2	Smaller sizing of timber contracts to allow smaller businesses to compete
2	County voice in endangered species legislation
1	Control recreational use to keep county pristine
1	Close unused logging roads
1	Need a planning commission
1	Solve wilderness issue
0	Forest Service to maintain roads
0	Leave all existing roads open
0	Keep government out of building plan standards-ordinances-regulations-zoning requirements
0	Maintain land between Canyonlands and Capital Reef as BLM

NATURAL RESOURCE/LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE GROUPING AND ISSUE PRIORITY

public land:

maintain multi-use	14 high	3 med	1 low
maintain access to public lands	9 high	9 med	0 low
explore school section exchanges	8 high	8 med	1 low
resolve national park buffer-zone issue	8 high	4 med	5 low (1)
solve wilderness issue	8 high	8 med	2 low
maintain land between Canyonlands and Capital Reef as BLM	7 high	5 med	6 low
keep wilderness out	7 high	4 med	5 low (2)
rehabilitate/develop state/federal grazing lands	7 high	9 med	1 low
public/private land exchanges to address future community needs	6 high	8 med	3 low
restoration of payment-in-lieu of taxes on State lands	4 high	8 med	3 low (3)

zoning/land use regulations:

preserve private property rights	9 high	9 med	0 low
develop County building/zoning regulations	8 high	4 med	6 low
need a planning commission	6 high	9 med	3 low
coordinate county community plans	6 high	10 med	2 low
keep government out of zoning regulations	2 high	5 med	11 low

livestock:

no elements listed

agriculture:

no elements listed

resources:

preserve, maintain and increase water resources	13 high	2 med	1 low (1)
preserve public lands mineral leasing rights	8 high	7 med	3 low
explore use limits placed on resources within national park buffer zones	5 high	8 med	5 low
smaller sizing of timber contracts to allow smaller businesses to compete	4 high	9 med	5 low
*existing water rights not impacted by upstream management decisions	1 high		

recreation:

maintain/increase tourist destination stays	5 high	7 med	6 low
develop, emphasize and enhance diverse recreational opportunities	6 high	7 med	4 low (1)
control recreational uses-keep County pristine	5 high	8 med	2 low (1)

*committee to study diverse recreational opportunities 1 high

wildlife:

increase wildlife management	9 high	7 med	2 low
County voice in endangered species legislation	8 high	5 med	5 low
more predator control	8 high	6 med	4 low
monitor and control wildlife	4 high	11 med	2 low
increase fish/game opportunities	3 high	5 med	10 low

other:

identify dollar value of different County assets (timber, recreation, livestock, etc.)	12 high	5 med	1 low
more local control rather than federal/state	10 high	3 med	5 low
focus Feds, State and local attention on one project and get it done	6 high	6 med	4 low (2)
determine how much growth can occur with natural resources	6 high	6 med	6 low
leave all existing roads open	4 high	3 med	11 low
close unused logging roads	2 high	5 med	9 low (2)
Forest Service to maintain roads	2 high	9 med	6 low
*maintain county custom/culture	1 high		

NATURAL RESOURCE/LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE OPTIONS

LIVESTOCK/AGRICULTURE:

The county desires that resource management plans provide for range improvements and better range conditions for the benefit of livestock, and that livestock grazing allotments on public lands are not reduced for the sole benefit of wildlife.

options:

- **sovereignty (how broad)**
- **referendums as tool to provide formal input to land use management plans, access to professionals, watchdog**
- **mechanism for range improvements**
- **county coordinating agent**
- **establish stewardship and accountability**
- **challenge purchase of wildlife AUMs for livestock**

TOURISM/RECREATION RESOURCES:

It is the county's desire that recreational growth be carefully planned to:

- **balance recreational developments with the county's ability to provide essential services;**
- **ensure other important economic resources are not sacrificed for the benefit of recreational development;**
- **preserve the county's custom and culture.**

options:

- **federal government to raise PILT**
- **encourage fed to cover emergency and law enforcement services**
- **tourism taxes (trans. room tax, tour tax, etc.)**
- **highway 24 a toll road**
- **create visitor serving business**
- **ethnic services**
- **cap number of visitors**
- **percentage of park fee returned to or collected for the county**
- **redemption tax**
- **wildlife license fee**
- **reservations to park**
- **special tours "special permit cost"**
- **private tours**
- **Great American Trail through Loa**
- **expand concessions inside the parks**

WILDLIFE RESOURCES:

The county desires that wildlife resources be comprehensively managed in ways which optimize wildlife resource opportunities in coordination with agriculture, livestock, recreation, and other important economic interests.

options:

- **increase predator control (process)**
- **increase number of mountain lion permits (process)**
- **decrease herd sizes (process)**
- **establish and maintain herd numbers (process)**
- increase wildlife viewing opportunities
- DWR to feed deer
- cut down out of state hunters
- improve winter range
- increase research
- more posted hunting units
- create hunting preserves
- increase upland game
- deer over elk
- organize marketing plan
- land-owner permits

ZONING AND LAND USE/PUBLIC REVENUE:

It is the county's desire to improve the coordination between the county and other local governments and to develop ordinances that establish limited land use zoning for commercial, residential, and industrial development. These guidelines should include adequate ordinances for building permits and property value assessments. We also recognize the need to consider innovative cost recovery methods and measures which place the burden of paying for such services on the service benefactor.

options:

- **challenge federal/state regulations in respect to state building inspectors, water quality and solid waste**
- **develop communication mechanism between commission and mayors**
- **establish ordinances for building permits (fees)**
- incorporate all county communities
- establish land use ordinance
- establish domestic pet law
- inventory land uses/structures
- publish existing ordinances
- establish a planning commission

PUBLIC LANDS:

It is in the county's best interest that:

- BLM and USFS range lands be managed and improved using accepted traditional range improvement/conservation practices;
- state school lands are managed to promote the growth of the county development;
- state school land exchanges do not result in a net reduction in the total value of state lands within the county;
- state school trust sections within the parks are exchanged for other federal lands within the county;
- all transportation routes on public lands, i.e. primitive right-of-ways, trails and roads, should be protected;
- no involuntary transfer of private lands to public ownership if such transfers result in a tax revenue and value loss;
- National Park boundaries (buffer zones) should not be expanded;
- State school trust lands should not be consolidated, checkerboard should be maintained.

options:

- **resolutions-county supports above stated positions**

RESOURCES:

It is the county's desire that each resource be managed for the optimal economic return, but in ways which do not sacrifice the county's natural aesthetic values.

options:

- encourage federal and state agencies to preserve cultural resources
- do not want WRSA
- preserve and expand water rights
- dissolve administrative lines in respect to instream right, downstream rights, etc.
- preserve private property rights
- commission to analyze existing land uses
- county cooperation with existing conservation agencies (Fremont River Conservation District, ASCS, etc.)
- smaller timber contracts for smaller contractors
- sustained timber flow
- forest management (let burn, etc.)

FEDERAL AND STATE PUBLIC LAND MANAGERS AND ADDRESSES

Bureau of Land Management

Resource Areas:

Henry Mountain BLM Resource Area Manager
Henry Mountain Resource Area
150 East 900 North
Richfield, Utah 84701

United States Forest Service

National Forests:

Dixie Forest Supervisor
Dixie National Forest
82 North 100 East
P.O. Box 0580
Cedar City, Utah 84721-0580

Forest/Land Use Planner
Dixie National Forest
82 North 100 East
P.O. Box 0580
Cedar City, Utah 84721-0580

Fishlake Forest Supervisor
Fishlake National Forest
115 East 900 North
Richfield, Utah 84701

Forest/Land Use Planner
Fishlake National Forest
115 East 900 North
Richfield, Utah 84701

National Park Service

National Parks:

Capital Reef Park Superintendent
Capital Reef National Park
Torrey, Utah 84775-0001

Canyonlands Park Superintendent
Canyonlands National Park
125 West 200 South
Moab, Utah 84532

Glen Canyon

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area
P.O. Box 1507
Page, Arizona 86040

Utah State Lands and Forestry:

Policy Integration Manager
State of Utah, State Lands and Forestry
355 West, North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 400
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1204

Division of Wildlife Resources:

Assistant Chief of Terrestrial
State of Utah, Division of Wildlife Resources
1596 West, North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

APPENDIX C
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

APPENDIX C

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ECONOMIC PROFILE OF WAYNE COUNTY

This section presents a brief overview of Wayne County's economy. In planning for the future, careful consideration should be given to the historic, current, and likely future economic base of an area. County planning can then be implemented with a recognition of the economic challenges and opportunities confronting the area.

Indications of Economic Activity

The economy in Wayne County is characterized by small growth in personal income, decreases in population, and low household income. Several facts illustrate the current challenges facing the county.

- Personal income in Wayne County increased by 1.6 percent from 1990 to 1991. In the same year personal income in the state increased four times as fast with a growth rate of 6.7 percent (See Figure #1).
- Wayne County was the only county in the state to lose population from 1991 to 1992. An estimated 2,150 people currently live in the county.
- Net out-migration has occurred in Wayne County in eight of the last ten years.
- Wayne County's median household income in 1989 was \$20,000 and ranked 27th in the state.

These indicators portray a county with significant economic challenges, namely providing jobs and income to the population that wants to work and live in the county. Table #1 provides a summary of demographic and economic activity in Wayne County and the State of Utah.

Another indicator of economic activity is changes in the number of businesses. The activity level in business development is determined by comparing the number of businesses that have been created over time to the number of businesses that have failed over that same time. Since 1989, Wayne County has experienced an increase of three businesses within the county (See Figure #2). The specific industries where this increase has occurred are primarily retail trade, construction, manufacturing and finance, insurance, and real estate (See Figure #3). The greatest decline in the number of businesses has been in mining, transportation, and utilities.

Figure #1




Table #1
Economic and Demographic Indicators
Wayne County and the State of Utah

	Wayne County	State of Utah
1992 Population	2,150	1,820,000
Percent Change 1991-92	-2.3%	2.5%
1991 Personal Income (000)	\$23,916	\$25,893,133
Percent Change 1990-91	1.6%	6.7%
1991 Per Capita Income	\$10,941	\$14,628
1992 Unemployment Rate	7.2%	4.9%
1989 Median Household Income	\$20,000	\$29,470

Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Utah Department of Employment Security and Bureau of the Census.

Figure #2





Figure #3



The amount of gross taxable sales within the county has declined to under \$10 million dollars from the previous amount of approximately \$12 million in 1989 (See Figure #4). Gross taxable sales is an indication of the extent of the retail business trade within the county.

Economic Base

Wayne County's economy depends on several sources of outside income to generate wealth for local residents. The industries that are critical to the county's economic base are government and agriculture. Figure #5 shows the sources of income in Wayne County in 1991.

Government, which consists largely of federal land management agencies, county and city government, and school districts, contributes 21.8 percent of all income in the county. Over 63 percent of the land in Wayne County is owned by the federal government. Federal land ownership, coupled with the major role that local government plays in providing public services such as education, make government a major participant in the Wayne County economy.

Figure #4






Figure #5
Sources of Income, 1991
Wayne County



Notes:

1. Agriculture includes farm earnings and earnings in agricultural services, forestry, fishery, and other.
2. Federal government earnings include federal land management agencies, the post office and other misc. federal employment.
3. State and Local Government earnings includes, cities, counties, state agencies, special service districts, and school districts.
4. Tourism income includes all or a portion of the earnings from hotels and lodging, food stores, eating and drinking, service stations, amusement and recreation, and other industries. Estimates are based on ratios of the tourism component of 2-digit SIC code industries identified by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget.
5. Other includes mining, transportation, public utilities construction, finance, insurance and real estate.
6. Transfer payments include government payments to individuals such as social security, disability insurance benefits, medical payments, welfare, unemployment insurance, veteran payments and education, and training and assistance payments.
7. These sources of income are estimated based on actual data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis. This income differs from personal income because contributions for social insurance are included but the residence adjustment is excluded.

Figure #6
1987 Agricultural Sales by Commodity
Wayne County



Notes:

1. Sales for crops, dairy, cattle, sheep, horses, hogs, and other are from the 1987 Census of Agriculture.
2. Agricultural sales include total sales from the Census of Agriculture and an estimate of sales from the agricultural industry of forestry as well as the manufacturing industry of lumber and wood products. These sales were estimated by applying the ratio of agricultural earnings and timber earnings to agricultural sales. The definition of agriculture in this graph is slightly different than the agricultural industry shown in the graph Sources of Income for Wayne County because agriculture in this graph includes the manufacturing industry of lumber and wood products.
3. Data are shown for 1987 because the 1987 Census of Agriculture is the most recent data for detailed agricultural sales by county. These data illustrate the composition of agricultural sales in 1987 but do not reflect current conditions in the county.

Agriculture constitutes 16.9 percent of income in the county and is comprised primarily of income from the livestock industry. Table #5 provides information on Animal Unit Months (AUMs) permitted within Wayne County. The county has over 101 thousand acres of land in farms and is the fourth most farm dependent county in Utah when measured using farm earnings as a percent of total earnings.³

The 1987 Census of Agriculture is the most recent available detailed data on agricultural sales by county. Agricultural sales in Wayne County are dominated by cattle and calves (49 percent), followed by forest products (15 percent) and dairy farming (15 percent). Figure #6 shows agricultural sales by commodity as a percent of total agricultural sales.

Manufacturing makes up 2.6 percent of total income in the county. The largest share of manufacturing income and employment in Wayne County originates in the lumber and wood and food and kindred products industries.

Tourism contributes 1.8 percent of the income in Wayne County. While tourism is small relative to other industries, it is a growth industry in the county. Tourism income is comprised of money from hotels and lodging, amusement and recreation, service stations, and eating and drinking establishments. Portions of Capitol Reef National Park, Canyonlands National Park, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and the Fishlake and Dixie National Forests are located in Wayne County. Table #2 shows the healthy growth in visitation at Capitol Reef National Park and Glen Canyon Recreation Area. Tourism is projected to continue to be a growth industry in the county.⁴ Figure #7 shows employment projections by major industry; the sizable growth in trade and services is illustrative of projected tourism growth.

When considering the ultimate value of tourism to the county, it is important to carefully assess the impact that tourism has on the county. In order to determine the actual dollar impact of tourism on a county, critical assumptions must be made about the number of tourists that will spend at least one night in the county, the amount of money they will spend, and the number in their party. During the course of this planning project, a careful assessment was made with the following conclusions (See Table #3):

- Total amount directly spent by tourists in Wayne County in 1989 was \$452,850.
- The total number of jobs that were created within the county by tourists was 61 with an estimated annual payroll of \$795,700.
- The total dollar impact of tourism on the county was estimated to be the combined amount of these figures, \$1,248,550.

³ 1987 *Census of Agriculture, Utah State and County Data*, p. 133 and 1993 *Economic Report to the Governor*, p. 140.


⁴ See projections by major industry in *State of Utah Economic and Demographic Projections 1992*, p. 186.

**Table #2
Recreation Visits to Selected National Parks**

	Capitol Reef	Glen Canyon
1981	397,789	1,820,163
1982	289,486	1,826,572
1983	331,734	1,975,273
1984	296,230	2,052,642
1985	320,503	2,160,542
1986	383,742	2,484,024
1987	428,808	2,883,412
1988	469,556	3,564,944
1989	515,278	3,483,904
1990	562,477	3,074,242
1991	618,056	3,181,100
1992	675,800	3,587,800
Average Annual Percent Change 1981-1992	5.4%	7.0%
Percent Change 1991-1992	9.3%	12.8%

Source: National Park Service.

Figure #7



An often overlooked but important contributor to the income in Wayne County is non-labor income that comes in the form of transfer payments -- mostly Social Security monies -- and dividends, interest and rents. Wayne County, like most rural counties, is relatively more dependent on non-labor income than the state average. Transfer payments and dividends, interest, and rents make up 38.7 percent of the total income in the county.

The combination of income from government, agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, transfer payments, and dividends/interest/rents comprises 82.0 percent of all income in the county and forms the economic base of Wayne County. The remaining 18.0 percent comes from mining, transportation, public utilities, non-tourism trade and services, finance, insurance and real estate.

In evaluating the economic base, it is important to recognize that jobs in various industries have a different economic value to the county. The direct wages paid are dispersed throughout the economy of the county, giving them a "multiplier effect". The average payroll for jobs within the county ranges from a low of \$387 per month in the trade industry to a high of \$1,783 per month in the transportation/public utilities industry (See Table #4). The multiplier for each of these jobs also changes and is affected to a great extent by the nature of the work performed. Estimates of these employment multipliers range from a low of 1.27 for trade to a high of 2.45 for manufacturing.

Table #3: Estimated Value of Tourism, Wayne County

Gross Taxable Room Rent 1989¹

		1986	1989	1991
Garfield	2,366,754	4,043,262	6,647,999	8,976,972
Piute	17,522	94,204	53,475	60,753
Wayne	154,095	278,007	405,278	907,523

Assumptions 1989

State Average Hotel Room Rate ⁴	\$50
Estimated Annual Hotel Night Stays in the County	8,106
Estimated Number of People per Hotel Room	3
Summer Amount Spent per Day per Tourist ²	\$25.40
Estimated Annual Amount Spent in the County	\$452,845
Estimated Number of Tourists Staying One Night in County (Range)	17,829-24,317

	How Each Tourist Dollar is Spent ²	Estimated 1989 Tourist Spending in Wayne County
Services	\$0.48	\$216,991
FIRE	\$0.06	\$28,897
Trade	\$0.23	\$104,030
TCPU	\$0.10	\$46,235
Manufacturing	\$0.07	\$30,999
Construction	\$0.01	\$4,729
Mining	\$0.01	\$4,729
Agriculture	\$0.00	\$1,051
Local Gov't Revenues	\$0.03	\$15,184
Total	\$1.00	\$452,845

	3,000 Tourists Create __ Jobs ²	3,000 Tourists Create Estimated Annual Payroll ³	Total Number Jobs from Tourism, 1989 ²	1989 Estimated Payroll from Tourism ³
Services	6.1	\$75,443	36	\$448,347
FIRE	0.3	\$5,441	2	\$32,338
Trade	1.6	\$10,847	9	\$64,460
TCPU	0.5	\$11,408	3	\$67,797
Manufacturing	0.4	\$8,608	3	\$51,154
Construction	0.1	\$959	0	\$5,701
Mining	0.0	\$909	0	\$5,400
Agriculture	0.0	\$691	0	\$4,104
Government ⁵	1.2	\$19,583	7	\$116,377
Total	10.3	\$133,888	61	\$795,677

¹State Tax Comm., ²Rural Utah Tourism, ³Utah Dept. of Employment Security, ⁴Project Team Estimates (PTE), ⁵GOPB and PTE

Table #4
Average Wage and Estimated Multiplier 1991
Wayne County

	Average Monthly Wage	Northern Utah Periphery Multiplier
Mining	NA	1.73
Construction	\$1,651	1.44
Manufacturing	\$696	2.45
Transportation/Public Utilities	\$1,783	1.82
Trade	\$387	1.27
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	\$895	1.81
Services	\$663	1.30
Government	\$1,340	1.28
Agriculture (1)	\$1,502	2.30

(1) Estimated using county employment projections and BEA farm earnings.

Sources: Utah Department of Employment Security and Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, UMRIO Model.

Table #5: BLM Grazing by Allotment

Allotments	Livestock	Livestock (a)			Elson				Mule Deer			Antelope	Bighorn Sheep	Burros	
		Kind of Livestock	Active Preference (AUMs)	Average Licensed Use (AUMs)	Forage Available to Livestock (AUMs)	Proposed Grazing Use (AUMs)	Crucial Winter (AUMs)	Crucial Summer (AUMs)	Crucial Yearlong (AUMs)	Proposed Grazing Use (AUMs)	Crucial Winter (AUMs)(b)	Crucial Summer (AUMs)(b)	Proposed Grazing Use (AUMs)	Proposed Grazing Use (AUMs)	Proposed Grazing Use (AUMs)
Blue Bench	Cattle	4598	2161	2749	5	0	5	0	34	1	0	0	0	0	
					(8)(c)		(8)								
Bullfrog (d)	Cattle	3120	2106	2337	74	74	0	0	62	22	0	0	0	0	
	Sheep	322	120 (e)	233	(97)	(97)									
Burr Point	Cattle	2138	1691	2951	15	0	15	0	32	0	1	18	0	0	
	Sheep	2279	No Use	914					(35)		(4)				
Cathedral	Cattle	2998	1638	2366	0	0	0	0	121	0	0	0	0	0	
		B 2503	B 1360	B 1871											
		P 495	P 278	P 495											
Cedar Point	Cattle	1892	839	1294	8	0	8	0	55	33	0	19	0	0	
					(15)		(15)								
Crescent Cr.	Cattle	332	333	181	65	0	65	0	81	0	75	0	0	0	
Hanksville	Cattle	4538	2848	6511	18	0	18	0	44	0	0	19	0	0	
	Sheep	1462	No Use	985											
Hartnet	Cattle	2938	1710	2884	0	0	0	0	103	0	0	0	0	0	
		B 1021	B 599	B 967											
		P 1917	P 1111	P 1917											
Nasty Flat	Cattle	474	468	297	685	0	457	228	71	6	55	0	0	0	
									(73)	(8)					
North Bench	Cattle	456	45	306	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	
Pennell	Cattle	2420	1960	2240	952	0	576	376	205	88	72	0	0	0	
	Sheep	174	No Use	109	(958)	(6)									
Robbers Roost (d)	Cattle	5288	2882	6902	0	0	0	0	392	0	0	31	22	100	
Rockies (d)	Cattle	5600	3762	4003	0	0	0	0	69	0	14	0	16	0	
	Sheep	272	128 (e)	249					(75)		(20)				
Sandy 1	Cattle	1209	1096	949	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	
		B 927	B 844	B 667											
		P 282	P 252	P 282											
	Sheep	B 51	No Use	0											
Sandy 2	Cattle	2228	1257	715	122	105	17	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	
					(155)	(138)									
Sandy 3	Cattle	985	875	981	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	
		B 305	B 271	B 301											
		P 680	P 604	P 680											
Sawmill Basin	Cattle	166	33	64	146	0	146	0	95	0	88	0	0	0	
Sewing Machine (d)	Cattle	1600	998	2681	0	0	0	0	167	0	0	0	21	0	
Steele Butte	Cattle	5034	2672	1888	202	178	17	7	112	54	0	0	0	0	
					(288)	(249)		(22)							
Trachyte	Cattle	2110	1542	1109	20	0	20	0	59	27	15	0	16	0	
	Sheep	743	84 (e)	475											
Waterpocket (d)	Cattle	3025	1813	3107	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	
		B 2861	B 1715	B 2943											
		P 164	P 98	P 164											
	Sheep (g)	322	133 (e)	280											
		B 322	B 133	B 262											
		P 0	P 0	P 18											
Wild Horse	Cattle	1067	104	1491	0	0	0	0	128	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotal	Cattle	54216	32833	48006	2312	357	1344	611	1974	231	320	87	75	100	
		B 50678	30490	44468	(2470)	(490)	(1354)	(626)	(1985)	(233)	(329)				
		P 3538	2343	3538											
	Sheep	5625	465	3245											
		B 5607	458	3227											
		P 18	7	18											
Unalloted Areas															
Dry Lakes	None				100	0	73	27	59	0	54	0	0	0	
					(226)			(153)							
Flint Trall (d)	None				0	0	0	0	166	0	0	0	0	0	
Little Rockies (d)	None				0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	
N. Calneville Mesa	No Livestock Use				0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	
S. Calneville Mesa	No Livestock Use				0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotal		0	0	0	100	0	73	27	261	0	54	0	0	0	
					(226)			(153)							
TOTAL (f)		59841	33298	51251	2412	357	1417	638	2235	231	374	87	75	100	
					(2696)	(490)	(1427)	(779)	(2246)	(233)	(383)				

Source: Figures were derived from the soil-vegetation inventory conducted by USDI, BLM, and Earth Environmental Consultants, Inc. (1980).

(a) Active preference and average licensed use AUMs are for BLM and Glen Canyon NRA (see footnote 'c') lands only, except for allotments containing National Park lands. B = BLM, P = Park. Average licensed use numbers have been changed in this Final EIS because of errors in data used to complete the Draft EIS. (b) Deer AUMs are comprised of crucial summer and crucial winter ranges in this Final EIS. (c) Numbers in () are actual AUMs needed from BLM-administered lands (as per UDWR and BLM agreement); however, there is not enough forage available to meet these needs. (d) Includes both BLM and Glen Canyon NRA lands. (e) Intermittent use. (f) Includes 3556 AUMs of active preference and 2037 AUMs of average licensed use in Capitol Reef National Park. (g) Sheep use has been excluded in Capitol Reef National Park since 1975 as stipulated in the Waterpocket Allotment Agreement and Management Plan.

Table #6: BLM Grazing by Allotment

Allotment	No.	Mgmt. Cat.	OWP	Acres	Kind of Livestock	Adjud Season of Use	Livestock		Allocations			Wildlife		
							Active Preference	Suspended NonUse	Bison	Mule Deer	Prong Horn	Big Horn	Burro	Elk
Bicknell	0700	I	BLM TOT	1772 1772	Cattle	11/1-1/15	90	150		11				
Bicknell Sp. Cedar Peak	0701 0706	I I	BLM S TOT	N/A 2355 10412 12767	Cattle Sheep	5/16-6/20 5/16-6/20 9/16-10/25	689 125		7	4			11	
Hare Lake	0715	I	BLM S P TOT	6352 6316 638 13306	Sheep	9/16-10/31 5/22-6/30	355			21	11			
Smooth Knoll	0732	I	BLM S TOT	17852 1412 19264	Sheep	5/16-6/25 9/1-10/31	1053			32	67			
Bicknell Wi. Flat Top	0702 0712	I I	BLM S TOT	N/A 18145 3367 21512	Cattle Sheep	4/16-5/15 11/1-1/9	1279 717			74	50			
King Sheep	0719	I	BLM S TOT	7302 718 8020	Sheep	11/1-2/28	161			74	20			
Busenbark	0704	C	BLM S TOT	247 36 283	Sheep	12/1-12/31	30			6				
Cyclone	0708	I	BLM S TOT	5206 14415 19621	Sheep	5/16-6/27 10/1-12/7	164			10	30		11	
Cyclone Coop	0740	I	BLM S TOT	0 7349 7349	Cattle	5/1-5/31	135							
Dez Hickman	0710	-	BLM TOT	230 230	Wildlife					6				
Donkey Hill	0711	C	BLM TOT	1285 1285	Cattle	10/16-3/15	25	25		17				
Govt. Creek	0713	C	BLM TOT	1832 1832	Sheep	12/1-2/28	91			47				
Grover	0714	C	BLM TOT	1488 1488	Cattle	10/1-4/15	80			24				
Hector Hollow	0716	I	BLM TOT	1955 1955	Sheep	11/16-2/15	138			14				
Horse Pasture	0717	C	BLM TOT	467 467	Cattle	5/1-5/31	14	26		17				
Hickman	0718	C	BLM TOT	269 269	Cattle	7/1-7/31	4			8				
Lime Kiln	0720	I	BLM P TOT	2927 318 3245	Sheep	11/1-2/15	354			58				
Loa Winter Deleuw	0721 0709	I I	BLM S TOT	N/A 3026 633 3659	Cattle Sheep	11/20-1/15 11/20-1/31	180 100	72 68		56	25			
Long Hollow	0722	I	BLM S TOT	8823 640 9463	Sheep	11/1-12/31	238	94		65	40			
Terza Flat	0738	I	BLM S TOT	7417 1306 8723	Sheep	1/10-2/15	291	87		41	65			
Lyman	0723	C	BLM TOT	2020 2020	Cattle	12/1-3/15	125	88		14				
Miners Mtn.	0724	M	BLM S TOT	14896 2000 16896	Cattle	5/1-5/31	212	307		159				
Neff Ranch	0725	C	BLM S P TOT	1602 516 659 2777	Cattle/ Sheep	1/7-2/28	82	122		91				
No. Fremont	0726	C	BLM S TOT	4036 634 4670	Sheep	12/15-2/28	230	71		47	19			
Post Hollow	0727	I	BLM S TOT	9561 5215 14776	Cattle/ Sheep	11/1-2/28	327	5		34	74			
River	0729	C	BLM P TOT	2029 160 2193	Cattle	10/16-4/15	75	51		24				
Sand Wash	0730	I	BLM TOT	676 676	Sheep	1/1-2/28	33	21		18				
Seven Mile	0731	I	BLM S TOT	17333 1295 18628	Cattle	5/11-6/14	702	129		104	8		53	
Spring Br.	0733	C	BLM TOT	452 452	Cattle	11/1-4/15	11			8				
Teasdale Bn.	0736	C	BLM TOT	1118 1118	Cattle	11/1-11/30	20			17				
Teasdale Ra.	0737	C	BLM TOT	921 921	Cattle	10/16-4/15	78	55		11				
Torrey In.	0739	I	BLM S P TOT	9199 70 160 9429	Cattle	12/1-1/31	381	99		47				
Wildlife	-	-	BLM TOT	320 320	Unallot.					4				
W. Fremont	0742	C	BLM TOT	1429 1429	Cattle/ Sheep	12/1-2/28	83	82		38				
TOTAL							63874	14598	2223	7034	408	3168	100	75

Table # 7 : AUMS, Fishlake National Forest

Allotment Name	# AUMs
Last Chance	2975
Seven Mile	6846
Solomon	2693
Thousand Lake	2441
Tidwell	4330
Daniels	1584
Hancock Sheep	1183
U.M.	6002
Total	28,054

Table # 8: AUMS, Dixie National Forest

Allotment Name	# AUMS
East Side	10,181
North Slope	1355
West Side (includes sheep)	8800
Total	20,336

Table #9: Wayne County AUMs

AGENCY	AREA	AUMs
Bureau of Land Management	Henry Mountain Resource Area	45,818 ¹
U.S. Forest Service	Dixie National Forest	20,336
	Fishlake National Forest	28,054
National Park Service ²	Capitol Reef National Park	
	Glen Canyon Nat'l Rec. Area	
State Lands & Forestry ³		7,881
Division of Wildlife Resources		0
Estimated Total		102,089

¹ This number includes a limited number of grazing permits that are held by Garfield County residents, plus 4229 AUMs in the Rock Spring Allotment. The total number given (45,818) cannot be divided on a county-level basis.

² Grazing permits in Capitol Reef National Park and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area are administered by the BLM and are included in that number.

³ Data for AUMs permitted by State Lands and Forestry is not available at the county level. Therefore, the number given is an estimate made by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and is based on the assumption that the number of AUMs permitted on SL&F land is proportionately equal to the number of AUMs permitted on BLM land.

Notes:

1. Data was collected from representatives of each agency. Each number represents an **estimate** of the number of AUMs held by Wayne County residents.

2. Data is for both cattle and sheep.

BENEFITS AND COSTS OF THE PREFERRED POLICIES

The following is presented as a clarification of the terms used in this analysis and the process of determining the benefits and costs.

Preferred Option Benefit Analysis

Benefit Scale

The scale used in the benefit analysis is a grade ranging from a low grade of "C" to a high grade of "A". All of the options generate some benefit to the county, therefore no option was assessed to be below a "C".

Benefit Factors

Five factors were assessed equally to determine the overall level of benefit associated with the preferred option. These factors consisted of:

- **Creates a critical mass**
If the option would, in time, develop a cluster of businesses or industries that would serve to attract into the county other businesses, the option was given a higher grade. This factor takes into consideration not only the immediate benefits associated with the activity, but the long term benefits and relationship to future economic development of the county.
- **Creates pride in the county**
Attitude of the citizens is critical to economic development. This attitude is conveyed to outsiders and if positive can affect the perception outsiders have of the area. If the option would generate pride in the citizens and thereby would positively influence how the county is perceived by others, the options received a higher ranking.
- **Increase the number of jobs**
Jobs are a direct result of successful economic development efforts. Those options that had the potential of generating more jobs received a higher ranking than those generating only a few.
- **Increase county revenue potential**
Certain types of business and industrial development generate more public revenues than other. It is a benefit to the county to have businesses that contribute a larger share to the general revenues of the county. If the option evaluated had this potential, then it received higher ranking.
- **Creates catalysts for other economic development**
Associated with certain options is the potential "spin off" effect it has on other economic development. If the option would serve to stimulate other development, it received a higher ranking.

Preferred Option Costs Analysis

Cost Scale

The cost scale used in the analysis ranged from a low cost "1" to a high cost "5". The higher the cost, the less attractive the preferred option is.

Cost Factors

A wide range of cost factors was considered in this analysis. Each of the factors is described below:

- **Changes county values**
If the option that is considered changes or is in conflict with the county's value/goal statement, or in any way violates the county's custom and culture, it received a high cost mark.
- **Requires new strengths**
Each of the economic options must build on a base of county strengths. If the county's current strengths align with the needs of the option, the cost is low. If new strengths are required, the cost of developing new strengths is high.
- **Requires county leadership or training**
Some of the options will require increasing the capabilities of county leaders or business managers. This is particularly true if the option is dependent on support of the general citizens for it to be successful. Someone must take the lead to develop that support. If this is the case, the cost for doing so is much higher.
- **Risk of failure**
Each preferred option has some degree of risk that it will not succeed. This risk varies depending on the number of elements that are critical to its success, the degree of competition, the timing of the opportunity, etc. If the risk is high, the cost of dealing with that risk is also high.
- **Requires infrastructure/facility development**
In order to pursue some of the options, infrastructure must be developed or expanded. Some of the options are dependent on the development of specific facilities. The costs for these developments can be extremely high and therefore the high cost ranking.
- **Requires policy changes**
Options may require a change in governmental policy in order for them to be accomplished. This change may include building or zoning regulations, administrative rule changes from the state or federal government, etc. The degree of difficulty in bringing about such changes affects the cost of the option.

- **Time to realize benefits**
If the option will produce immediate benefits in terms of jobs created and revenue generated, the costs are low. If, however, a long investment period must take place before the county sees any real benefits, the cost is significantly higher.
- **Cost/funds required**
The actual dollar cost to pursue each option was considered. Included in this was the evaluation of costs of personnel, marketing materials, financial incentives, etc.
- **Dependence on another goal**
Some of the options have a unique dependency on the accomplishment of some other economic goal. If this dependency is strong, the cost is higher because essentially two options must be accomplished.

WAYNE COUNTY POTENTIAL ECONOMIC POLICIES

The economic development subcommittee in Wayne County evaluated an array of economic options and divided them according to broad economic categories and degree of effort.

Retail Businesses

- Low Effort: Prevent loosing any existing retail businesses.
- Medium Effort: Retain the existing retail businesses and expand their current operations.
- High Effort: Grow existing businesses to where they reflect a critical mass. Attract additional businesses as a result of the critical mass.

Tourism/Recreation

- Low Effort: Organize the county's tourism and recreation promotion. Get "in the loop" with other promotion groups within the state and region. Expand on the promotion efforts of the other groups.
- Medium Effort: Improve the county's existing tourism and recreation capabilities. Market tourism and recreation opportunities to specific target groups interested in the Hale Theater, Arts/Culture at Capital Reef, etc.
- High Effort: Create new attractions and recreational facilities within the county. Specifically, Pioneer Days, tourist shops.

Agriculture

- Low Effort: Maintain current agriculture businesses. Prevent loosing any additional AUMs. Keep current number of acres in agricultural use. Continue to use the Board of Water Resources water development funds to enhance agriculture by the wise and efficient use of available water resources. Continue to use state Agricultural Resource Development Loan (ARDL) funds and ASCS cost/share funds.
- Medium effort: Expand the number of AUMs. Expand the acreage used for agriculture. Expand the dairy and cheese industry.
- High effort: Expand the dairy and cheese industry to the point that related businesses can be attracted or created.

Create New Businesses

- **Low Effort:** Provide general information throughout the county on business creation.
- **Medium Effort:** Provide direct assistance and consulting to entrepreneurs to assist them in starting and operating their own business.
- **High Effort:** Provide direct assistance in business financing, marketing, exploring, etc.

Attract New Businesses

- **Low Effort:** Develop a brochure regarding business opportunities within the county. Expand on the efforts of other agencies, i.e. region, state, etc.
- **Medium Effort:** Create a county Economic Development Office including staff support. Engage in general and direct promotion of the county.
- **High Effort:** Conduct market research. Develop incentives for new businesses. Directly market location opportunities to light manufacturers, computer industry, and beef industry.

Commercial Fisheries

- **Low Effort:** Maintain the existing water rights and the current fisheries business.
- **Medium Effort:** Expand the fisheries business by assisting in the development of new markets for the product.
- **High Effort:** Create new and additional fisheries-related businesses.

Timber Industry

- **Low Effort:** Maintain the current level of timber harvesting.
- **High Effort:** Restructure the timber contracts to allow for smaller sales. Create a chip board business using the aspen timber.

LEVEL OF EFFORT

County Resources	Low Effort	Medium Effort	High Effort
PEOPLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of the current level of county volunteerism. • Requires a few key leaders with a "vision". • Requires a few key individuals to be active in accomplishing the goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Normal" number of county volunteers is increased. • Some trained expertise is required. • An increased number of leaders and citizens are involved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders champion the cause and convert the masses. • Many citizens volunteer to participate. • Full time expertise and technical personnel are retained.
POLITICAL SUPPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts build off of existing political climate and support. • Effort requires only renewed emphasis and not changes in policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in current policies are required. • Some opposition to effort is expected. • Supportive political proponents required to achieve success. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant new policies are required. • Strong political support from large numbers of citizens is required. • Strong political leadership is required.
MONEY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited new funds required. • Some reallocation of funds may be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional funds are required. • New funds may require discontinuing funding of some current activities. • Support of citizens for funding decisions is critical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant amount of funds are required. • All sources of funding are tapped including tax increases. • Support from citizens must be strongly and openly expressed.

APPENDIX D
INFRASTRUCTURE

APPENDIX D

INFRASTRUCTURE

INFRASTRUCTURE AREAS OF FOCUS

The Wayne County Infrastructure Subcommittee identified approximately eight to ten different categories or elements in the infrastructure, human/social services and education areas that needed particular attention. These eight to ten categories were reduced to seven different categories due to limited resources and the number of committee members working on each of the various assignments. In some cases, individuals were asked to serve on more than one sub-group (such as water and solid waste). The seven main categories with a list of specific components or sub-items comprising each main category are as follows:

Development and Miscellaneous Public Utilities

- Building permits and housing
- Zoning, development ordinances, building codes
- Telecommunications, telephone, etc.
- Television, cable, etc.
- Electrical power distribution (power company)
- Power generation (dams, liquid fuels, fossils fuels)
- Energy conservation
- Natural gas, propane, etc.
- Coal and other mineral resources

Education and Public Facilities

- Primary & secondary education & facilities
- Special education & facilities
- Technical/vocational schools & facilities
- College and University/extension services and facility
- Libraries
- Post Office
- Recreational facilities (pools, bowling alleys, etc.)
- Parks, golf courses, etc.
- City & county offices & facilities

Environmental Health

- Septic tank systems, sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment facilities
- Organic and animal disposal, solid waste and garbage collection, hazardous waste
- Air quality
- Water quality (watershed, ground water, etc.)
- Noise

Human Services/Social Services

- Aging/elderly services
- Child care/youth services
- Handicapped services
- Housing
- Welfare
- Employment/unemployment
- Healthcare
- Medical facilities (clinics, hospitals, etc.)
- Drug and substance abuse
- Mental health

Public Safety and Law Enforcement

- Juvenile enforcement and judicial system
- Criminal enforcement and judicial system
- Emergency medical service
- Fire protection and emergency rescue
- Highway safety and enforcement
- Drug and substance abuse

Transportation

- Highways, roads, streets and trails
- Rights-of-way to access federal and state lands
- Airports
- Railroads
- Public and private transportation (buses, taxi, limo, vehicle rental, etc.)
- Truck freight
- School transportation (buses, vans, etc.)
- Specialized transportation (handicapped, elderly, etc.)
- Special conveyance systems (bulk handling, conveyor belts, etc.)
- Aquatic transportation and facilities (ferries, marinas, boat launches, etc.)

Water and Water Resources

- Dams and reservoirs, springs, wells, etc.
- Water conveyance systems (rivers, canals, pipe lines, etc.)
- Water treatment facilities
- Water storage facilities
- Water distribution systems
- Irrigation systems and secondary water systems
- Fire protection
- Storm water and flood control
- Water rights and water resources

BACKGROUND INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION

Extensive capital investments have been made on infrastructure elements including roads, public and private utilities, telecommunications, equipment, public facilities and buildings (schools, medical facilities, community centers, libraries, courthouses, etc.), and services.

Infrastructure covers a broad range of public facilities and services including transportation (other than highways), water and water resources, law enforcement, emergency services, community facilities, and environmental health (clean air and water, solid waste, etc.). Many infrastructure categories and services overlap with other areas or programs which are not normally considered to be infrastructure such as education, human/social services (including welfare, employment, social services programs, etc.) and health services. Education, human and social services, and health services, are addressed in regard to infrastructure related aspects such as public buildings, transportation requirements, and other infrastructure or utility requirements for these facilities. Needs for education curriculum and human/social and health care services and programs have not been addressed in this planning effort.

Infrastructure needs in Wayne County over the past ten years have remained fairly constant with the primary needs being capital replacement or modernization, despite decreasing employment and student enrollment. Population projections from the State of Utah (Governor's Office of Planning and Budget) indicate that while population and employment are both projected to increase only moderately from 1990 to 2000 (approximately 1 percent per year), education enrollment is anticipated to decrease 17 percent from 1,060 to 881 students by the year 2000.

The information presented on the following pages is a brief summary of the existing conditions of various infrastructure elements. The information was collected from numerous sources including individuals on the Wayne County Infrastructure Subcommittee, the cities in Wayne County, Wayne County staff, and regional, state, and federal agencies.

Development And Zoning

The infrastructure subcommittee reported the following:

- Building permits are not yet required in Wayne County but will be in the future. City ordinances require building permits in Bicknell and Loa.
- There are no county zoning ordinances at the present time. There are basic zoning ordinances within the incorporated cities.
- The county commissioners have adopted the Utah Uniform Building Code as the minimum standard for structures in the county, but there are no building inspectors to inspect new buildings for structural, electrical, or plumbing code compliance before the structure is occupied. The State Board of Health representative from the

Richfield office inspects new septic systems for installation and adequate drain field size before a new structure is occupied.

Environmental Health

Air Quality

Air quality in Wayne County is excellent. Many residents value clean air as a cultural benefit associated with the rural county lifestyle.

Organic And Animal Disposal

In Wayne County, most local cities have organic and animal disposal sites which at present, accept other solid waste and garbage on a regular basis. Each of the various cities within the county which currently operate unpermitted solid waste were required to be closed by October 9, 1993, or face state closure. Future compliance requirements may include monitoring, testing, reporting, further regulations and possible fines. Wayne County does have plans whereby all local municipal sites would be closed by the October deadline. New organic and animal disposal sites are not required by the State of Utah.

Solid Waste Disposal

There were five garbage dump sites within the county. One is located one mile west of Loa. This site is a result of unorganized and casual dumping and is spread over an unusually large area. Another is located two miles southwest of Bicknell, within a short distance of the Fremont River. This is a smaller site and is somewhat better managed than others in the county. Torrey's dump site was located south of town and Teasdale had one located northeast of town. Hanksville has a site located about one-half mile northwest of town.

In Wayne County, there are no permitted solid waste facilities currently in operation. Wayne County has submitted plans for a solid waste site near Caineville and plans to be in compliance in the near future.

Wastewater Disposal and Treatment

At the present time, Hanksville is the only city in Wayne County with a sewer system. The county uses septic tank systems to dispose of wastewater. Pumped septic tank sludge waste is disposed of privately. In general, facilities appear to be adequate for present needs. However, any substantial expansion for mineral, industrial, or commercial development could result in the need for further expansion of their existing facilities or new facilities.

A significant wastewater disposal-related problem relates to septic tank sludge which clogs and backs up effluent if not pumped on a regular basis. Also the county and/or cities are in need of lagoons for the disposal and treatment of septic tank sludge. While the cost effectiveness of

implementing sewer systems in each city is more an economic issue than a health issue, the proper disposal of septic sludge is primarily a health issue with economics being secondary.

Water Quality

Water quality within Wayne County for household use ranges from good to excellent. All public drinking water systems within the county are state approved. The majority of spring fed or well water systems are located above the river basins or septic tank systems. Water quality of downstream rivers such as the Fremont River is generally reduced due to their downstream location. The explanation of the various water designations is contained later in Appendix D.

- Fremont River and tributaries - Water Quality use classification is 1C, 3A and 4, through Capitol Reef National Park to the headwaters. From Capitol Reef to the Muddy, the classification is 3C and 4.
- Spring Creek - Water Quality use classification is 1C and 3A (see Fremont River and tributaries for additional information).
- Dirty Devil River - Generally the same use classification and quality as the Fremont River.

Most smaller creeks and streams originating in the mountains are relatively clean and clear and are used mostly for irrigation. Excess or off-season flow enters the Fremont and Dirty Devil Rivers. The quality of water from mountain streams ranges from good to excellent due to their origins and because there is relatively little development of any kind within the watersheds.

The Fremont and Dirty Devil Rivers are considerably different. These two rivers are located in the bottom of the valleys, adjacent to residential, recreational, and agricultural uses and development. Excess nutrient loads, phosphorus, and general lack of dissolved oxygen contribute to their poor quality. In general it can be summarized that the water sources located above the cities and towns are fed by clean and pure water sources, whereas the downstream rivers, specifically the Fremont River, have decreased water quality due to their salts, organic, and nutrient content, and sediment loading from natural erosion.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety

According to Wayne County law enforcement officials, the county is in need of an additional four deputies. This would accommodate the current need and help with the severe demand on personnel which occurs during peak tourist season. Because of the great distance between some cities in the county, multiple distant responses can be a serious problem. A significant portion of the county's law enforcement responsibilities are related to drug and alcohol cases from non-county residents. Because a significant portion of law enforcement effort is related to non-resident incidents, the county believes that it is appropriate to pursue with the state legislature law enforcement funding

relief for the county. One possibility worth pursuing is a recreational-use reimbursement tax.

Law enforcement and emergency service personnel indicated that equipment improvements are also an essential need within their area.

Public and Private Utilities

Electrical Power

Residents and businesses in Wayne County are currently served by one provider, Garkane Power Association, Inc. Current electrical power needs are adequately served. There are many remote areas in which there are few or no service lines. These areas are more common in the eastern portion of the county. For additional information regarding power rates and power availability contact Garkane Power Association, Inc.

The electrical distribution system in Wayne County is owned and operated by Garkane Power Association. The power transmission and most of the distribution lines in the county have been replaced within the past 10 years and an additional substation has been added south of Bicknell to allow for increased growth in the western part of the county. There is a bottleneck at the present time where the existing distribution lines for the eastern part of the county cross Capitol Reef National Park. Approximately 6 miles of old line need replacement and an additional 40 miles of existing line require that another conductor be added. When this construction project is completed, there should be adequate capacity for moderate load growth in the eastern areas of the county.

Garkane Power is in the process of obtaining a right-of-way through Capital Reef National Park. The necessary environmental impact studies are being done and construction is expected to be completed by 1994.

There are no significant sources of power generation in the county at this time. There are several sites where hydroelectric generation could be developed in the future, one being the dam at the existing Mill Meadow Reservoir north of Fremont.

There are significant coal deposits in the eastern part of the county around the Factory Butte and also on the southern border near Notom and Sandy. The deposit at Factory Butte was developed in the late 1970's but has since closed.

Gas

At the present time natural gas is not available within Wayne County. LP gas is delivered by private vendors.

Telephone

Wayne County is currently served by one carrier. Information about rates, areas covered, line installation and type of switching equipment used can be obtained by contacting South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc.

Upgrading the telephone system in Wayne County is a major concern. There is no telephone service available in Caineville and up to eight party lines are used in the Grover-Fish Creek area. The existing telephone exchanges in Loa and Bicknell have not been upgraded to provide digital switching. The existing switching equipment at the exchanges do not provide reliable data line capability for computer links with other areas.

South Central Telephone is in the process of purchasing the telephone system in Wayne County with the exception of Hanksville, pending FCC approval. South Central plans to upgrade all the exchanges, install Northern Telecom digital switches in all the exchanges, and upgrade the switching equipment in Torrey and Teasdale.

Television

Cable television service is available in Loa, Lyman, and Bicknell and to residents along the cable route between these towns.

Programming is available for satellite dish owners from Southern Utah Satellite Systems in Richfield and also from rural television subscription offered by Garkane Power Association. Ed-Net telecommunication services are used in Wayne County schools and Ag-Net satellite system is also available. For more information, contact Southern Utah Cablevision.

Transportation

In Wayne County, like most rural counties, transportation facilities are the life lines of the local residents. The major and minor roadway arterials running through the county provide an essential function in accessing federal and state land and their resources. A map showing major transportation routes within Wayne County is on page six of this document. A map of RS 2477 roads within Wayne County is available by contacting the Wayne County Road Superintendent. A more detailed discussion of the RS 2477 issue is later in Appendix D of this document.

Airports

A summary of the airport facilities in Wayne County is given in Table #10.

Table #10
Airport Facilities Inventory

	Hanksville Airport	Loa-Wayne Airport
Length of Runway	5675 feet	5900 feet
Surface	Asphalt	Asphalt
Rotating Light/Beacon	Yes	Yes
Navigational Aids	VHF/DF; VORTAC 115.9	
Communication	UNICOM 122.8	CTAF 122.9
Distance to S.L. Int'l Airport	175 miles	164 miles

Source: Utah Aeronautical Chart, April 1, 1989.

Highways

Transportation, and more specifically Wayne County's highway system, is the single largest infrastructure investment. Existing highways in Wayne County, including state roads, are only in fair condition overall, due partly to insufficient funds to properly maintain and renovate these aging facilities.

The major issue with respect to county highway facilities is maintenance. State roads currently receive the best maintenance and the most funding, with county roads receiving significantly less. Of greater concern for state and county roads is the fact that many of these facilities have already exceeded their 25 to 30 year design life and are in need of major rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement. Many local city streets are in worse condition. Often poorly constructed for drainage or structurally inadequate (thickness of asphalt, roadbase, or sub-base), many local roads are in poor condition.

Roadway facilities in Wayne County are primarily served by four key State Route (SR) Highways: SR-12, SR-24, SR-72 and SR-95. SR-25, immediately west of the Wayne County-Piute County border, provides access to Fish Lake and the Fishlake National Forest. The main highway facility in the county is SR-24. This is primarily an east-west road which connects the majority of the cities in the county. SR-95, the Bicentennial Highway, accesses Interstate-70 in Emery County and provides access to rural counties including Emery, Wayne and Garfield, to the Glen Canyon National Recreational Area and the Bullfrog Basin Marina area. SR-12, the Clem Church Memorial Highway, is another scenic road providing access through the Dixie National Forest in both Wayne and Garfield Counties and ultimately accessing Bryce Canyon National Park. SR-72, originating in the Loa-Fremont area continues north through the Fishlake National Forest and connects with Interstate-70 near Fremont Junction. The far eastern portion of the county has limited roads and is

served primarily by roads under the RS 2477 roads provision. One unimproved road identified by the infrastructure subcommittee needing improvement, including hard surfacing of some type (chip and seal, slurry seal, or pavement) is the road originating in the Loa area and traveling south through the Dixie National Forest to Escalante and Garfield Counties.

Railroads

There is no rail trackage in Wayne County.

Water and Water Resources

The Division of Water Resources and its construction loan program has been providing technical and financial assistance to Wayne County for the last 45 years. Through local sponsors such as Caineville Special Service District, East Bicknell Irrigation Company, Fremont Irrigation Company, Fremont Waterworks Company, Hanksville Canal Company, Hanksville Waterworks Company, Loa Waterworks Company, Lyman Water System, Road Creek Water Users Association, Sand Creek Irrigation Company, Teasdale Irrigation Company, Torrey Irrigation Company, Torrey Town, and West Bicknell Irrigation Company, the Board of Water Resources has loaned over 3.3 million dollars to build 5.4 million dollars worth of water construction projects. Since the first project in 1948, Wayne County water users have built 35 water projects through the Division of Water Resources which includes two dams, four regulation and diversion dams, fifteen sprinkle irrigation systems, eight culinary systems and five dual water systems. Through the combined efforts of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Division of Water Resources, the agriculture economic base in Wayne County has been supported, stabilized, and expanded. The culinary system projects have improved the quality of life and helped provide safe drinking water in Wayne County.

The Division of Water Resources, through its Water Planning Section has extensive technical information and data relating to water planning issues for Wayne County. The Hydrologic Inventory of the Dirty Devil Study Unit completed in 1977, contains detailed water resources information for the county. A water-related land use inventory for the county was completed in the summer of 1991, and the report *Water-Related Land Use Inventories, West Colorado Study Unit* is now available. The Planning Section has helped the Wayne County Water Conservancy District in its effort to build a reservoir along the Fremont River. The State of Utah Water Plan will be focusing its efforts in Wayne County with the West Colorado River Basin Plan in 1994 through 1996.

The Fremont River Basin and Muddy River/Dirty Devil River are closed to new appropriations of water rights. The exception is the Caineville area, which has an approved right to store approximately 50,000 acre feet of water pending resolution of environmental concerns. Economic development must consider land use activities which do not require extensive new water resources or water rights (primarily from agricultural uses) that may potentially be purchased and converted to other beneficial uses. Agricultural conversions may have water storage and transmission

implications, requiring dam enlargement and water line construction needs. Because commercial, industrial, or domestic water uses may impact the traditional seasonal storage requirements imposed by agricultural uses, further analysis of such transfers would be required. For example, household conversions will require high quality water, with water deliveries on a consistent year-round basis. The agricultural source for this water may not be of adequate quality. Also agricultural water is stored in the winter months (with no use) and has very intensive water use requirements during the hot summer growing season.

In the more populated areas in Wayne County every public water system is Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) approved. In many outlying areas and unincorporated portions of the county, water sources are private local springs and wells and do not fall within DEQ's regulations. The increase in population in each town is determined by the available supply of culinary water. Some towns have an adequate supply for growth and some towns have no excess water available without the further development of additional water sources.

At the present time, the Lyman Water System is chlorinating the water it provides. Bicknell has a chlorinating system installed in their new spring development but does not chlorinate their water. The Safe Drinking Water Act will require all public water systems to be chlorinated in the near future or EPA might possibly enact regulations requiring chlorination of public drinking water.

Extensive water rights information is available at the State of Utah's Department of Natural Resources, Water Rights Division. This information is not summarized in a usable form and the collection and presentation of this data is beyond the scope of this study.

Geologic Resources

Mining has played a role in Wayne County's economy and custom and culture. With help from the Utah Geological Survey, a summary of Wayne County's geologic hazards and mineral occurrences are listed in Table #11.

Table #11
Mineral Occurrences in Wayne County - UMOs Database

Site Name	Commodity	Deposit Size	Prod	Township	Range	Section
"The Ledges" Gravel Pit	SDG	Medium	M	027S	3	17
Allred Point Borrow Pit	SDG	Medium	M	027S	2	25
Big Hollow Gravel Deposit	SDG	Medium	S	028S	3	34
Billy's Dream	U V	Medium	M	030S	8	7
Birch Spring Prospect	U CU	Small	N	028S	4	35
Black Ridge Borrow Pit	SDG	Small	S	027S	2	28
Black Ridge Gypsum	GYP	Medium	N	029S	4	18
Blacks Claims	U	Small	S	029S	4	10
Blue Tail Fly	U V	Small	S	030S	8	17 18
Bluebird	U	Small	N	029S	6	36
Capitol Reef Gypsum	GYP	Large	N	029S	7	15
Catherine Black Gravel Pit	SDG	Large	S	029S	4	11
Chief Red Wing #1 Prospect	U	Small	S	029S	8	6
Collins Claims	U	Small	N	029S	4	4
Cooks Mesa Prospect	U	Small	N	028S	5	32
Curtis Formation Jasper Nodule Locality	GEM	Medium	N	027S	9	19 20 30
Dry Valley Gravel Pit #1	SDG	Medium	S	027S	2	35
Dry Valley Gravel Pit #2	SDG	Medium	M	027S	2	35
Durfee Canyon Gravel Pit	SDG	Small	S	029S	3	3
Factory Butte Claims	U V	Small	S	027S	9	31
Factory Butte Coal Mine	COA2	Small	S	027S	9	03 09 10
Factory Strip Mine	COA2	Small	S	027S	9	2
Glen Haven Claims	U	Small	N	027S	12	04 05 08
Graveyard Hollow Borrow Pit	SDG	Small	S	027S	2	24
Green Hornet	U V	Small	S	030S	8	33
Group #25 Prospect	CU	Small	N	030S	6	10
Holt Draw Uranium Prospect	U	Small	N	028S	4	35
Jet Basin	GEM	Small	S	030S	10	22
Lion Mountain Gypsum	GYP	Small	N	030S	5	27
Loa Town	HG	Small	N			
Lucky Strike Prospects	U V	Small	S	029S	8	5
Moroni Slopes Gypsum	GYP	Large	N	027S	7	11
North Caineville Reef State	COA2	Small	N	027S	9	16
Notom Bench Jasper	GEM	Small	N	030S	8	18
Old Faithful #2 Prospect	CU	Small	N	030S	6	17
Old Faithful Mine	CU	Small	S	030S	6	17
Oyler	U	Small	U			
Oyler Mine	U	Small	S	029S	6	26
Parker Hollow Gravel Pit	SDG	Medium	S	027S	1	25
Picture Stone Quarry	STN2	Medium	S	029S	5	30
Pine Creek Shaft	UNF	Small	N	030S	3	4
Power Wagon Mine	U V	Small	S	030S	7	33
Rabbit Valley Borrow Pit	SDG	Small	S	028S	3	22
Red Desert Gypsum	GYP	Medium	N	029S	8	6
Rock Canyon Borrow Pit	SDG	Small	S	029S	4	6
South Desert Gypsum	GYP	Large	N	028S	6	4
Spanish Bottoms Chalcedony	GEM	Medium	N	030S	18	34
Sulphur Creek Copper Prospect	CU PB	Small	N	030S	5	20
Sulphur Creek Prosepct	U	Small	N	028S	5	31
Tar Sands Triangle	BIT	Large	N	029S	17	33
Torrey Gravel Pit	SDG	Small	S	029S	5	20
TR #1 Group	CU	Small	S	029S	6	8
Twin Peaks Uranium Prospect	U	Small	N	030S	6	28
U308 Mine	U V	Medium	M	027S	9	29
Wood Bench Uranium Occurrence	U	Small	N	027S	8	34

Source: Utah Geological Survey

Other sources of information regarding geologic hazards in Wayne County include:

- Black, B.D., 1993, Radon-hazard-potential map of Utah: Utah Geological Survey Map 149, 12p., scale 1:1,000,000.
- Harty, K.M., 1991, Landslide map of Utah: Utah geological and Mineral Survey Map 133, 28 p., scale 1:500,000.
- Harty, K.M., 1993, Landslide map of the Loa 30' x 60' quadrangle: Utah Geological Survey Open-File Report 279, scale 1:100,000, 12p.
- Harty, K.M., 1993, Landslide map of the Hanksville 30' x 60' quadrangle: Utah Geological Survey Open-File Report 280, scale 1:100,000, 10 p.
- Harty, K.M., and Christenson, G.E., 1988, Flood hazard from lakes and failure of dams in utah: Utah Geological and Mineral Survey Map 111. 8p., scale 1:750,000.
- Harty, K.M., Hecker, Suzanne, and Jarva, J.L., 1992, Geologic hazards bibliography of Utah: Utah Geological Survey Open-File Report 264-DF, 1 disk.
- Hecker, Suzanne, 1993, Quaternary tectonics of Utah with emphasis on earthquake-hazard characterization: Utah Geological Survey Bulletin 127, 157 p.
- Hecker, Suzanne, Harty, K.M., and Christenson, G.E., 1988, Shallow ground water and related hazards in Utah: Utah Geological and Mineral Survey Map 110, 17 p., scale 1:750,000.
- Mulvey, W.E., 1992, Soil and rock causing engineering geologic problems in Utah: Utah Geological Survey Special Studies 80, 23 p., scale 1:500,000.

Education and Healthcare Facilities

Educational Facilities

Education is one of the key issues identified at the public scoping meeting in November. In Wayne County, declining student enrollment, high educational costs per pupil, and adequate competitive curriculum are some of the challenging issues which must be addressed.

Curriculum and educational programs are beyond the scope of this plan. However, additional information on Wayne County educational facilities is provided below. For information regarding comparative statistics for Wayne County both statewide and nationally, refer to Table #12 .

COUNTY EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Hanksville Elementary School

Pre-Kindergarten to 6
42 South Center
Hanksville, Utah
Telephone: 542-3291
Enrollment: 40

Loa Elementary

Pre-Kindergarten to 6
34 South 100 East
Loa, Utah
Telephone: 836-2851
Enrollment: 200
Square Footage: 23,998

Wayne Preschool

Preschool
Enrollment: 25
Square Footage: 5,850

Wayne Middle School

Grades 6 to 8
75 North Center
Bicknell, Utah
Telephone: 425-3421
Enrollment: 150
Teacher Ratio: ?
Square Footage: 19,304

Wayne High School

Grades 9 to 12
265 North 400 West
Bicknell, Utah
Telephone: 425-3421
Enrollment: 175
Square Footage: 32,076

Table #12
Comparative Statistics for Wayne School District,
State of Utah and the United States
1989-1990

	WAYNE	UTAH	U.S.
Pupil/Teacher Ratio	17	23	17
Expenditure per Student	\$3695	\$2700	\$4760
1990 Median SAT* Score:			
Grade 5	72	53	50
Grade 8	55	51	50
Grade 11	44	53	50
1990 High School Enrollment	120	435,762	--
1989 High School Graduates	43	22,373	--

* SAT = Standard Achievement Test

Note: Test scores shown are median tests scores based on five categories. The national norm is 50 for each sub-test.

Source: Utah State Office Of Education, *Supplement to the Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1989-1990*. Utah State Office of Education, *Report on Education Research*, unpublished data.

Human/Health Care Services Facilities

Health care services in Wayne County appear to be adequate, though accessible services are of concern to residents in remote locations. Wayne County has one health care facility located in Bicknell, the Wayne County Medical Clinic. The clinic provides most of the standard out-patient care services needed in Wayne County. It is closely associated with the Emergency Medical Technician (EMT), the Mental Health programs and the social service operations which also maintain offices in the clinic building.

The Department of Human Services, consisting of the Office of Family Support and the Office of Social Services, is located in the Wayne County Courthouse. These offices are an important part of the infrastructure in Wayne County. The services they provide include financial assistance, food

stamps, and medical assistance which affect the economic stability of many Wayne County residents. The medical programs provided are of great influence in the operations of the Wayne County Medical Clinic. Protective services, foster care, adoptions, and services to the elderly are other services provided by the Department of Human Services in Wayne County.

Emergency Medical Services

Emergency medical care has always been of great concern to Wayne County residents as the nearest hospital is 50-100 miles away. Wayne County has a small permanent resident population and an ever-increasing tourist population with two national parks (Capitol Reef and Canyonlands), two national forests (Dixie and Fishlake), and a gateway to a national recreation area (Lake Powell).

For many years there were no trained medical responders in the area. In 1971, the first Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) course was offered in the state and Wayne County had one person who became an EMT Instructor at that time. Soon after, fourteen people from the county took an EMT training course in Richfield. In order to become certified as a Basic EMT with the State of Utah, and individual must complete 120 hours of training, pass both a written and practical test. EMTs must keep their training current and recertify with the state every three years.

In 1991, Wayne County EMTs made the decision to upgrade their rating to an "Intermediate Level". This involved additional training and testing under the direction of the State's Bureau of Emergency Medical Services. Wayne County's crew is also D-Fibrillator certified. Wayne County can be proud that their ambulance crew is as well trained and as skilled as any EMT crew in the state.

Wayne County's ambulance crew is not large in numbers. They have a large area to cover and must serve a sometimes very large tourist population in addition to permanent residents. The crew has made a commitment to keep their skills and training current. They are committed to serving the community, both residents and tourists, to the best of their ability.

At this time, Wayne County has five ambulances in service: a 1975 Chevrolet and 1993 Ford in Hanksville; a 1986 Ford in Teasdale; and a 1993 Ford and 1982 Ford in Loa. Wayne County has been fortunate to receive funds from the Community Impact Board to help with the purchase of ambulances and equipment. The county also receives funds each year from grants made possible by the State of Utah, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services.

It is of utmost importance to Wayne County to continue to have trained emergency care available. Goals for the future include continuing to have certified EMTs and up-to-date equipment and ambulances that are available to serve the needs of the area. Continued support and assistance from the county government and from outside sources such as the Community Impact Board and the State of Utah, Bureau of Emergency Services will be necessary.

Vocational and Higher Education

Educational and vocational training for residents of the county are provided by the Wayne School District.

Snow College in Ephraim and Southern Utah University in Cedar City are the nearest institutions offering post-secondary education to Wayne County residents. The Sevier Valley Applied Technology Center, located in Richfield, offers a diverse selection of vocational and technical training.

INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

In order to achieve the values/goals of the Wayne County steering committee, and particularly those related to infrastructure, the following six key infrastructure priorities were identified:

1) Education Facilities: Improve or establish infrastructure facilities and/or equipment supportive of the county's educational value/goals.

The county placed high priority on education within Wayne County. The most critical educational needs include:

- Facilities (school facilities, equipment, and libraries. Specifically, a high school auditorium in Bicknell, storage facilities at Hanksville, elementary computer lab, high school track and field, and swimming pool roof).
- Technology improvements (Ed-net, T1 cable, etc.)
- Curriculum improvements (vocational education/training, special education, graduation requirements, etc.)

2) Environmental Quality: Improve the existing environmental quality of life, including provisions for the proper disposal of solid and liquid waste.

Wayne County values the rural life style, clean air and water it has known over the years. To that end, the county steering committee placed emphasis on the elements related to clean water and air and the disposal of solid waste. The county is in compliance with these various areas as described earlier in this document.

3) Infrastructure Services: Improve infrastructure services in select areas including law enforcement, emergency and medical services.

The infrastructure services subcommittee identified the need for improvements in basic telecommunications. Part of this concern was directly related to education, providing every student equal opportunity with other students in urban areas. The other aspect of the concern is related to poor telephone service and television. Shared telephone lines and outdated mechanical equipment are concerns within the county. Also of concern is the lack of affordable television service.

4) Road Maintenance and Preservation: Maintain or improve the existing roadway system within the county including the preservation of RS 2477 access rights-of-way to federal and state lands.

The maintenance of existing city, county, and state roads and highways is of major concern. While the State of Utah maintains all state highways and provides partial funding for Class B (county) roads, maintenance of these facilities is inadequate as described earlier in this Appendix.

The issue of how best to obtain additional funding for maintenance and roadway reconstruction could be approached in any number of different ways. It appears that the best solution is a comprehensive approach. This issue is extremely complicated because highways are an integral part of so many infrastructure elements.

The method of taxation and funding of highways and other infrastructure services (garbage, police, ambulance, etc.) should be equally distributed among all road users. Because the beneficiaries of county services and infrastructure are different and the services and facilities they impact are also different, individual user categories be identified and then evaluated as a whole. One comprehensive formula should be developed and coordinated with county, state, and federal parties concerned. While the scope of this project does not allow the analysis and formulation of this exercise, the infrastructure subcommittee did identify the various potential sources of funding and the affected beneficiaries of a comprehensive approach. The most serious infrastructure service problem is the inadequate reimbursement of law enforcement, emergency services (search and rescue, medical transport and care, etc.) resulting from the tourism and recreation industries. Roads, solid waste, water, utilities, and other infrastructure elements and services must also be addressed.

RS 2477 Roads

Revised Statute 2477, enacted in 1866, reads, "The right-of-way for the construction of highways over public land, not reserved for public uses, is hereby granted." Under this direct grant offer from the federal government, thousands of highways were established across the public domain in the western United States. Most of these roads were constructed without documentation on the public land record.

Although RS 2477 was repealed with the passage of the 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), valid existing rights under the old statute were preserved. Under current departmental policy, assertions of a right-of-way under RS 2477 may be acknowledged by the federal government, and/or the right-of-way may have attached to the public land if all three of the following conditions were met prior to the repeal of RS 2477 on October 21, 1976:

1. The lands involved must have been public lands not reserved for public use at the time of acceptance.
2. Some form of construction of the highway must have occurred.
3. The highway so constructed must be considered a public highway.

Today, controversies still arise regarding whether a public highway was established pursuant to the Congressional grant under RS 2477 and, if so, the extent of the rights obtained under that grant. Wayne County interprets highway to mean trails, stock driveways, pipelines, roads, ditches, canals, and transmission lines.

To address this important public-land issue in a manner that responds to Congress's direction, the BLM assembled a task force. Each BLM state organization and the BLM headquarters office were represented on this team. Individual task force members and BLM managers in each state worked with the affected interests across the public-land states to prepare a report which was submitted to Congress in May, 1993. A map of RS 2477 roads in Wayne County is available by contacting the Wayne County Road Superintendent.

5) Recreation/Tourism Support: Provide infrastructure services supportive of proposed economic strategies for tourism, while receiving fair and commensurate payment for all infrastructure services provided to those receiving benefit.

6) Water Resource Development: Aggressively pursue water resources development and water rights acquisition.

Wayne County will continue to repair, upgrade, and improve existing water-related facilities that will help maintain agricultural production and safeguard culinary drinking water system supplies. The county will also pursue the planning and development of a Fremont River Reservoir (Caineville site).

WATER QUALITY USE DESIGNATIONS

- Class 1 Protected for use as a raw water source for domestic water systems.
- Class 1A Reserved
- Class 1B Reserved
- Class 1C Protected for domestic purposes with prior treatment by treatment processes as required by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality.
- Class 2 Protected for in-stream recreational use and aesthetics.
- Class 2A Protected for recreational bathing (swimming).
- Class 2B Protected for boating, water skiing, and similar uses, excluding recreational bathing (swimming).
- Class 3 Protected for in-stream use by aquatic wildlife.
- Class 3A Protected for cold water species of game fish and other cold water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
- Class 3B Protected for warm water species of game fish and other warm water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
- Class 3C Protected for non-game fish and other aquatic life including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
- Class 3D Protected for waterfowl, shore birds and other water oriented wildlife not included in classes 3A, 3B, or 3C, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain.
- Class 4 Protected for agricultural uses including irrigation of crops and stock watering.
- Class 5 Reserved
- Class 6 Waters requiring protection when conventional uses identified herein do not apply.

COMMUNITY DESCRIPTIONS

COMMUNITY:	Bicknell
LOCATION:	Township 29 South, Range 3 East
1990 POPULATION:	327
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Utah State Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Systems
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Loa-Wayne
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital
	Richfield, Utah
EDUCATION:	Wayne Middle School (6 - 8)
	75 North Center
	Bicknell, Ut 84715
	(801) 425-3421
	Number of Students - 150
	Gross Square Footage - 19,304 + (gym - 20,130)
	Wayne High School (9 - 12)
	265 North 400 West
	Bicknell, Ut 84715
	(801) 425-3421
	Number of Students - 175
	Gross Square Footage - 32,076
POWER:	Garkane Power Association
	Richfield, Utah
	(801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	South Central Utah Telephone Association
	45 North 100 West
	Escalante, UT 84726
	(801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:	Bicknell
OWNER:	Bicknell Town
MANAGER:	David Moosman (801) 425-3505
OPERATOR:	
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	145
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	30
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	175
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	187,200
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	172
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	300,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	None
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Gravity

COMMUNITY:	Capitol Reef
LOCATION:	Township 29 South, Range 6 East
1990 POPULATION:	Under 50
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Systems
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Loa-Wayne
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital
	Richfield, Utah
	Bicknell Clinic
POWER:	Garkane Power Association
	Richfield, Utah
	(801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	South Central Utah Telephone Association
	45 North 100 West
	Escalante, UT 84726
	(801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:	Capitol Reef National Park
OWNER:	U.S. Park Services
MANAGER:	Park Ranger (801) 425-3871
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	15
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	4
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	19
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	100,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	Complete
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Gravity

COMMUNITY:	Fremont
LOCATION:	Township 27 South, Range 3 East
1990 POPULATION:	240
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 72
WATER SYSTEMS:	Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Tank
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Loa-Wayne Airport
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital / Richfield, Utah
	Central Utah Health District / Loa, Utah
EDUCATION:	Loa Elementary School / Loa, Utah
	Wayne Middle School / Bicknell, Utah
	Wayne High School / Bicknell, Utah
POWER:	Garkane Power Association
	Richfield, Utah
	(801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	South Central Utah Telephone Association
	45 North 100 West
	Escalante, UT 84726
	(801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:	Fremont
OWNER:	Fremont Water Works Co.
MANAGER:	
OPERATOR:	
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	100
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	20
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	120
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	9,600
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	132
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	60,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	None
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Gravity

COMMUNITY: Grover
LOCATION: Township 29 South, Range 5 East
MAIN HIGHWAYS: State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS: Utah State Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM: Individual Septic Systems
LANDFILL: Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT: Loa-Wayne
MEDICAL: Sevier Valley Hospital
Richfield, UT
Bicknell Clinic
POWER: Garkane Power Association
Richfield, Utah
(801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE: South Central Utah Telephone Association
45 North 100 West
Escalante, Utah 84726
(801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:
OWNER:
MANAGER:
OPERATOR:
RATING:
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:
OTHER CONNECTIONS:
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:
STORAGE:
NUMBER OF UNITS:
MATERIAL:
CAPACITY:
ADEQUATE:
TREATMENT:
TYPE:
DISTRIBUTION:
PUMP / GRAVITY:

COMMUNITY:	Hanksville
LOCATION:	Township 28 South, Range 11 East
1990 POPULATION:	250
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 95 and 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Utah State Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Tank
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Hanksville
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital / Richfield, Utah Central Utah Health District / Loa, Utah
EDUCATION:	Hanksville Elementary (PreK - 6) 42 South Center Hanksville, Ut 84734 (801) 542-3291 Number of Students - 40
POWER:	Garkane Power Association Richfield, Utah (801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	U.S. West Communications Salt Lake City, Utah (801) 237-7200
WATER COMPANY:	Hanksville
OWNER:	Hanksville Culinary WW SU
MANAGER:	Vance Morrill (801) 542-3435
OPERATOR:	
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	50
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	6
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	56
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	91,200
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	114
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	100,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	None
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Both

COMMUNITY:	Loa
LOCATION:	Township 27 South, Range 2 East
1990 POPULATION:	444
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Utah State Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Systems
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Loa-Wayne
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital Richfield, Utah Bicknell Clinic
EDUCATION:	Loa Elementary (K - 5) 34 South 100 East Loa, Ut 84747 (801) 836-2851 Number of Students - 200 Total Square Footage - 23,998 sq.ft.
POWER:	Garkane Power Association Richfield, Utah (801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	South Central Utah Telephone Association 45 North 100 West Escalante, UT 84726 (801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:	Loa
OWNER:	Loa Waterworks Co.
MANAGER:	James Potter
OPERATOR:	Evan P. Harding
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	210
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	10
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	220
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	307,200
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	446
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	179,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	None
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Both

COMMUNITY:	Lyman
LOCATION:	Township 28 South, Range 3 East
1990 POPULATION:	198
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Systems
LANDFILL:	
AIRPORT:	
MEDICAL:	
POWER:	Loa-Wayne Sevier Valley Hospital Richfield, Utah Garkane Power Association Richfield, Utah (801) 896-5403 South Central Utah Telephone Association 45 North 100 West Escalante, UT 84726 (801) 826-4211
TELEPHONE:	
WATER COMPANY:	
OWNER:	Lyman
MANAGER:	Lyman Water Board
OPERATOR:	Lane Chappell (801) 836-2393
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	87
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	3
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	90
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	116,800
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	315
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	200,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	Chlorination
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Gravity

COMMUNITY:	Teasdale
LOCATION:	Township 29 South, Range 4 East
1990 POPULATION:	175
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Tank
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Loa-Wayne
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital
	Richfield, Utah
POWER:	Garkane Power Association
	Richfield, Utah
	(801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	South Central Utah Telephone Association
	45 North 100 West
	Escalante, UT 84726
	(801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:	Teasdale Special Service District
OWNER:	Teasdale Special Service District
MANAGER:	George Walrath (801) 425-3217
OPERATOR:	Dennis Hickey (801) 425-3492
RATING:	Approved
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	50
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	6
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	56
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	68,800
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	215
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	1
MATERIAL:	Concrete
CAPACITY:	200,000
ADEQUATE:	Yes
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	None
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	Gravity

COMMUNITY:	Torrey
LOCATION:	Township 29 South, Range 1 West
1990 POPULATION:	122
MAIN HIGHWAYS:	State Route 24
WATER SYSTEMS:	Utah State Approved
SEWER DISPOSAL SYSTEM:	Individual Septic Systems
LANDFILL:	Caineville (Tentative, to be approved)
AIRPORT:	Loa-Wayne
MEDICAL:	Sevier Valley Hospital
	Richfield, Utah
	Bicknell Clinic
POWER:	Garkane Power Association
	Richfield, Utah
	(801) 896-5403
TELEPHONE:	South Central Utah Telephone Association
	45 North 100 West
	Escalante, UT 84726
	(801) 826-4211
WATER COMPANY:	Torrey Culinary Water System
OWNER:	
MANAGER:	
OPERATOR:	
RATING:	
RESIDENTIAL CONNECTIONS:	96
OTHER CONNECTIONS:	25
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONNECTIONS:	121
CALCULATED PEAK DEMAND (GPD):	
PEAK HOURLY DEMAND:	
STORAGE:	
NUMBER OF UNITS:	
MATERIAL:	
CAPACITY:	60,000, 230,000, and 25,000
ADEQUATE:	
TREATMENT:	
TYPE:	
DISTRIBUTION:	
PUMP / GRAVITY:	