

---

# Appendix M

## Socioeconomics Data and Methodology



# APPENDIX M

## SOCIOECONOMICS DATA AND METHODOLOGY

### DETAILED EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS DATA BY COUNTY

**Table M.1**, Employment Levels by Industry Sector and County in 2010, through **Table M.7**, Annual Population by County, 2000-2010, provide detailed employment and earnings data by county.

**Table M.1**  
**Employment Levels by Industry Sector and County in 2010<sup>1,2</sup>**

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>3</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Farm	184	738	248	142	2,076	524	339	654	2,113	54	975	370	267
Forestry, fishing, & related activities <sup>4</sup>	(D)	189	138	75	359	148	(D)	218	595	(D)	105	(D)	(D)
Mining (including oil and gas)	(D)	2,286	94	69	3,621	664	921	678	1,084	(D)	2,915	462	5,823
Utilities	71	220	(D)	(L)	232	(D)	(D)	(D)	255	(D)	146	75	(D)
Construction	4,092	4,509	1,117	(D)	6,019	418	352	2,053	12,018	1,895	1,283	781	2,241

<sup>1</sup> (D) Not shown to avoid disclosure of confidential information, but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>2</sup> (L) Fewer than 10 jobs, but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>3</sup> Larimer County, Colorado; Summit County, Colorado; Uintah County, Utah; Carbon County, Wyoming; and Sweetwater County, Wyoming constitute a "secondary" Socioeconomic Study Area, as documented in the text.

<sup>4</sup> "Related activities" includes hunting and trapping, as well as agricultural services such as custom tillage.

**Table M.1**  
**Employment Levels by Industry Sector and County in 2010<sup>1,2</sup>**

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>3</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Manufacturing	389	323	166	(D)	3,028	106	83	213	11,933	164	258	(D)	1,384
Wholesale trade	543	866	(D)	(D)	2,622	283	(D)	(D)	3,725	(D)	667	76	(D)
Retail trade	3,590	3,662	897	99	9,938	961	298	1,775	21,174	2,975	1,869	958	2,935
Transportation and warehousing	664	905	193	(D)	3,141	(D)	140	451	2,938	351	964	539	1,656
Information	471	260	56	(D)	1,101	90	28	218	3,287	(D)	169	98	245
Finance and insurance	1,789	1,309	334	(D)	4,135	224	120	901	9,683	908	792	280	702
Real estate and rental and leasing	5,124	2,481	1,141	40	4,380	288	124	2,257	10,517	3,015	827	406	1,248
Professional and technical services	2,375	2,168	500	(D)	4,286	(D)	(D)	1,318	16,663	1,380	554	287	881
Management of companies and enterprises	240	260	47	0	384	(D)	(D)	103	610	130	(D)	20	93
Administrative and waste services	2,277	1,755	416	(D)	4,454	222	193	835	11,750	1,201	(D)	267	752
Educational services	373	511	71	12	666	(D)	17	326	2,775	255	121	(D)	125
Health care and social assistance	2,297	2,618	302	60	9,978	(D)	94	1,454	19,552	1,141	1,075	(D)	1,299
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	3,962	891	1,139	28	1,780	139	63	1,502	5,078	1,551	122	202	262
Accommodation and food services	7,048	2,742	1,680	84	6,289	525	314	2,113	15,194	5,909	998	964	2,293
Other services, except public administration	2,300	1,720	434	(D)	4,416	455	159	1,119	9,464	1,032	1,065	444	1,213
Federal government	312	488	206	46	2,004	219	109	214	3,383	157	570	338	513
State government	107	498	68	25	2,134	231	203	146	11,756	155	145	549	273
Local government	2,904	4,326	1,095	119	5,975	867	859	1,589	13,576	2,168	2,252	1,319	4,031
Categories for which data were not disclosed	438	0	149	404	0	1,417	284	508	0	791	652	1,281	1,389
<b>Total Employment</b>	<b>41,550</b>	<b>35,725</b>	<b>10,491</b>	<b>1,203</b>	<b>83,018</b>	<b>7,781</b>	<b>4,700</b>	<b>20,645</b>	<b>189,123</b>	<b>25,232</b>	<b>18,524</b>	<b>9,716</b>	<b>29,625</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: US Department of Commerce 2012

<sup>2</sup>

**Table M.2**  
**Employment Percentages by Industry Sector and County in 2010<sup>1,2</sup>**

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>3</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Farm	0.4%	2.1%	2.4%	11.8%	2.5%	6.7%	7.2%	3.2%	1.1%	0.2%	5.3%	3.8%	0.9%
Forestry, fishing, & related activities <sup>4</sup>	(D)	0.5%	1.3%	6.2%	0.4%	1.9%	(D)	1.1%	0.3%	(D)	0.6%	(D)	(D)
Mining (including oil and gas)	(D)	6.4%	0.9%	5.7%	4.4%	8.5%	19.6%	3.3%	0.6%	(D)	15.7%	4.8%	19.7%
Utilities	0.2%	0.6%	(D)	(L)	0.3%	(D)	(D)	(D)	0.1%	(D)	0.8%	0.8%	(D)
Construction	9.8%	12.6%	10.6%	(D)	7.3%	5.4%	7.5%	9.9%	6.4%	7.5%	6.9%	8.0%	7.6%
Manufacturing	0.9%	0.9%	1.6%	(D)	3.6%	1.4%	1.8%	1.0%	6.3%	0.6%	1.4%	(D)	4.7%
Wholesale trade	1.3%	2.4%	(D)	(D)	3.2%	3.6%	(D)	(D)	2.0%	(D)	3.6%	0.8%	(D)
Retail trade	8.6%	10.3%	8.6%	8.2%	12.0%	12.4%	6.3%	8.6%	11.2%	11.8%	10.1%	9.9%	9.9%
Transportation and warehousing	1.6%	2.5%	1.8%	(D)	3.8%	(D)	3.0%	2.2%	1.6%	1.4%	5.2%	5.5%	5.6%
Information	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%	(D)	1.3%	1.2%	0.6%	1.1%	1.7%	(D)	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%
Finance and insurance	4.3%	3.7%	3.2%	(D)	5.0%	2.9%	2.6%	4.4%	5.1%	3.6%	4.3%	2.9%	2.4%
Real estate and rental and leasing	12.3%	6.9%	10.9%	3.3%	5.3%	3.7%	2.6%	10.9%	5.6%	11.9%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%
Professional and technical services	5.7%	6.1%	4.8%	(D)	5.2%	(D)	(D)	6.4%	8.8%	5.5%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Management of companies and enterprises	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	(D)	(D)	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	(D)	0.2%	0.3%
Administrative and waste services	5.5%	4.9%	4.0%	(D)	5.4%	2.9%	4.1%	4.0%	6.2%	4.8%	(D)	2.7%	2.5%
Educational services	0.9%	1.4%	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	(D)	0.4%	1.6%	1.5%	1.0%	0.7%	(D)	0.4%
Health care and social assistance	5.5%	7.3%	2.9%	5.0%	12.0%	(D)	2.0%	7.0%	10.3%	4.5%	5.8%	(D)	4.4%
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	9.5%	2.5%	10.9%	2.3%	2.1%	1.8%	1.3%	7.3%	2.7%	6.1%	0.7%	2.1%	0.9%
Accommodation and food services	17.0%	7.7%	16.0%	7.0%	7.6%	6.7%	6.7%	10.2%	8.0%	23.4%	5.4%	9.9%	7.7%
Other services, except public administration	5.5%	4.8%	4.1%	(D)	5.3%	5.8%	3.4%	5.4%	5.0%	4.1%	5.7%	4.6%	4.1%
Federal government	0.8%	1.4%	2.0%	3.8%	2.4%	2.8%	2.3%	1.0%	1.8%	0.6%	3.1%	3.5%	1.7%
State government	0.3%	1.4%	0.6%	2.1%	2.6%	3.0%	4.3%	0.7%	6.2%	0.6%	0.8%	5.7%	0.9%
Local government	7.0%	12.1%	10.4%	9.9%	7.2%	11.1%	18.3%	7.7%	7.2%	8.6%	12.2%	13.6%	13.6%
Categories for which data were not disclosed	1.1%	0.0%	1.4%	33.6%	0.0%	18.2%	6.0%	2.5%	0.0%	3.1%	3.5%	13.2%	4.7%

Source: US Department of Commerce 2012

<sup>1</sup> (D) Not shown to avoid disclosure of confidential information (US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not report data when there are three or fewer employers in a sector), but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>2</sup> (L) Fewer than 10 jobs (US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not report specific data when there are fewer than 10 jobs in a sector), but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>3</sup> Larimer County, Colorado; Summit County, Colorado; Uintah County, Utah; Carbon County, Wyoming; and Sweetwater County, Wyoming constitute a "secondary" Socioeconomic Study Area, as documented in the text.

<sup>4</sup> "Related activities" includes hunting and trapping, as well as agricultural services such as custom tillage.

Table M.3

## Labor Income Levels by Industry Sector and County and Non-Labor Income Levels by County in 2010, presented in 2010 dollars (millions)

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>1</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Population	52,064	56,139	14,791	1,390	146,307	13,819	6,625	23,451	300,552	28,082	32,435	15,834	43,623
Non-labor income <sup>2</sup>	\$773.7	\$672.7	\$200.6	\$24.7	\$2,052.1	\$144.8	\$73.6	\$458.4	\$3,975.0	\$473.1	\$269.7	\$231.5	\$542.2
Dividends, interest, and rent	\$631.4	\$423.7	\$136.9	\$15.6	\$1,042.5	\$66.2	\$36.8	\$366.5	\$2,360.9	\$389.9	\$124.7	\$132.1	\$320.2
Personal current transfer receipts <sup>3</sup>	\$142.3	\$249.1	\$63.7	\$9.1	\$1,009.6	\$78.6	\$36.8	\$91.9	\$1,614.1	\$83.2	\$145.0	\$99.4	\$222.0
Adjustment for residence <sup>4</sup>	\$34.3	\$40.4	\$43.2	\$1.2	\$86.1	\$57.4	-\$24.4	-\$42.6	\$649.1	-\$58.6	-\$23.6	-\$6.9	-\$135.9
Contributions for government social insurance <sup>5</sup>	\$182.5	\$155.1	\$32.1	\$2.8	\$363.3	\$32.5	\$22.5	\$82.3	\$803.0	\$91.2	\$93.0	\$53.3	\$218.9
Total personal income by place of residence	\$2,506.8	\$2,092.7	\$551.5	\$57.7	\$5,029.9	\$505.5	\$268.2	\$1,142.5	\$11,585.1	\$1,210.0	\$935.9	\$615.4	\$2,092.9
Earnings by place of work <sup>6</sup>	\$1,881.3	\$1,534.7	\$339.8	\$34.6	\$3,255.0	\$335.8	\$241.6	\$809.0	\$7,764.0	\$886.9	\$782.9	\$444.0	\$1,905.5
<b>Total earnings by place of work by sector<sup>7, 8</sup></b>													
Farm	\$2.1	-\$1.0	\$4.2	\$8.7	\$4.1	\$9.6	\$1.9	\$3.9	\$20.9	-\$0.2	-\$0.9	\$6.1	\$1.9
Forestry, fishing, & related activities <sup>9</sup>	(D)	\$1.7	\$1.3	\$1.5	\$7.3	\$2.0	(D)	\$3.5	\$7.9	(D)	\$1.2	(D)	(D)
Mining (including oil and gas)	(D)	\$183.1	\$2.0	(L)	\$235.7	\$65.9	\$76.8	\$56.3	\$23.1	(D)	\$202.7	\$35.7	\$740.7
Utilities	\$6.4	\$24.4	(D)	(L)	\$22.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	\$22.8	(D)	\$19.8	\$6.3	(D)
Construction	\$242.0	\$241.7	\$44.2	(D)	\$269.5	\$15.4	\$24.0	\$114.1	\$609.7	\$81.1	\$69.4	\$48.8	\$153.1
Manufacturing	\$12.6	\$16.2	\$5.9	(D)	\$134.1	\$2.9	\$3.0	\$3.6	\$1,019.1	\$2.8	\$7.3	(D)	\$134.9
Wholesale trade	\$33.0	\$55.2	(D)	(D)	\$137.0	\$14.6	(D)	(D)	\$216.7	(D)	\$42.1	\$2.8	(D)
Retail trade	\$144.3	\$121.3	\$24.7	\$2.8	\$269.0	\$29.4	\$16.9	\$76.1	\$541.2	\$88.2	\$49.5	\$27.3	\$84.7

<sup>1</sup> Larimer County, Colorado; Summit County, Colorado; Uintah County, Utah; Carbon County, Wyoming; and Sweetwater County, Wyoming constitute a "secondary" Socioeconomic Study Area, as documented in the text.

<sup>2</sup> Non-labor income includes dividends, interest, and rent and personal current transfer receipts.

<sup>3</sup> Personal current transfer receipts are benefits received by persons for which no current services are performed. They are payments by government and business to individuals and institutions, such as retirement and disability insurance benefits.

<sup>4</sup> Residence adjustment represents the net inflow of the earnings of inter-area commuters. A positive number indicates that, on balance, area residents commute outside to find jobs; a negative number indicates that, on balance, people from outside the area commute in to find jobs.

<sup>5</sup> Contributions for government social insurance consist of payments by employers, employees, the self-employed, and other individuals who participate in the following government programs: Old-age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance; Medicare; unemployment insurance; railroad retirement; pension benefit guarantee; veterans' life insurance; publicly-administered workers' compensation; military medical insurance; and temporary disability insurance.

<sup>6</sup> Earnings by place of work differs from total personal income by the exclusion of dividends, interest, and rent, as well as adjustments to account for net transfer payments (e.g., unemployment benefits and Social Security taxes and payments) and the residential adjustment.

<sup>7</sup> (D) Not shown to avoid disclosure of confidential information (US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not report data when there are three or fewer employers in a sector), but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>8</sup> (L) Less than \$50,000 (therefore US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not disclose specific figures), but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>9</sup> "Related activities" includes hunting and trapping, as well as agricultural services such as custom tillage.

**Table M.3****Labor Income Levels by Industry Sector and County and Non-Labor Income Levels by County in 2010, presented in 2010 dollars (millions)**

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>1</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Transportation and warehousing	\$32.9	\$51.8	\$5.3	(D)	\$191.4	(D)	\$8.9	\$16.3	\$121.3	\$14.6	\$57.6	\$37.5	\$119.7
Information	\$22.9	\$10.4	\$2.5	(D)	\$52.4	\$3.2	\$0.7	\$8.9	\$174.3	(D)	\$6.2	\$3.2	\$7.5
Finance and insurance	\$54.3	\$42.3	\$6.6	(D)	\$132.6	\$7.6	\$2.8	\$33.7	\$253.3	\$22.2	\$10.3	\$8.6	\$29.6
Real estate and rental and leasing	\$258.8	\$66.3	\$23.7	(L)	\$57.1	\$3.4	\$1.7	\$35.1	\$118.1	\$69.2	\$26.0	\$3.8	\$34.8
Professional and technical services	\$111.3	\$85.8	\$20.5	(D)	\$170.1	(D)	(D)	\$56.8	\$885.3	\$73.6	\$28.5	\$9.9	\$48.5
Management of companies and enterprises	\$13.1	\$10.1	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$15.7	(D)	(D)	\$5.9	\$55.2	\$6.1	(D)	\$1.5	\$6.1
Administrative and waste services	\$71.5	\$56.3	\$8.5	(D)	\$138.9	\$5.1	\$6.3	\$24.4	\$342.9	\$34.8	(D)	\$4.5	\$20.5
Educational services	\$13.8	\$11.5	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$10.2	(D)	(L)	\$6.4	\$50.1	\$5.7	\$0.9	(D)	\$2.0
Health care and social assistance	\$172.9	\$137.5	\$11.4	\$0.6	\$496.2	(D)	\$2.1	\$77.0	\$992.4	\$63.1	\$39.0	(D)	\$50.5
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	\$160.9	\$12.2	\$35.8	\$0.2	\$19.8	\$1.5	\$0.7	\$52.6	\$57.2	\$39.5	\$0.5	\$7.4	\$3.1
Accommodation and food services	\$246.5	\$65.7	\$40.0	\$1.2	\$130.5	\$9.8	\$10.6	\$56.6	\$298.0	\$182.2	\$16.9	\$18.8	\$45.3
Other services, except public administration	\$78.7	\$63.9	\$20.5	(D)	\$156.6	\$13.6	\$17.0	\$41.2	\$328.1	\$35.3	\$42.1	\$13.5	\$48.0
Federal government	\$18.9	\$37.8	\$13.8	\$3.4	\$173.1	\$17.3	\$8.0	\$13.8	\$328.8	\$9.2	\$44.8	\$23.2	\$34.3
State government	\$7.5	\$31.2	\$4.1	\$1.2	\$114.0	\$10.1	\$9.8	\$7.8	\$574.3	\$7.3	\$9.7	\$34.1	\$17.5
Local government	\$165.3	\$209.4	\$53.6	\$3.9	\$317.2	\$40.5	\$39.7	\$76.1	\$723.4	\$113.0	\$94.4	\$67.0	\$218.3
Categories for which data were not disclosed	\$11.9	\$0.0	\$10.2	\$11.1	\$0.0	\$84.0	\$10.9	\$38.6	\$0.0	\$39.2	\$14.8	\$84.3	\$104.6

Source: US Department of Commerce 2012

2

**Table M.4**  
**Labor Income Percentages by Industry Sector and County and Non-Labor Income Percentages by County in 2010**

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>1</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Population	52,064	56,139	14,791	1,390	146,307	13,819	6,625	23,451	300,552	28,082	32,435	15,834	43,623
Non-labor income as a proportion of total personal income <sup>2</sup>	30.9%	32.1%	36.4%	42.8%	40.8%	28.6%	27.4%	40.1%	34.3%	39.1%	28.8%	37.6%	25.9%
Dividends, interest, and rent as a proportion of total personal income	25.2%	20.2%	24.8%	27.1%	20.7%	13.1%	13.7%	32.1%	20.4%	32.2%	13.3%	21.5%	15.3%
Personal current transfer receipts as a proportion of total personal income <sup>3</sup>	5.7%	11.9%	11.5%	15.7%	20.1%	15.5%	13.7%	8.0%	13.9%	6.9%	15.5%	16.1%	10.6%
Adjustment for residence as a proportion of total personal income <sup>4</sup>	1.4%	1.9%	7.8%	2.0%	1.7%	11.4%	-9.1%	-3.7%	5.6%	-4.8%	-2.5%	-1.1%	-6.5%
Contributions for government social insurance as a proportion of total personal income <sup>5</sup>	7.3%	7.4%	5.8%	4.9%	7.2%	6.4%	8.4%	7.2%	6.9%	7.5%	9.9%	8.7%	10.5%
Total personal income by place of residence (\$ millions)	\$2,506.8	\$2,092.7	\$551.5	\$57.7	\$5,029.9	\$505.5	\$268.2	\$1,142.5	\$11,585.1	\$1,210.0	\$935.9	\$615.4	\$2,092.9
Earnings by place of work (\$ millions) <sup>6</sup>	\$1,881.3	\$1,534.7	\$339.8	\$34.6	\$3,255.0	\$335.8	\$241.6	\$809.0	\$7,764.0	\$886.9	\$782.9	\$444.0	\$1,905.5
<b>Total earnings by place of work by sector<sup>7, 8</sup></b>													
Farm	0.1%	-0.1%	1.2%	25.1%	0.1%	2.8%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	-0.1%	1.4%	0.1%
Forestry, fishing, & related activities <sup>9</sup>	(D)	0.1%	0.4%	4.3%	0.2%	0.6%	(D)	0.4%	0.1%	(D)	0.2%	(D)	(D)
Mining (including oil and gas)	(D)	11.9%	0.6%	(L)	7.2%	19.6%	31.8%	7.0%	0.3%	(D)	25.9%	8.0%	38.9%
Utilities	0.3%	1.6%	(D)	(L)	0.7%	(D)	(D)	(D)	0.3%	(D)	2.5%	1.4%	(D)
Construction	12.9%	15.8%	13.0%	(D)	8.3%	4.6%	9.9%	14.1%	7.9%	9.1%	8.9%	11.0%	8.0%
Manufacturing	0.7%	1.1%	1.7%	(D)	4.1%	0.8%	1.2%	0.4%	13.1%	0.3%	0.9%	(D)	7.1%

<sup>1</sup> Larimer County, Colorado; Summit County, Colorado; Uintah County, Utah; Carbon County, Wyoming; and Sweetwater County, Wyoming constitute a "secondary" Socioeconomic Study Area, as documented in the text.

<sup>2</sup> Non-labor income includes dividends, interest, and rent and personal current transfer receipts.

<sup>3</sup> Personal current transfer receipts are benefits received by persons for which no current services are performed. They are payments by government and business to individuals and institutions, such as retirement and disability insurance benefits.

<sup>4</sup> Residence adjustment represents the net inflow of the earnings of inter-area commuters. A positive number indicates that, on balance, area residents commute outside to find jobs; a negative number indicates that, on balance, people from outside the area commute in to find jobs.

<sup>5</sup> Contributions for government social insurance consist of payments by employers, employees, the self-employed, and other individuals who participate in the following government programs: Old-age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance; Medicare; unemployment insurance; railroad retirement; pension benefit guarantee; veterans' life insurance; publicly-administered workers' compensation; military medical insurance; and temporary disability insurance.

<sup>6</sup> Earnings by place of work differs from total personal income by the exclusion of dividends, interest, and rent, as well as adjustments to account for net transfer payments (e.g., unemployment benefits and Social Security taxes and payments) and the residential adjustment.

<sup>7</sup> (D) Not shown to avoid disclosure of confidential information (US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not report data when there are three or fewer employers in a sector), but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>8</sup> (L) Less than \$50,000 (therefore US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not disclose specific figures), but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.

<sup>9</sup> "Related activities" includes hunting and trapping, as well as agricultural services such as custom tillage.

**Table M.4**  
**Labor Income Percentages by Industry Sector and County and Non-Labor Income Percentages by County in 2010**

	Eagle, CO	Garfield, CO	Grand, CO	Jackson, CO	Mesa, CO	Moffat, CO	Rio Blanco, CO	Routt, CO	Larimer, CO <sup>1</sup>	Summit, CO	Uintah, UT	Carbon, WY	Sweetwater, WY
Wholesale trade	1.8%	3.6%	(D)	(D)	4.2%	4.4%	(D)	(D)	2.8%	(D)	5.4%	0.6%	(D)
Retail trade	7.7%	7.9%	7.3%	8.1%	8.3%	8.8%	7.0%	9.4%	7.0%	9.9%	6.3%	6.1%	4.4%
Transportation and warehousing	1.8%	3.4%	1.6%	(D)	5.9%	(D)	3.7%	2.0%	1.6%	1.6%	7.4%	8.4%	6.3%
Information	1.2%	0.7%	0.7%	(D)	1.6%	1.0%	0.3%	1.1%	2.2%	(D)	0.8%	0.7%	0.4%
Finance and insurance	2.9%	2.8%	1.9%	(D)	4.1%	2.3%	1.1%	4.2%	3.3%	2.5%	1.3%	1.9%	1.6%
Real estate and rental and leasing	13.8%	4.3%	7.0%	(L)	1.8%	1.0%	0.7%	4.3%	1.5%	7.8%	3.3%	0.8%	1.8%
Professional and technical services	5.9%	5.6%	6.0%	(D)	5.2%	(D)	(D)	7.0%	11.4%	8.3%	3.6%	2.2%	2.5%
Management of companies and enterprises	0.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	(D)	(D)	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	(D)	0.3%	0.3%
Administrative and waste services	3.8%	3.7%	2.5%	(D)	4.3%	1.5%	2.6%	3.0%	4.4%	3.9%	(D)	1.0%	1.1%
Educational services	0.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	(D)	(L)	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.1%	(D)	0.1%
Health care and social assistance	9.2%	9.0%	3.3%	1.8%	15.2%	(D)	0.9%	9.5%	12.8%	7.1%	5.0%	(D)	2.7%
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	8.6%	0.8%	10.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	6.5%	0.7%	4.4%	0.1%	1.7%	0.2%
Accommodation and food services	13.1%	4.3%	11.8%	3.4%	4.0%	2.9%	4.4%	7.0%	3.8%	20.5%	2.2%	4.2%	2.4%
Other services, except public administration	4.2%	4.2%	6.0%	(D)	4.8%	4.1%	7.0%	5.1%	4.2%	4.0%	5.4%	3.0%	2.5%
Federal government	1.0%	2.5%	4.1%	9.9%	5.3%	5.2%	3.3%	1.7%	4.2%	1.0%	5.7%	5.2%	1.8%
State government	0.4%	2.0%	1.2%	3.5%	3.5%	3.0%	4.0%	1.0%	7.4%	0.8%	1.2%	7.7%	0.9%
Local government	8.8%	13.6%	15.8%	11.2%	9.7%	12.1%	16.4%	9.4%	9.3%	12.7%	12.1%	15.1%	11.5%
Categories for which data were not disclosed	0.6%	0.0%	3.0%	32.2%	0.0%	25.0%	4.5%	4.8%	0.0%	4.4%	1.9%	19.0%	5.5%

1 Source: US Department of Commerce 2012

2

**Table M.5**  
**Employment Trends by Select Industry Sector and County, 2001-2009**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Mining</b>									
Eagle, CO	(D)	(D)							
Garfield, CO	382	478	753	1,011	1,657	2,314	2,514	3,240	2,395
Grand, CO	(D)	22	27	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	83	88
Jackson, CO	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(L)	10	11	44	63
Mesa, CO	652	665	799	1,125	1,519	2,363	3,462	4,884	3,874
Moffat, CO	533	578	553	552	608	672	688	755	684
Rio Blanco, CO	553	571	563	666	796	907	945	1,089	917
Routt, CO	572	586	619	652	670	(D)	(D)	(D)	732
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>2,692</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>3,314</b>	<b>4,006</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>6,266</b>	<b>7,620</b>	<b>10,095</b>	<b>8,753</b>
<b>Farming<sup>1</sup></b>									
Eagle, CO	166	152	162	160	163	165	181	185	181
Garfield, CO	701	677	699	672	672	670	737	741	726
Grand, CO	246	241	248	237	232	230	246	250	245
Jackson, CO	181	163	167	153	146	140	139	144	140
Mesa, CO	2,016	1,962	1,993	1,907	1,898	1,886	2,092	2,083	2,045
Moffat, CO	543	528	525	496	486	476	529	529	519
Rio Blanco, CO	345	333	334	318	314	311	340	341	333
Routt, CO	743	757	732	673	642	612	657	659	647
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>4,941</b>	<b>4,813</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>4,616</b>	<b>4,553</b>	<b>4,490</b>	<b>4,921</b>	<b>4,932</b>	<b>4,836</b>
<b>Retail trade</b>									
Eagle, CO	3,537	3,392	3,582	3,730	3,718	3,870	4,118	4,079	3,713
Garfield, CO	3,714	3,667	3,724	3,969	4,042	4,379	4,584	4,384	3,990
Grand, CO	1,001	955	999	1,041	1,148	1,174	1,218	1,091	987
Jackson, CO	110	109	109	115	113	117	120	111	100
Mesa, CO	9,499	9,618	9,848	10,070	10,263	10,467	10,873	10,694	10,213
Moffat, CO	931	905	901	873	863	881	945	1,060	1,024
Rio Blanco, CO	353	334	372	324	321	334	341	326	342
Routt, CO	1,929	1,945	1,939	1,934	2,003	2,021	2,059	2,052	1,855

<sup>1</sup> Farming values sum data for "Farm" and "Agriculture and forestry support activities."

**Table M.5**  
**Employment Trends by Select Industry Sector and County, 2001-2009**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>21,074</b>	<b>20,925</b>	<b>21,474</b>	<b>22,056</b>	<b>22,471</b>	<b>23,243</b>	<b>24,258</b>	<b>23,797</b>	<b>22,224</b>
<i>Accommodation and food services</i>									
Eagle, CO	6,396	6,339	6,610	6,722	7,122	7,199	7,315	7,809	7,165
Garfield, CO	2,567	2,533	2,601	2,719	2,812	2,966	3,178	3,235	2,959
Grand, CO	1,728	1,771	1,790	1,808	1,734	1,768	1,869	1,882	1,697
Jackson, CO	67	66	73	95	101	96	87	90	87
Mesa, CO	5,297	5,841	5,850	6,070	6,081	6,245	6,570	6,902	6,571
Moffat, CO	571	574	566	572	566	579	545	573	575
Rio Blanco, CO	293	0	295	320	343	367	399	403	364
Routt, CO	2,305	2,316	2,306	2,337	2,336	2,380	2,394	2,317	2,162
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>19,224</b>	<b>19,440</b>	<b>20,091</b>	<b>20,643</b>	<b>21,095</b>	<b>21,600</b>	<b>22,357</b>	<b>23,211</b>	<b>21,580</b>
<i>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</i>									
Eagle, CO	3,649	3,747	3,468	3,630	3,801	3,899	3,904	3,961	3,976
Garfield, CO	808	829	808	843	854	869	890	887	889
Grand, CO	1,241	1,139	1,243	1,065	1,039	1,052	1,110	1,151	1,136
Jackson, CO	24	27	28	24	26	30	28	30	26
Mesa, CO	1,261	1,316	1,328	1,567	1,742	1,800	1,865	1,873	1,815
Moffat, CO	76	(D)	83	98	117	130	147	175	143
Rio Blanco, CO	78	(D)	66	69	68	64	70	65	63
Routt, CO	1,430	1,428	1,418	1,395	1,483	1,423	1,494	1,489	1,404
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>8,567</b>	<b>8,486</b>	<b>8,442</b>	<b>8,691</b>	<b>9,130</b>	<b>9,267</b>	<b>9,508</b>	<b>9,631</b>	<b>9,452</b>

Source: US Department of Commerce 2012

1

2

**Table M.6**  
**Labor Earnings Trends by Select Industry Sector and County, 2001-2009**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Mining</b>									
Eagle, CO	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Garfield, CO	\$29.4	\$34.0	\$52.4	\$70.4	\$123.8	\$198.5	\$216.1	\$290.5	\$196.6
Grand, CO	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$4.0	\$1.9
Jackson, CO	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
Mesa, CO	\$29.9	\$29.8	\$36.0	\$71.9	\$97.5	\$178.4	\$272.4	\$384.9	\$264.2
Moffat, CO	\$47.0	\$50.0	\$52.7	\$59.6	\$60.7	\$72.5	\$75.0	\$100.8	\$71.4
Rio Blanco, CO	\$40.0	\$46.0	\$48.1	\$59.1	\$69.2	\$83.6	\$79.9	\$95.1	\$78.4
Routt, CO	\$50.3	\$51.1	\$51.3	\$59.3	\$60.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$63.2
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>\$196.6</b>	<b>\$211.5</b>	<b>\$241.2</b>	<b>\$320.2</b>	<b>\$412.1</b>	<b>\$533.2</b>	<b>\$643.7</b>	<b>\$875.3</b>	<b>\$675.8</b>
<b>Farming<sup>1</sup></b>									
Eagle, CO	\$6.2	\$10.2	\$6.2	\$6.3	\$7.0	\$5.0	\$4.5	\$4.4	\$5.4
Garfield, CO	\$5.1	\$8.2	\$6.6	\$11.1	\$10.0	\$6.1	\$4.2	\$2.8	\$3.6
Grand, CO	\$0.0	\$1.3	\$2.1	\$7.9	\$9.0	\$11.7	\$8.0	\$7.5	\$9.0
Jackson, CO	-\$1.7	\$2.0	\$2.9	\$5.1	\$9.8	\$11.5	\$12.3	\$9.2	\$10.2
Mesa, CO	\$17.3	\$18.0	\$11.4	\$17.6	\$22.4	\$14.9	\$18.9	\$15.9	\$14.7
Moffat, CO	\$5.1	\$7.5	\$11.8	\$16.3	\$19.5	\$17.5	\$22.4	\$17.4	\$20.8
Rio Blanco, CO	\$3.1	\$4.0	\$4.4	\$7.0	\$10.1	\$7.3	\$6.9	\$3.1	\$4.7
Routt, CO	\$1.0	\$4.9	\$6.9	\$12.4	\$13.1	\$9.8	\$10.3	\$10.6	\$10.0
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>\$36.2</b>	<b>\$56.1</b>	<b>\$52.3</b>	<b>\$83.6</b>	<b>\$100.8</b>	<b>\$83.8</b>	<b>\$87.6</b>	<b>\$70.8</b>	<b>\$78.4</b>
<b>Retail trade</b>									
Eagle, CO	\$138.3	\$137.5	\$146.9	\$150.8	\$150.6	\$161.2	\$171.9	\$165.3	\$148.2
Garfield, CO	\$118.2	\$118.1	\$119.6	\$129.5	\$133.6	\$148.8	\$158.5	\$154.3	\$136.5
Grand, CO	\$26.2	\$25.2	\$25.5	\$26.9	\$30.3	\$31.8	\$33.3	\$29.6	\$26.9
Jackson, CO	\$2.3	\$2.6	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.8	\$2.5	\$2.4	\$2.7
Mesa, CO	\$267.4	\$275.4	\$281.8	\$285.6	\$290.0	\$300.8	\$310.6	\$307.5	\$281.1
Moffat, CO	\$26.8	\$25.8	\$28.3	\$27.8	\$28.1	\$29.4	\$31.3	\$33.5	\$30.8
Rio Blanco, CO	\$12.3	\$15.0	\$17.7	\$18.7	\$18.0	\$18.1	\$16.9	\$16.4	\$16.9
Routt, CO	\$90.3	\$100.4	\$86.8	\$83.7	\$87.5	\$87.8	\$87.9	\$82.5	\$77.7

<sup>1</sup> Farming values sum data for "Farm" and "Agriculture and forestry support activities."

**Table M.6**  
**Labor Earnings Trends by Select Industry Sector and County, 2001-2009**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>\$681.9</b>	<b>\$700.0</b>	<b>\$709.2</b>	<b>\$725.6</b>	<b>\$740.6</b>	<b>\$780.8</b>	<b>\$813.0</b>	<b>\$791.5</b>	<b>\$720.8</b>
<i>Accommodation and food services</i>									
Eagle, CO	\$207.9	\$202.2	\$217.5	\$230.6	\$237.5	\$237.7	\$259.9	\$267.0	\$236.4
Garfield, CO	\$57.3	\$56.1	\$57.3	\$62.2	\$64.4	\$68.7	\$78.6	\$79.4	\$69.1
Grand, CO	\$35.9	\$38.8	\$40.4	\$44.6	\$41.8	\$41.7	\$45.3	\$43.2	\$38.1
Jackson, CO	\$0.9	\$0.8	\$1.0	\$1.2	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$1.2	\$1.3	\$1.1
Mesa, CO	\$96.9	\$103.7	\$106.4	\$113.2	\$113.1	\$118.8	\$136.2	\$140.9	\$129.7
Moffat, CO	\$8.3	\$8.3	\$8.8	\$9.1	\$8.9	\$9.4	\$9.8	\$10.1	\$9.8
Rio Blanco, CO	\$4.3	\$0.0	\$5.3	\$5.3	\$5.8	\$6.4	\$9.5	\$12.0	\$11.0
Routt, CO	\$56.3	\$57.0	\$57.7	\$59.9	\$61.1	\$62.6	\$67.3	\$63.1	\$56.4
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>\$467.8</b>	<b>\$467.1</b>	<b>\$494.3</b>	<b>\$526.2</b>	<b>\$533.8</b>	<b>\$546.7</b>	<b>\$608.0</b>	<b>\$616.9</b>	<b>\$551.6</b>
<i>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</i>									
Eagle, CO	\$138.5	\$139.6	\$163.9	\$157.5	\$187.1	\$209.8	\$179.5	\$166.7	\$152.4
Garfield, CO	\$12.6	\$12.6	\$11.1	\$11.4	\$12.1	\$13.1	\$12.3	\$13.1	\$12.0
Grand, CO	\$38.9	\$37.0	\$36.1	\$34.0	\$32.8	\$34.5	\$35.2	\$36.1	\$32.9
Jackson, CO	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2
Mesa, CO	\$12.0	\$15.8	\$16.5	\$19.2	\$20.5	\$22.0	\$23.5	\$20.7	\$20.1
Moffat, CO	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.8	\$0.9	\$1.4	\$1.6	\$1.9	\$1.6
Rio Blanco, CO	\$0.8	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.9	\$0.9	\$0.6	\$0.5	\$0.4	\$0.7
Routt, CO	\$40.6	\$44.4	\$45.1	\$49.2	\$48.1	\$49.5	\$47.7	\$51.1	\$45.7
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>\$244.3</b>	<b>\$249.8</b>	<b>\$274.4</b>	<b>\$273.4</b>	<b>\$302.7</b>	<b>\$331.3</b>	<b>\$300.4</b>	<b>\$290.2</b>	<b>\$265.5</b>

Source: US Department of Commerce 2012

Values reported in 2001 dollars were converted to 2010 dollars using the Consumer Price Index (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012a).

1  
2  
3

**Table M.7**  
**Annual Population by County, 2000-2010<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Geographic Area</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010<sup>2</sup></b>
Eagle County, CO	41,961	43,238	44,227	44,995	45,893	47,205	48,476	49,803	51,049	52,513	52,126
Garfield County, CO	44,257	45,636	46,925	47,622	48,193	49,579	51,594	53,534	55,449	57,089	56,139
Grand County, CO	12,496	12,743	13,158	13,324	13,596	13,627	14,003	14,306	14,622	14,902	14,796
Jackson County, CO	1,577	1,529	1,532	1,512	1,486	1,449	1,415	1,407	1,378	1,408	1,390
Mesa County, CO	117,631	119,496	122,440	124,994	127,678	130,194	134,665	139,434	143,155	147,851	146,313
Moffat County, CO	13,147	13,065	13,193	13,106	13,175	12,956	13,115	13,348	13,585	13,728	13,818
Rio Blanco County, CO	5,986	5,868	5,951	5,923	6,007	5,945	6,176	6,373	6,522	6,779	6,620
Routt County, CO	19,815	20,210	20,469	20,893	21,162	21,398	21,859	22,491	23,135	23,688	23,447
<b>Socioeconomic Study Area</b>	<b>256,870</b>	<b>261,785</b>	<b>267,895</b>	<b>272,369</b>	<b>277,190</b>	<b>282,353</b>	<b>291,303</b>	<b>300,696</b>	<b>308,895</b>	<b>317,958</b>	<b>314,649</b>
<b>Colorado</b>	<b>4,326,921</b>	<b>4,425,687</b>	<b>4,490,406</b>	<b>4,528,732</b>	<b>4,575,013</b>	<b>4,631,888</b>	<b>4,720,423</b>	<b>4,803,868</b>	<b>4,889,730</b>	<b>4,972,195</b>	<b>5,049,071</b>
Larimer County, CO <sup>3</sup>	253,072	260,541	265,372	268,448	271,510	275,116	280,713	286,112	291,650	296,696	300,637
Summit County, CO	23,700	24,716	25,006	25,408	25,313	25,487	26,019	26,603	27,144	27,678	28,081
Uintah County, UT	25,215	25,786	26,395	26,561	26,994	27,661	28,662	29,920	31,009	32,931	32,434
Carbon County, WY	15,582	15,217	15,256	15,240	15,236	15,077	15,136	15,494	15,658	15,977	15,853
Sweetwater County, WY	37,552	36,899	37,428	37,450	38,026	38,739	39,749	41,470	42,358	44,133	43,621

Source: US Census Bureau 2011

<sup>1</sup> Population values provided as of July 1 of each year.

<sup>2</sup> The values for July 1, 2010 were produced by applying estimates of change in the population between April 1 and July 1 of 2010 to the 2010 Census counts. Further details on this methodology are available at [http://www.census.gov/popest/methodology/intercensal\\_nat\\_meth.pdf](http://www.census.gov/popest/methodology/intercensal_nat_meth.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Larimer County, Colorado; Summit County, Colorado; Uintah County, Utah; Carbon County, Wyoming; and Sweetwater County, Wyoming constitute a "secondary" Socioeconomic Study Area, as documented in the text.

## NON-MARKET VALUATION METHODS

This section addresses economic valuation of three categories of non-market resources that are present in the study area and could potentially be affected by the alternatives. These three categories of non-market value are recreation, values of GRSG to households in the intermountain west, and value of the ranching tradition to the ranchers themselves, residents, and visitors to the region. Recreation is included because actions that promote the conservation of GRSG habitat may result in changes in recreation opportunities, such as increasing the amount of habitat for other wildlife species that may be hunted or viewed that depend on public lands, roads open or closed for recreation access, and the quality of the recreation experience.

The economic non-market values described in this appendix are not directly comparable to regional economic indicators commonly used to describe how natural resources on public lands contribute to the regional economic indicators such as output/sales, labor income, and employment. These indicators provide valuable information to the local public as well as to regional government agencies for purposes of public service and infrastructure planning. These impacts or contributions are often referred to as distributional effects as they describe the effects to the region. However, these indicators do not represent net economic value. For example, in economic terms, labor income associated with mineral production would actually be considered a cost to the producer. Similarly, expenditures by a recreation visitor associated with a visit to public lands would be viewed by the recreationist as a cost. One last example would be the total sales generated by the sale of minerals extracted from federally owned minerals: the total sales do not reflect the net economic value since the costs associated with the extraction are not accounted for (including labor income, supplies, and equipment, as well as potentially non-market costs such as those associated with pollution). This section considers the economic value of the non-market outputs, a concept describe below.

### Total Non-Market Economic Value

Many of the multiple uses in the study area are not bought and sold in competitive markets. For instance, many recreational visitors to public lands pay no or low admission fees, and the presence of wild animals such as GRSG have no “market price,” yet both have value to people. In some cases people gain value from using these non-market resources, such as recreation on public lands; in other cases, protection of some natural resources provides both a use value (e.g., wildlife viewing) as well as a non-use value (e.g., the value some people hold for knowing that a specific natural resource exists and is protected even if they never intend to “use” or visit it).

Economists call the sum of these two values Total Economic Value. Use values typically can be consumptive use (e.g., hunting) and/or non-consumptive, such as viewing or being present on site (e.g., camping and hiking). In contrast, non-use values occur off-site to people who derive enjoyment from knowing a natural

1 environment, habitat or species exists in its natural state, either for themselves  
2 (existence value) and/or future generations (bequest value). Krutilla (1967)  
3 documents the conceptual origins of these two elements of non-use value, and  
4 Freeman (2003) provides a rigorous theoretical treatment.

5 Non-use or existence values can potentially be enjoyed by millions if the good  
6 or service (e.g., the presence of a specific wild species such as wild salmon or  
7 rare bird species) is of widespread interest. Thus, while the non-use value per  
8 household may much lower than a value per day received by a visitor, in total,  
9 non-use values may be quite large.

### 10 **Recreation Values**

11 Economists measure the net economic use and non-use values as “Consumer  
12 Surplus.” At its most basic level, consumer surplus is the maximum amount a  
13 person would pay minus the amount they actually have to pay. Consumer  
14 surplus, which is also sometimes referred to as “net willingness to pay,” is a  
15 measure of benefit has been used by economists and federal agencies for  
16 decades (US Water Resources Council 1983; US Environmental Protection  
17 Agency 2009, 2010).

18 For public land recreation, especially on BLM and USFS recreation sites,  
19 entrance fees are typically very low or non-existent, so the value people place  
20 on these public land recreation opportunities is not fully measured simply by the  
21 entrance fees they pay. In economic terms, there is not a competitive market or  
22 a “market clearing price” for access to public recreation sites. Therefore, there  
23 can be a substantial difference between what people pay to visit a recreation site  
24 (e.g., entrance fees plus travel costs, including the value of time) and the  
25 maximum amount they would pay.

26 A common non-market valuation method used for recreation is the travel cost  
27 method. In this method, economists survey visitors to a recreation site and  
28 collect data on their frequency of trips, travel distance and costs incurred to  
29 access the site. Because the survey uses information from actual visitors, the  
30 travel cost method is a “revealed preference” method of valuation; economists  
31 use the travel costs as a proxy to determine the value that people gain from  
32 using the site. Variations in the travel cost across visitors, along with their  
33 respective number of trips, allow economists to statistically estimate a  
34 relationship between travel cost and quantity of trips – an aggregate demand  
35 curve for the recreation site, much like a demand curve for goods and services  
36 that are sold in competitive markets. This aggregate demand curve will tend to  
37 show that individuals with a relatively high travel cost take fewer trips on  
38 average, while individuals with a lower cost take more trips on average. From  
39 this aggregate demand curve, economists can calculate consumer surplus. Many  
40 of the consumer surplus values for recreation in the literature (Loomis 2005)  
41 and recently developed by the USFS (Bowker et al. 2009) rely upon the travel  
42 cost method.

1           **Diagram M-I**, Consumer Demand Curve and Consumer Surplus for  
2           Recreation Trips, provides an illustration of a demand curve for recreation on a  
3           particular site. In Diagram M-I, the aggregate demand is shown on an average  
4           basis, that is, for an average individual consumer. The downward-sloping  
5           diagonal line in Diagram M-I represents the relationship between the travel cost  
6           and quantity of trips demanded by this average consumer. In the diagram, the  
7           value of the first several trips is relatively high (\$70 for the first and \$60 for the  
8           second trip), while the value of the sixth trip is lower (\$20 in the diagram). In a  
9           travel cost method study, these values are statistically derived from the  
10          aggregate demand calculated for the entire population. The downward slope of  
11          the demand curve corresponds to declining value associated with each trip,  
12          which is typical for most goods and services.<sup>1</sup> It also corresponds to the fact  
13          that visitors will take fewer trips to areas with a higher travel cost.

14          Each visitor receives a net benefit from each trip, which is measured by the  
15          difference between what they had to pay and the maximum amount they would  
16          pay for each trip. In **Diagram M-I**, Consumer Demand Curve and Consumer  
17          Surplus for Recreation Trips, the net benefit for the average visitor is the  
18          difference between their actual expenditures of \$20 per trip and the maximum  
19          amount they would pay for each trip. As shown, the first trip has a net benefit  
20          of \$50 (\$70 of value less \$20 in expenditures), the second trip \$40 (\$60 less  
21          \$20), and so on until the sixth trip. At the sixth trip the visitor's cost is the  
22          same as their benefit, and hence there is no net benefit from further trips. Thus,  
23          this gain to the visitor over and above what they spend is their "consumer  
24          surplus."


25          Given the large range and diversity of sites in the study area, the BLM and USFS  
26          did not perform original travel cost method analysis of visitation in the study  
27          area. Rather, they relied upon transferring existing recreation values from travel  
28          cost method studies such as Bowker et al. (2009) and other recreation values  
29          from the existing literature (Loomis 2005; Loomis and Richardson 2007; USFWS  
30          2009) to the recreation activities in the study area, focusing on existing studies  
31          in the Rocky Mountain and Great Basin area (Colorado, Utah, Wyoming,  
32          Arizona, New Mexico, Idaho, Montana, and Nevada). This approach, known as  
33          "Benefit Transfer," is well-developed in academic and policy literature and has  
34          been used by federal agencies including the US Environmental Protection  
35          Agency (see Griffiths et al. 2012 for a recent listing of economic studies where  
36          benefit transfer was used), US Army Corps of Engineers, US Bureau of  
37          Reclamation, USFS (USFS 1991; also see Ervin et al. 2012 for a recent  
38          application of benefit transfer to the Mount Hood National Forest), and other

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that for some types of recreation use, users may gain increased value over a portion of the number of trips; for example, mountain bikers may experience increased enjoyment of subsequent trips to a single location as their trail-specific skills and knowledge increase with repeat visits. Climbers and other users may also experience similar gains over repeat visits. However, even these users will likely hit a point where the marginal value begins to decrease with more trips.

1 agencies. Benefit transfer is widely used in academic applications as well; see  
 2 Wilson and Hoehn (2006) for a series of journal articles on benefit transfer.

### 3 Diagram M-1. Consumer Demand Curve and Consumer Surplus for Recreation Trips



4  
 5 The BLM measures recreation activity in various units, including a “visitor hour,”  
 6 which represents the presence of one or more persons in an area for  
 7 continuous or simultaneous periods of time aggregating 1 hour (i.e., one person  
 8 for 1 hour or two persons for 30 minutes each). A “visitor day” as defined by  
 9 BLM represents 12 visitor hours (BLM 2003). The BLM Recreation Management  
 10 Information System provides data on recreation visitor days (RVDs); to be  
 11 compatible with these units, BLM identified non-market values for various  
 12 recreation activities in units of dollars per RVD. Values from economic  
 13 literature, based on primary research conducted on various recreation sites,  
 14 were matched to BLM and USFS recreation activity classifications. **Table M.8,**  
 15 **Consumer Surplus for Recreation Activities,** provides a listing of the values per  
 16 day representing Colorado.

**Table M.8**  
**Consumer Surplus for Recreation Activities**

<b>Recreation Activity Category</b>	<b>Consumer Surplus per Visitor Day (2012 dollars)</b>
Backpacking	36.48
Camping	31.73
Cross Country Skiing	36.32
Fishing	49.00
Floatboating/Rafting/Canoeing	82.28
General Recreation	42.96
Hiking	107.16
Hunting	59.50
Motorboating	65.24
Mountain Biking	175.21
Off-Road Vehicle Driving/Off-Highway Vehicle	51.35
Other Recreation	47.69
Picnicking	52.27
Pleasure Driving	71.65
Rock Climbing	61.32
Sightseeing	41.33
Snowmobiling	51.75
Swimming	35.10
Waterskiing	69.23
Wildlife Viewing	38.00

Sources: Rosenberger 2012; Loomis 2005; Loomis and Richardson 2007; Bowker et al., 2009; USFWS 2009.

1  
2 Consistent with the description above of consumer surplus and the travel cost  
3 method, readers should interpret the values in **Table M.8**, Consumer Surplus  
4 for Recreation Activities, as the consumer surplus or the amount of value that  
5 the average visitor derives from a full day of recreation beyond their actual  
6 expenditures. Thus, a typical off-highway vehicle user would pay an average  
7 value of \$51.35 more than their trip cost to have the opportunity to participate  
8 in a typical day of driving off-road vehicles.

9 **Table M.9**, Total Consumer Surplus for Recreation in Northwest Colorado  
10 Sub-Region, shows the total consumer surplus associated with recreation  
11 activities on BLM-administered and National Forest System lands for the  
12 Northwest Colorado sub-region, including the BLM Field Offices of Colorado  
13 River Valley, Grand Junction, Kremmling, Little Snake, and White River, as well  
14 as the Routt National Forest. RVDs on BLM lands presented in **Table M.9**,  
15 Total Consumer Surplus for Recreation in Northwest Colorado Sub-Region, is  
16 calculated directly from Report 26 from the BLM Recreation Management  
17 Information System (Report 26 provides RVDs based on recorded visitor hours  
18 – defined above – and dividing by 12). For this analysis, the BLM used average  
19 RVDs per year over the period 2008 to 2012. RVDs on National Forests are  
20

**Table M.9**  
**Total Consumer Surplus for Recreation in Northwest Colorado Sub-Region**

<b>Recreation Activity</b>	<b>Average RVDs Per Year</b>	<b>Total Consumer Surplus (millions of 2012 dollars)</b>
Backpacking	147,444	\$5.4
Big Game Hunting	1,050,200	\$62.5
Camping	1,024,141	\$32.5
Cross Country Skiing	14,828	\$0.5
Fishing	63,003	\$3.1
Floatboating/Rafting/Canoeing	88,881	\$7.3
General Recreation	22,146	\$1.0
Hiking	101,309	\$10.9
Hunting – Other	122,642	\$7.3
Motorboating	1,173	\$0.1
Mountain Biking	101,493	\$17.8
Off Road Vehicle Driving/Off-Highway Vehicle	420,761	\$21.6
Other Recreation	122,373	\$5.8
Picnicking	34,955	\$1.8
Pleasure Driving	126,625	\$9.1
Rock Climbing	4,507	\$0.3
Sightseeing	66,201	\$2.7
Small Game Hunting	27,927	\$1.7
Snowmobiling	22,116	\$1.1
Swimming	2,100	\$0.1
Waterfowl Hunting	3,290	\$0.2
Wildlife Viewing	29,326	\$1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,007,520</b>	<b>\$193.8</b>

Source: BLM 2012; USFS 2012; consumer surplus per RVD shown in **Table M.8**, Consumer Surplus for Recreation Activities.

1  
2 calculated from the most recent available data (Fiscal Year 2007) from the USFS  
3 National Visitor Use Monitoring report (USFS 2012). RVDs for National Forest  
4 System lands were calculated based on the total number of site visits, the “main  
5 activity” reported by recreators, and the number of hours per day reported  
6 engaging in that activity, with the number of RVDs equal to the number of hours  
7 divided by 12. Note that conservation measures for GRSG may only affect  
8 specific types and fractions of the public lands that contributed to the visitor  
9 days used to estimate the surplus values in **Table M.9**, Total Consumer Surplus  
10 for Recreation in Northwest Colorado Sub-Region.

11 To estimate impacts on consumer surplus associated with changes in RVDs,  
12 BLM economists worked with BLM and USFS recreation specialists to project  
13 how RVDs for various activities would change under the alternatives. Initial  
14 projected growth rates (for Alternative A) are based on recent growth rates  
15 and projected trends, including growth rates predicted for the Rocky Mountain  
16 Region by Bowker et al. (1999). For the action alternatives, BLM and USFS

1 recreational specialists projected changes in growth rates or initial shifts in  
2 RVDs based on their knowledge of local recreational facilities and the  
3 management actions that would occur under each alternative. Projected changes  
4 in consumer surplus are calculated as the product of projected changes in RVDs  
5 and the values of consumer surplus per RVD, as shown in **Table M.8**,  
6 Consumer Surplus for Recreation Activities.

### 7 **Values Associated with Greater Sage-Grouse Populations**

8 Economists have long recognized that wildlife species, especially rare,  
9 threatened, and endangered species, have economic values beyond just viewing.  
10 This is supported by a series of legal decisions and technical analyses. The US  
11 Court of Appeals in 1989 first clarified that the US Department of the Interior,  
12 in assessing damages in Natural Resource Damage Assessment cases, should  
13 include what it termed as “passive use values,” that is, existence values provided  
14 to non-users of the species, as a compensable value in addition to any use value.  
15 These passive use values are also included in Oil Pollution Act damage  
16 assessments as well. The term passive values is interchangeable with the term  
17 non-use values defined previously. This ruling and subsequent analysis for  
18 Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Oil Pollution Act assessments are  
19 consistent with well-established economic theory showing that people derive  
20 value from passive use or non-use as well as active uses of resources (Krutilla  
21 1967). Economists have devoted a great deal of conceptual and empirical work  
22 to refining concepts and developing methods to measure these passive use  
23 values.

24 The dominant methods are “stated preference” methods, of which the most  
25 prominent is the Contingent Valuation Method. The basic element of this  
26 method is to use a survey to construct or simulate a market or referendum for  
27 protection or improvement of a natural environment, habitat, or species, and  
28 then having the respondent indicate whether or not they would pay for an  
29 increment of protection, and if so, how much they would pay. While the  
30 method has developed a great deal of sophistication that has increased the  
31 validity of the willingness to pay responses, there is admittedly a degree of bias  
32 that can result in stated willingness to pay exceeding actual willingness to pay by  
33 a factor averaging two to three (Loomis 2011; Murphy et al. 2005; List and  
34 Gallet 2001). While not a perfect estimator of willingness to pay, the  
35 Contingent Valuation Method provides a useful means for estimating the public’s  
36 passive use values.

37 Numerous academic papers and even entire books have been written on the  
38 Contingent Valuation Method. Mitchell and Carson (1989) was one of the first,  
39 while Alberini and Kahn (2006) is a more recent treatment. To date there have  
40 been about 7,500 Contingent Valuation Method studies in over 130 countries  
41 (Carson 2011). A number of federal agencies have used or referenced stated  
42 preference methods, including the US Bureau of Reclamation, US Environmental  
43 Protection Agency, National Park Service, and state agencies such as the

1 California Department of Fish and Game, Idaho Fish and Game, and Montana  
 2 Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. The USFWS commissioned an original Contingent  
 3 Valuation Method study of the economic values the public receives from  
 4 reintroduction of wolves in the areas of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, and  
 5 used those values in an EIS on wolf reintroduction (USFWS 1994). The US  
 6 Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, and Lower Elwha S'Klallam Tribe  
 7 commissioned a Contingent Valuation Method study on the value of removal of  
 8 the Elwha and Glines Canyon Dams (Meyer et al. 1995). The US Bureau of  
 9 Reclamation also commissioned an original Contingent Valuation Method study  
 10 on the values of providing stable river flows to benefit riparian vegetation,  
 11 endangered species, and cultural resources. That study was cited by then-  
 12 Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt as a factor in selecting the more  
 13 protective flow regime from Glen Canyon Dam despite it having more foregone  
 14 hydroelectricity (Babbitt 1996).

15 The BLM and USFS conducted a literature search to demonstrate the potential  
 16 range of values that could be associated with species that are candidates for  
 17 listing as threatened or endangered, such as GRSG populations. Analysts first  
 18 verified there are no existing studies on Total Economic Value or non-use  
 19 valuation specific to the GRSG. This is not an uncommon occurrence, as there  
 20 are dozens of rare or potentially threatened species that have not been valued  
 21 despite the very high policy relevance of the species and the large magnitude of  
 22 economic value at stake in these policy decisions.

23 The BLM and USFS used three criteria to identify studies that are most  
 24 applicable to the current analysis: (1) whether the species valuation study was  
 25 located in the same geographic region as the GRSG habitat; (2) whether the  
 26 species was listed or not listed as threatened or endangered; and (3) whether  
 27 the species was hunted or not (implying a mix of use and non-use values).

28 The primary database of articles was the recent peer-reviewed journal article by  
 29 Richardson and Loomis (2009), which is a compilation of the economic values of  
 30 threatened, endangered, and rare species. A literature review was also  
 31 conducted to determine if there had been any recent studies on GRSG or  
 32 closely related species. Unfortunately, there is not a perfect match in the  
 33 literature in terms of geographic region (intermountain) and a species that is  
 34 both hunted and rare. **Table M.10**, Existing Estimates of Annual Total  
 35 Economic Value of Protecting Habitat for Species Similar to GRSG, provides a  
 36 summary of the studies with features most similar to the GRSG species.

37 **Table M.10**  
 38 **Existing Estimates of Annual Total Economic Value of Protecting Habitat for Species**  
 39 **Similar to GRSG**

Region	Species	Listed	Hunted	Annual Value per Household <sup>b</sup>	Change Valued
--------	---------	--------	--------	---	---------------

Region	Species	Listed	Hunted	Annual Value per Household <sup>b</sup>	Change Valued
Four Corners (AZ, CO, NM, UT)	Mexican Spotted Owl	Yes	No	\$58.49	Avoid extinction in 15 years in Four Corners region
New England	Wild Turkey	No	Yes	\$16.72 <sup>a</sup>	Avoid extinction in New England
Texas (also L.A., NYC, Chicago, Atlanta)	Whooping Crane	Yes	No	\$43.69 <sup>a</sup>	Avoid extinction
Maine	Peregrine Falcon	Yes	No	\$32.37 (one time)	Restore self-sustaining population
South Carolina & Rest of US	Red-Cockaded Woodpecker	Yes	No	\$14.69	Restore habitat to increase chance of survival to 99%

Sources: Loomis and Ekstrand 1997 (Mexican spotted owl); Stevens et al. 1991 (New England wild turkey); Bowker and Stoll 1988 (whooping crane); Kotchen and Reiling 2000 (peregrine falcon); Reaves et al. 1999 (red-cockaded woodpecker). All of these sources are as cited in Richardson and Loomis (2009).

Notes:

- a. Average of estimates from the study.
- b. As noted in the text, these stated preference values for household may have a degree of hypothetical bias that could overstate the actual monetary amount households would pay by a factor of two to three.

1  
2 As can be seen in **Table M.10**, Existing Estimates of Annual Total Economic  
3 Value of Protecting Habitat for Species Similar to GRSG, there is one study with  
4 a geographic region overlapping the sub-region (Mexican spotted owl), and one  
5 study on a species that was hunted at the time (wild turkey). At the time of the  
6 study, the Mexican spotted owl was a threatened species under the Endangered  
7 Species Act, and respondents were told in the survey that it was a threatened  
8 species. The whooping crane, red-cockaded woodpecker, and peregrine falcon  
9 studies involved an endangered species.

10 All of these studies used the Contingent Valuation Method in a mail survey.  
11 Households were asked whether they would pay a specific dollar amount, with  
12 that amount varying across individuals in the sample (i.e., the valuation questions  
13 were “closed-ended,” although the wild turkey study and red-cockaded  
14 woodpecker also used an open-ended valuation question for some  
15 respondents). Researchers used the closed-ended valuation questions to  
16 generate a statistical valuation function. This valuation function exhibited internal  
17 validity: the higher the dollar amount households were asked to pay, the lower  
18 the percentage of them that would pay that dollar amount.

19 With the exception of the peregrine falcon study, which asked respondents to  
20 commit to a one-time payment, each survey asked respondents to pay annually  
21 to accomplish the stated goal (typically, preventing the species from going  
22 extinct in the region of interest, although this varied by study as the table  
23 shows). For the peregrine falcon and red-cockaded woodpecker, households

1 were told that their payment would restore a self-sustaining population (i.e., one  
2 that would not go extinct).

3 The original wild turkey study provided an estimate of three values (in 1990  
4 dollars) that were averaged and then adjusted to 2012 dollars using the  
5 Consumer Price Index, resulting in a value of \$16.72 per household per year.  
6 The same procedure was used to update the 1996 dollar values of the Mexican  
7 spotted owl to 2012, resulting in values of \$58.49 per household per year. The  
8 higher values for the Mexican spotted owl may be due to the large area of  
9 habitat (4.6 million acres stated in the survey and shown on a map) that would  
10 be protected in the Four Corners area by paying, and the fact the species was  
11 not a hunted species. The whooping crane values are fairly large at \$43.69 per  
12 household per year; this value represents a Total Economic Value, including  
13 both use and non-use value, as some of the sample included people who actively  
14 “used” the species (as wildlife viewers).

15 The study values in **Table M.10**, Existing Estimates of Annual Total Economic  
16 Value of Protecting Habitat for Species Similar to GRSG, demonstrate that many  
17 people, or segments of the public, hold substantial value for protecting  
18 threatened and endangered species, which may carry over to the GRSG.  
19 However, additional studies would be needed to identify values specifically for  
20 GRSG protection. Given that protection is a public good available to all  
21 households in the intermountain west, the aggregate or intermountain regional  
22 value could be substantial.

### 23 **Values Associated with Grazing Land**

24 Public lands managed for livestock grazing provides both market values (e.g.,  
25 forage for livestock) and non-market values. Many ranchers themselves value  
26 the ranching lifestyle in excess of the income generated by the ranching  
27 operations. This is evident in some ranch sales transaction data which suggests  
28 some ranch properties have sold for more than the market value of the public  
29 land forage (Bartlett et al. 2002; Taylor 2006). One of the primary reasons  
30 public lands ranchers indicate they own land is for the “tradition, values and  
31 culture” rather than primarily for profit (Tanaka et al. 2005). Many public land  
32 ranchers work elsewhere part-time and rely on the ranch for only 20 percent of  
33 their income (Hanus 2011), relying instead on outside jobs or other savings to  
34 support their ranching lifestyle. Land appreciation has also provided increased  
35 value and therefore served as an economic resource for ranchers (Tanaka et al.  
36 2005; Torell et al. 2005). As several of these authors note, changes in public  
37 land grazing that reduce the profitability of grazing may not directly translate to  
38 withdrawal from ranching, due to the fact that economic factors are not  
39 necessarily the primary motivation for public land ranching.

40 Some studies have found non-market values of ranching associated with use  
41 values to residents (Mangun et al. 2005) and tourists in the form of open space  
42 and western ranch scenery (Ellingson et al. 2006). However, some others see

1 non-market opportunity costs associated with livestock grazing that may,  
2 depending on management methods and other variables, reduce native plant  
3 species and forage for wildlife (Todres et al. 2003). The potential exists for  
4 other residents or visitors to prefer lifestyles or have lifestyle needs that are not  
5 consistent with grazing or ranching lifestyles or landscapes.

6 Methods available to measure the use values to residents and tourists associated  
7 with grazing land include stated preference methods similar to contingent  
8 valuation (Ellingson et al. 2006; Mangun et al. 2005). Methods for attempting to  
9 isolate any amenity values that ranchers themselves may hold include the  
10 hedonic price method. This method uses observed sale prices of ranch land as a  
11 function of the characteristics, including both conventional market factors (e.g.,  
12 size of ranch and quantity of forage) but also amenity values (e.g., scenic views,  
13 presence of wildlife species, and on-site fishing or hunting opportunities) that  
14 may be provided by the ranch (Torell et al. 2005). The additional value that  
15 ranchers pay for the amenity values of the ranch provide some indication of  
16 how much they value these amenities. Using the hedonic price method to  
17 estimate a “lifestyle value” separate from the market and amenity values has yet  
18 to be done in the literature. This may be due to the fact that lifestyle values  
19 attributed to living on a ranch or ranching is present on nearly all ranch  
20 properties sold. As such, statistically it is difficult to isolate the contribution of  
21 ranching lifestyle to differences in ranch property values as ranching lifestyle is a  
22 common feature of nearly all ranch properties sold.

### 23 **References**

- 24 Alberini, A., and J. Kahn. 2006. Handbook on Contingent Valuation. Edward  
25 Elgar, Northampton, MA.
- 26 Babbitt, B. 1996. Record of Decision, Operation of Glen Canyon Dam. Final  
27 Environmental Impact Statement. US Department of the Interior,  
28 Washington, DC.
- 29 Bartlett, T., L. A. Torell, N. Rimbey, L. van Tassell, and D. McCollum. 2002.  
30 Valuing Grazing on Public Land. *Journal of Range Management* 55: 426-  
31 438.
- 32 BLM (United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management).  
33 2003. Guidelines to Reporting Recreation Visitation. June 23. US  
34 Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.
- 35 \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Recreation Management Information System. Report 26, Visitor  
36 Days and Participants by Office and Activity. US Department of the  
37 Interior, Washington, DC.

- 1 Bowker, J. M., M. Starbuck, D. English, J. Bergstrom, R. Rosenberger, and D.  
2 McCollum. 2009. Estimating the Net Economic Value of National Forest  
3 Recreation: An Application of the National Visitor Use Monitoring Data.  
4 Faculty Series Working Paper, FS-09-02. Department of Agricultural and  
5 Applied Economics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- 6 Bowker, J. M., D. B. K. English, and H. K. Cordell. 1999. Projections of Outdoor  
7 Recreation Participation to 2050. *In* Outdoor Recreation in American  
8 Life: A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends (ed. H. K.  
9 Cordell). Sagamore Publishing.
- 10 Bowker, J. M., and J. R. Stoll. 1988. Use of dichotomous choice nonmarket  
11 methods to value the whooping crane resource. *American Journal of*  
12 *Agricultural Economics* 70, 372–381.
- 13 Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2012a. Consumer Price Index. Internet Web site:  
14 <http://www.bls.gov/cpi/>. Accessed on March 15, 2013.
- 15 Carson, R. 2011. *Contingent Valuation: A Comprehensive Bibliography and*  
16 *History*. Edward Elgar, Northampton, MA.
- 17 Ellingson, L., A. Seidl, and C. J. Mucklow. 2006. Tourists' Value of Routt  
18 County's Working Landscape, 2005: Summary Report. EDR 0-07,  
19 Economic Development Report, Dept. of Agricultural and Resource  
20 Economics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. Internet Web  
21 site: <http://dare.colostate.edu/pubs/EDR/EDR06-07.pdf>.
- 22 Ervin, D., G. Larsen, and C. Shin. 2012. Simple Ecosystem Service Valuation Can  
23 Impact National Forest Management, *AERE Newsletter* 32(1): 17-22.  
24 May.
- 25 Freeman, M. 2003. *The Measurement of Environmental and Resource Values*.  
26 Resources for the Future Press, Washington, DC.
- 27 Griffiths, C., H. Klemick, M. Massey, C. Moore, S. Newbold, D. Simpson, P.  
28 Walsh, and W. Wheeler. 2012. US Environmental Protection Agency  
29 Valuation of Surface Water Quality Improvements. *Environmental*  
30 *Economics and Policy* 6(1): 130-146.
- 31 Hanus, A. 2011. *Socio-Economic Profile and Analysis of Seven Oregon Counties*  
32 *Included in the Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Strategy for Oregon*.  
33 Association of Oregon Counties.
- 34 Kotchen, M., and S. Reiling. 2000. Environmental attitudes, motivations, and  
35 contingent valuation of nonuse values: a case study involving endangered  
36 species. *Ecological Economics* 32, 93–107.

- 1 Krutilla, J. V. 1967. Conservation Reconsidered. *American Economic Review* 57:  
2 777-786.
- 3 List, J., and C. Gallet. 2001. What experimental protocol influences disparities  
4 between actual and hypothetical stated values? *Environmental and*  
5 *Resource Economics* 20: 241–254.
- 6 Loomis, J. 2005. Updated Outdoor Recreation Use Values on National Forests  
7 and Other Public Lands. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-658.  
8 USDA Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR.  
9 Internet Web site: [http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw\\_gtr658.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw_gtr658.pdf).
- 10 Loomis, J. 2011. What's to Know about Hypothetical Bias in Stated Preference  
11 Valuation Studies. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 25(2): 363-370.
- 12 Loomis, J., and E. Ekstrand. 1997. Economic Benefits of Critical Habitat for the  
13 Mexican Spotted Owl: A Scope Test Using a Multiple Bounded  
14 Contingent Valuation Survey. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource*  
15 *Economics* 22(2): 356-366.
- 16 Loomis, J., and L. Richardson, 2007. Benefit Transfer and Visitor Use Estimating  
17 Models of Wildlife Recreation, Species and Habitats. Department of  
18 Agricultural and Resource Economics, Colorado State University, Fort  
19 Collins, CO. Internet Web site:  
20 <http://dare.colostate.edu/tools/benefittransfer.aspx>.
- 21 Mangan, N., A. Seidl, C. J. Mucklow, and D. Alpe. 2005. The Value of Ranchland  
22 to Routt County Residents 1995-2005. EDR 05-02, Economic  
23 Development Report, Dept. of Agricultural and Resource Economics,  
24 Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. Internet Web site:  
25 <http://dare.colostate.edu/pubs/EDR/EDR05-02.pdf>.
- 26 Meyer, P. A., R. Lichtkoppler, R. B. Hamilton, D. A. Harpman, C. L. Borda, and  
27 P. M. Engel. 1995. Elwha River Restoration Project: Economic Analysis,  
28 Final Technical Report. Developed by the Project Human Effects Team.  
29 A Report to the US Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, and  
30 Lower Elwha S'Klallam Tribe. Davis, CA. Internet Web site:  
31 [http://digital.library.ucr.edu/cdri/documents/R264\\_Economic\\_analysis.pdf](http://digital.library.ucr.edu/cdri/documents/R264_Economic_analysis.pdf).
- 32 Mitchell, R., and R. Carson. 1989. Using Surveys to Value Public Goods: The  
33 Contingent Valuation Method. *Resources for the Future*, Washington  
34 DC.
- 35 Murphy, J. J., P. G. Allen, T. H. Stevens, and D. Weatherhead. 2005. A meta-  
36 analysis of hypothetical bias in stated preference valuation.  
37 *Environmental and Resource Economics* 30: 313-325.

- 1 Reaves, D. W., R. Kramer, and T. Holmes. 1999. Does Question Format  
2 Matter? Valuing an Endangered Species. *Environmental and Resource*  
3 *Economics* 14: 365-383.
- 4 Richardson, L., and J. Loomis. 2009. The Total Economic Value of Threatened,  
5 Endangered and Rare Species: An Updated Meta- Analysis, *Ecological*  
6 *Economics* 68: 1535-1548.
- 7 Rosenberger, R. 2012. Recreation Use Values Database. Downloaded October  
8 13, 2012. Internet Web site:  
9 [http://recvaluation.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/](http://recvaluation.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/RECREATION_USE_VALUES_DATABASE_%20SUMMARY.pdf)  
10 [files/RECREATION\\_USE\\_VALUES\\_DATABASE\\_%20SUMMARY.pdf](http://recvaluation.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/RECREATION_USE_VALUES_DATABASE_%20SUMMARY.pdf).
- 11 Rosenberger, R., and J. Loomis. 2000. Using Meta-Analysis for Benefit Transfer:  
12 In-Sample Convergent Validity Tests of an Outdoor Recreation  
13 Database. *Water Resources Research*, 36(4): 1097-1107.
- 14 Stevens, T., J. Echeverria, R. Glass, T. Hager, and T. Moore. 1991. Measuring the  
15 Existence Value of Wildlife. *Land Economics* 67(4): 390-400.
- 16 Tanaka, J., L. A. Torell, and N. Rimbey. 2005. Who Are Public Land Ranchers  
17 and Why are They Out There? *Western Economic Forum*: 14-20. Fall  
18 2005.
- 19 Taylor, T. 2006. Rural Communities and Public Lands in the West: Impacts and  
20 Alternatives. University of Wyoming. USDA Research, Education and  
21 Economics Information System.
- 22 Todres, T., A. Seidl, D. McLeod, A. Bittner, R. Coupal, and K. Inman. 2003.  
23 Preferred Public Land Use and Policy in Moffat County: Final Report of  
24 Countywide Opinion Survey. APRPR03-11. Agricultural and Resource  
25 Policy Report, Dept. of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Colorado  
26 State University, Fort Collins, CO. Internet Web site:  
27 [http://dare.colostate.edu/pubs/ARPR/](http://dare.colostate.edu/pubs/ARPR/ARPR%2003-11.pdf)  
28 [ARPR%2003-11.pdf](http://dare.colostate.edu/pubs/ARPR/ARPR%2003-11.pdf).
- 29 Torrell, L. A., N. Rimbey, O. Ramirez, and D. McCollum. 2005. Income Earning  
30 Potential versus Consumptive Amenities in Determining Ranchland  
31 Values. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 30(3): 537-560.
- 32 US Court of Appeals, DC Circuit. 1989. *State of Ohio v. US Department of*  
33 *Interior* (880 F.2d. 432).
- 34 US Environmental Protection Agency. 2000. Guidelines for Preparing Economic  
35 Analyses. EPA 240-R-00-003. Washington, DC.

- 1 \_\_\_\_\_ . 2009. Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services. EPA-  
2 SAB-09-012. Washington, DC.
- 3 \_\_\_\_\_ . 2010. Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses. EPA 240-R-10-001.  
4 Washington, DC.
- 5 USFS (United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service). 1991.  
6 Resource Pricing and Valuation Procedures for the Recommended 1990  
7 RPA Program. US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.
- 8 \_\_\_\_\_ . 2012. National Visitor Use Monitoring, Round 2 Results. USDA Forest  
9 Service Natural Resource Manager. Visits by Market Segment, Activity  
10 Participation, Regional Annual Visit Duration, and Annual Visitation  
11 Estimate for Routt National Forest, Fiscal Year 2007. US Department of  
12 Agriculture, Washington, DC. Internet Web site:  
13 <http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/>.
- 14 USFWS (United States Fish and Wildlife Service). 1994. Final Environmental  
15 Impact Statement: The Reintroduction of Gray Wolves to Yellowstone  
16 National Park and Central Idaho. US Department of Agriculture,  
17 Washington, DC.
- 18 \_\_\_\_\_ . 2009. Net Economic Values of Wildlife-Related Recreation in 2006.  
19 Report 2006-5. US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.
- 20 US Census Bureau. 2011. Population Estimates, Intercensal Estimates of the  
21 Resident Population for Counties: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2010. Internet  
22 Web site: [http://www.census.gov/popest/data/intercensal/county/CO-  
23 EST00INT-01.html](http://www.census.gov/popest/data/intercensal/county/CO-EST00INT-01.html).
- 24 US Department of Commerce. 2012. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional  
25 Economic Information System, Local Area Personal Income and  
26 Employment. Internet Web site: <http://www.bea.gov/regional/index.htm>.
- 27 US Water Resources Council. 1983. Principles and Guidelines for Water and  
28 Related Land Resource Implementation Studies. Washington, DC.
- 29 Wilson, M., and J. Hoehn. 2006. Valuing Environmental Goods and Services  
30 Using Benefit Transfer: The State-of-the-art and Science. Ecological  
31 Economics. Special Issue Volume 60.

## 32 **ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY**

33

### 34 **Introduction**

35 This appendix describes the methods and data that underlie the economic  
36 impact modeling analysis. Input-output models such as the Impact Analysis for  
37 Planning (IMPLAN) model, an economic impact analysis model, provide a

1 quantitative representation of the production relationships between individual  
2 economic sectors. Thus, the economic modeling analysis uses information about  
3 physical production quantities and the prices and costs for goods and services.  
4 The inputs required to run the IMPLAN model are described in the following  
5 narrative and tables. The resulting estimates from the IMPLAN model, by  
6 alternative, are in **Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, Section 4.24,**  
7 **Social and Economic Conditions.** The first portion of the following information  
8 describes general aspects of the IMPLAN model and how it was used to  
9 estimate economic impacts. The remaining sections provide additional detailed  
10 data used in the analysis for livestock grazing, recreation, and oil and gas.

### 11 **The IMPLAN Model**

12 IMPLAN is a regional economic model that provides a mathematical accounting  
13 of the flow of money, goods, and services through a region's economy. The  
14 model provides estimates of how a specific economic activity translates into  
15 jobs and income for the region. It includes the ripple effect (also called the  
16 multiplier effect) of changes in economic sectors that may not be directly  
17 impacted by management actions, but are linked to industries that are directly  
18 impacted. In IMPLAN, these ripple effects are termed indirect impacts (for  
19 changes in industries that sell inputs to the industries that are directly impacted)  
20 and induced impacts (for changes in household spending as household income  
21 increases or decreases due to the changes in production).

22 This analysis used IMPLAN 2011; prior to running the model, cost and price  
23 data were converted to a consistent dollar year (2011) using sector-specific  
24 adjustment factors from the IMPLAN model. The values in this appendix are  
25 expressed in year 2011 dollars.

26 The current IMPLAN model has 440 economic sectors, of which 241 are  
27 represented in the Primary and 293 are represented in the Secondary  
28 Socioeconomic Study Area counties. This analysis involved direct changes in  
29 economic activity for 33 IMPLAN economic sectors, as well as changes in all  
30 other related sectors due to the ripple effect. The IMPLAN production  
31 coefficients were modified to reflect the interaction of producing sectors in the  
32 Primary and Secondary Socioeconomic Study Areas. As a result, the calibrated  
33 model does a better job of generating multipliers and the subsequent impacts  
34 that reflect the interaction between and among the sectors in the Primary and  
35 Secondary Socioeconomic Study Areas compared to a model using unadjusted  
36 national coefficients. Key variables used in the IMPLAN model were filled in  
37 using data specific to the Primary and Secondary Socioeconomic Study Areas,  
38 including employment estimates, labor earnings, and total industry output.

39 The trade data available in the current version of IMPLAN (Version 3.0) make it  
40 possible to do multi-region analysis to track how an impact on any of the  
41 IMPLAN sectors in the study area affects production in any of the sectors in any  
42 other region of the US. For this analysis, this feature allowed the estimation of

1 how an impact in the primary study area disperses into the secondary study  
2 area, and how these effects in the secondary study area create additional local  
3 effects in the primary study area. As a result, it was possible to estimate not  
4 only the jobs and income generation in the primary study area, but to also  
5 estimate how the economic activity in the primary study area affected jobs and  
6 income generation in the secondary study area.

### 7 **Livestock Grazing**

8 Economic impacts from changes to livestock grazing are a function of the  
9 amount of forage available and the economic value of forage.

10 Forage availability was measured in Animal Unit Months (AUMs), with one AUM  
11 defined as the amount of forage needed to feed a cow, one horse, or five sheep  
12 for one month. For Forest Service data, measurements in AUMs were also  
13 obtained. Data were obtained from the BLM's Rangeland Administration System  
14 (BLM 2012) and from the Forest Service's INFRA range module (Forest Service  
15 2013). Two types of AUM measures were used: Active AUMs and Billed AUMs.  
16 Active AUMs measure the amount of forage from land available for grazing. The  
17 Forest Service designates this measure "permitted" AUMs. Billed AUMs  
18 measure the amount of forage that the BLM and Forest Service bill for annually.  
19 The Forest Service uses the designation "authorized" AUMs. Impacts were  
20 estimated for the range between billed and active AUMs. Data were typically for  
21 2011, except active AUMs on the Routt National Forest, for which 2013 data  
22 was used.

23 Forage availability was estimated for Alternatives A and C, where Alternative A  
24 used the current data (obtained as explained above), and where Alternative C  
25 discounted that data to remove all AUMs in GRSG habitat (all designated habitat  
26 [ADH]). The estimate of the share of AUMs in GRSG habitat was based on  
27 comparing 336,951 currently permitted AUMs in ADH (per **Chapter 4**,  
28 **Environmental Consequences, Section 4.13**, Range Management) with total  
29 active AUMs obtained as explained above (476,652)<sup>1</sup>. This generated a factor of  
30 70.69 percent of AUMs in GRSG habitat. This factor was used to discount billed  
31 and active AUMs, as shown in **Table M.11**, Estimated Animal Unit Months,  
32 below. AUMs are distinguished between sheep AUMs and cattle and other  
33 animals to allow different valuation of forage, as explained further below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because permitted AUMs include active and suspended AUMs (in BLM terminology), this comparison of total active AUMs with ADH permitted AUMs may overestimate the loss of AUMs under Alternative C.

**Table M.11**  
**Estimated Annual Animal Unit Months**

Item	Alternative A					
	Active			Billed		
	Cattle and Other	Sheep	Total	Cattle and Other	Sheep	Total
Initial AUMs (Alternative A)	388,346	88,306	476,652	266,842	60,070	326,912
Share in ADH	70.69%	70.69%	70.69%	70.69%	70.69%	70.69%
AUMs in ADH	274,527	62,424	336,951	188,634	42,464	231,098
AUMs not in ADH (Alternative C)	113,820	25,881	139,701	78,208	17,606	95,814

Sources: Calculated based on data from BLM 2012, Forest Service 2013, and share of AUMs in ADH from **Chapter 4**, Environmental Consequences, **Section 4.13**, Range Management.

The economic value of forage is estimated based on the value of production associated with the forage. Values for cattle and sheep are estimated separately, with the value of forage for other animals considered equivalent to the value for cattle.

Due to price fluctuations, average per-AUM values for cattle and sheep are based on the 2002 to 2011 average value of production estimates from the (US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service 2012). The value for cattle is \$51.19 per AUM, and the value for sheep is \$58.01 per AUM in the Primary Socioeconomic Study Area (in 2011 dollars). Including indirect and induced impacts, the value of one AUM in the Primary Socioeconomic Study Area for cattle is \$105.97 and for sheep is \$132.61 (in 2011 dollars). **Table M.12**, Assumptions for Analysis of Impacts on Output for Livestock Grazing, shows the economic impact assumptions for cattle and sheep. The direct economic impact is the estimated change in livestock output per AUM; IMPLAN generates the indirect and induced impacts.

**Table M.12**  
**Assumptions for Analysis of Impacts on Output for Livestock Grazing**

Economic Impact	Primary Study Area	Primary and Secondary Study Area
<b>Cattle</b>		
Direct Economic Impact (\$/AUM)	\$51.19	\$51.19
Indirect Economic Impact (\$/AUM) <sup>1</sup>	\$45.51	\$45.69
Induced Economic Impact (\$/AUM) <sup>2</sup>	\$9.26	\$9.34
Total Economic Impact (\$/AUM)	\$105.97	\$106.21
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	2.07	2.07
<b>Sheep</b>		
Direct Economic Impact (\$/AUM)	\$58.01	\$58.01
Indirect Economic Impact (\$/AUM) <sup>1</sup>	\$60.89	\$61.22
Induced Economic Impact (\$/AUM) <sup>2</sup>	\$13.71	\$13.82

**Table M.12**  
**Assumptions for Analysis of Impacts on Output for Livestock Grazing**

<b>Economic Impact</b>	<b>Primary Study Area</b>	<b>Primary and Secondary Study Area</b>
Total Economic Impact (\$/AUM)	\$132.61	\$133.05
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	2.29	2.29

Note: All dollar values are in 2011 dollars.

<sup>1</sup> Indirect impacts reflect increased demand in sectors that directly or indirectly provide supplies to the livestock industry.

<sup>2</sup> Induced impacts reflect increased demand in the consumer and government sectors.

1

2

3

4

**Table M.13**, Assumptions for Analysis of Employment Impacts for Livestock Grazing, provides a summary of the employment impacts that would result, according to IMPLAN, based on unit changes in livestock AUMs.

**Table M.13**  
**Assumptions for Analysis of Employment Impacts for Livestock Grazing**

<b>Employment Impact</b>	<b>Primary Study Area</b>	<b>Primary and Secondary Study Area</b>
<b>Cattle</b>		
Direct Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.000559	0.000559
Indirect Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.000466	0.000466
Induced Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.000077	0.000077
Total Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.001101	0.001101
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	1.97	1.97
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$34,465	\$34,512
<b>Sheep</b>		
Direct Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.000980	0.000980
Indirect Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.001091	0.001091
Induced Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.000116	0.000116
Total Employment (Jobs/1,000 AUMs)	0.002187	0.002187
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	2.23	2.23
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$18,732	\$18,769

Note: Direct, indirect, and induced employment impacts and average earnings per job are calculated using IMPLAN.

5

6

### Recreation

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Economic impacts from recreation are a function of visits to recreation areas and expenditures per visit. Average annual visits were estimated over a 20-year period (2015 to 2034) under each alternative for the primary study area. To do this, first, visits per field office or National Forest were obtained for the latest date available (Fiscal Year 2011 for field offices and Fiscal Year 2007 for the Routt National Forest), as shown in **Table 3-87**, Estimated Number of Annual Visits by Field Office and National Forest, of **Chapter 3, Section 3.24**, Social and Economic Conditions (Including Environmental Justice).

1 Second, projected growth rates were estimated for broad types of recreational  
2 activity (e.g., camping, fishing, and pleasure driving), based on current recreation  
3 visitor days (RVDs), recent growth rates, and projected trends. Estimates of  
4 current RVDs were based on data from the BLM's Recreation Management  
5 Information System and the Forest Service's National Visitor Use Monitoring  
6 (Round 2) for the latest year available. Recent growth rates were obtained for  
7 the Rocky Mountain Region from Bowker et al. (1999).

8 Third, BLM and Forest Service recreational specialists projected changes in  
9 growth rates or initial shifts in RVDs under each action alternative, based on  
10 knowledge of local recreational facilities and on management actions under each  
11 alternative. The resulting projections were then broken down by local and  
12 nonlocal, day and overnight trips, for each broad recreational category, based  
13 on the BLM's and Forest Service's recreational specialists' knowledge of local  
14 recreational activities.

15 Only the share of nonlocal RVDs was considered in the impact analysis. This  
16 was based on the assumption that expenditures of residents of the primary  
17 study area would occur in the region regardless of the BLM's or Forest Service's  
18 actions that impact recreational opportunities; however, changes in nonresident  
19 recreation patterns would alter the amount of money entering the primary  
20 study area. Information on the origin of visitors to recreational areas is typically  
21 not available. The BLM and Forest Service estimated instead that the share of  
22 visitors (participants) that would have come from over 60 miles away from the  
23 recreational area destination, based on the local knowledge of BLM and Forest  
24 Service recreational experts. The resulting impact should therefore be thought  
25 of as an upper bound, given that the estimated share of nonlocal visitors may  
26 still include some residents from the primary study area.

27 Fourth, projected RVDs by nonlocals per alternative were used to estimate  
28 visits by nonlocals per alternative by applying the ratio of visits to RVDs, by field  
29 office or National Forest.

30 **Table M.14**, Estimated Nonlocal Visits, Average Annual (2015–2034), shows  
31 the estimated nonlocal average annual visits over the 20-year period by  
32 alternative.

33 Expenditures per party per trip by type of expenditure (e.g., restaurants,  
34 groceries, camping, and motels) were obtained from White and Gooding (2012).  
35 Based on these expenditures and average party size, expenditures per visit per  
36 person were estimated. The individual sector price indices from the IMPLAN  
37 database were used to bring estimated expenditures to 2011 dollars, and each  
38 type of expenditure was allocated to an IMPLAN sector. IMPLAN was then used  
39 to generate output, employment, and earnings multipliers per million dollars of  
40 expenditures. These multipliers were then applied to the estimated visits by  
41 alternative to obtain the resulting impacts.

**Table M.14**  
**Estimated Nonlocal Visits, Average Annual (2015–2034)**

	<b>Nonlocal Day</b>	<b>Nonlocal Overnight</b>	<b>Total Nonlocal</b>
<b>Alternative A</b>			
BLM	339,247	1,336,212	1,675,459
Forest Service	107,371	876,446	983,817
Total	446,618	2,212,658	2,659,276
<b>Alternative B</b>			
BLM	331,374	1,318,099	1,649,473
Forest Service	104,315	853,836	958,152
Total	435,690	2,171,935	2,607,625
<b>Alternative C</b>			
BLM	325,782	1,299,593	1,625,375
Forest Service	101,361	825,505	926,866
Total	427,143	2,125,098	2,552,241
<b>Alternative D</b>			
BLM	336,846	1,332,419	1,669,265
Forest Service	106,956	874,970	981,927
Total	443,803	2,207,389	2,651,192

Source: Calculated based on Recreation Management Information System, National Visitor Use Monitoring, and Bowker et. al (1999), as described in the text.

The estimates for average expenditure per visit, in 2011 dollars, are \$25.45 for nonlocal day trips and \$146.58 for nonlocal overnight trips. **Table M.15**, Assumptions for Analysis of Impacts on Output for Recreation Activities, shows the direct, indirect, and induced output per visit in 2011 dollars.

**Table M.15**  
**Assumptions for Analysis of Impacts on Output for Recreation Activities**

<b>Economic Impact</b>	<b>Primary Study Area</b>	<b>Primary and Secondary Study Area</b>
<b>Nonlocal Day Trip</b>		
Direct Economic Impact <sup>1</sup>	\$25.45	\$25.45
Indirect Economic Impact <sup>2</sup>	\$2.66	\$3.85
Induced Economic Impact <sup>3</sup>	\$4.73	\$4.96
Total Economic Impact	\$32.84	\$34.26
Multiplier (total impact/direct impact)	1.29	1.35
<b>Nonlocal Overnight Trip</b>		
Direct Economic Impact <sup>1</sup>	\$146.58	\$146.58
Indirect Economic Impact <sup>2</sup>	\$28.59	\$28.85
Induced Economic Impact <sup>3</sup>	\$33.97	\$34.25
Total Economic Impact	\$209.14	\$209.67
Multiplier (total impact/direct impact)	1.43	1.43

Notes: Overnight expenditures are the simple average of expenditures on and off National Forest System lands. Details may not add to total due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Direct economic impact is the average expenditure per visit.

<sup>2</sup>Indirect impacts from IMPLAN reflect increased demand in sectors that directly or indirectly provide support for the recreation industry.

<sup>3</sup>Induced impacts from IMPLAN reflect increased demand in the consumer and government sectors.

**Table M.16**, Assumptions for Employment Impact Analysis for Recreation Activities, provides a summary of employment impacts according to IMPLAN results, based on unit changes in the number of visits.

**Table M.16**  
**Assumptions for Employment Impact Analysis for Recreation Activities**

Employment Impact (annual number of jobs per visit)	Primary Study Area	Primary and Secondary Study Area
<i>Nonlocal Day Trip</i>		
Direct Employment	0.000193	0.000186
Indirect Employment	0.000023	0.000033
Induced Employment	0.000041	0.000043
Total Employment	0.000257	0.000262
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	1.33	1.41
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$34,366	\$35,432
<i>Nonlocal Overnight Trip</i>		
Direct Employment	0.001281	0.001281
Indirect Employment	0.000254	0.000254
Induced Employment	0.000293	0.000293
Total Employment	0.001828	0.001828
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	1.43	1.43
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$34,792	\$34,871

Note: Direct, indirect, and induced employment impact and average earnings per job are calculated using IMPLAN.

### Oil and Gas

The economic impact of oil and gas reflects drilling, completion, and production activities. Estimation of drilling, completion, and production activities was done for a 20-year period (2015 to 2034).

The number of wells drilled and the number of wells completed under the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) were based on the average number of wells expected to be drilled or completed per year in each BLM field office's current Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenario. Typically, a 95-percent completion rate was assumed (with the exception of wells drilled in the LSFO planning area, where the assumed rate was 80 percent). Drilling and completion numbers were estimated for federal surface, as well as for all surface ownership.

The BLM oil and gas specialists estimated the share of oil and gas that would intersect with GRSG ADH and PPH using GIS. Surface acres were classified as high, medium, or low potential for oil and gas based on the available geological information. The number of wells projected to be drilled and completed that would intersect with GRSG ADH or PPH was projected based on the expected presence of wells in areas of high, medium, or low oil and gas potential (according to Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenarios and currently available information) and the intersection of high, medium, and low oil and gas potential areas with GRSG habitat.

The number of wells completed or drilled that would be affected by each alternative is the number that intersects with ADH or PPH, as appropriate for each alternative:

- Alternative A – Existing areas would be available for fluid mineral leasing
- Alternative B – All PPH would be closed to fluid mineral leasing
- Alternative C – All ADH would be closed to fluid mineral leasing
- Alternative D – All PPH would be NSO for fluid mineral leasing

In the case of Alternative D, due to the lack of information on the extent to which horizontal drilling would allow reaching oil and gas under surface lands closed to exploration, a mid-range estimate between Alternatives A and B is presented to allow for comparison among alternatives of the potential estimate of impacts on output, employment, and earnings, when added to the impacts of other resource areas.

**Table M.17**, Oil and Gas Well Numbers, presents the total number of wells drilled and completed in the Primary Socioeconomic Study Area for each alternative.

**Table M.17  
Oil and Gas Well Numbers**

Item	Primary Study Area
<b>Federal Surface</b>	
Alternative A – Wells Drilled	18,225
Alternative A – Wells Completed	17,068
Alternative B – Wells Drilled	16,417
Alternative B – Wells Completed	15,465
Alternative C – Wells Drilled	12,889
Alternative C – Wells Completed	12,182
Alternative D – Wells Drilled	17,321
Alternative D – Wells Completed	16,267
<b>Federal, State, and Fee Surface</b>	
Alternative A – Wells Drilled	37,013
Alternative A – Wells Completed	34,694
Alternative B – Wells Drilled	35,205
Alternative B – Wells Completed	33,091
Alternative C – Wells Drilled	31,677
Alternative C – Wells Completed	28,704
Alternative D – Wells Drilled	36,109
Alternative D – Wells Completed	33,893

Sources: Elaborated by BLM staff based on field office Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenarios and available information

The production per new well was assumed based on the typical production of existing wells in the area. A linear decline in production of each new well was assumed at a 5-percent rate (20-year life for each well). Wells were assumed to start production on January 1 of each year of completion. Total oil and gas production under Alternative A was based on multiplying production per well and the number of wells drilled and completed (estimated as described above). Oil and gas production of existing wells was not included because they would not be affected by GRSG habitat management alternatives<sup>1</sup>. The production that would be affected by each alternative is proportional to the share of wells affected by GRSG habitat, whether ADH or PPH, as appropriate for each alternative. **Table M.18**, Projected Oil and Gas Production, 20-Year Period, presents the projected quantity of oil and gas over the 20-year forecast period on federal surface and on federal, state, and fee surface.

**Table M.18**  
**Projected Oil and Gas Production, 20-Year Period**

Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D	
Gas (BCF)	Oil (MMBO)	Gas (BCF)	Oil (MMBO)	Gas (BCF)	Oil (MMBO)	Gas (BCF)	Oil (MMBO)
<i>Federal Surface</i>							
52,650	17,424	38,994	15,702	27,069	12,478	45,822	16,563
<i>Federal, State, and Fee Surface</i>							
96,211	36,108	82,556	34,386	70,631	31,162	89,384	35,247

Sources: Elaborated by BLM staff based on field office Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenarios and available information

BCF = billion cubic feet; MMBO = million barrels

The costs of drilling and completing wells and producing oil and gas also are relevant for the economic impact analysis. Cost of completion or drilling per well were obtained from 2009 data available for Southwest Wyoming.<sup>2</sup> Price indices from the IMPLAN database were used to bring estimated expenditures to 2011 dollars. IMPLAN was then used to generate output, employment, and earnings multipliers per million dollars of expenditures. These multipliers were then applied to the estimated expenditures with drilling and completion by alternative to obtain the resulting impacts. **Table M.19**, Assumptions for Analysis of Economic Impacts for Oil and Gas Well Drilling and Completion, provides a summary of the costs of drilling and completion used for the economic analysis.

<sup>1</sup> New wells in existing leases would also not be affected. The current estimates may, therefore, overestimate the impacts of the action alternatives.

<sup>2</sup> Amendment 6 – Resource Management Plans in Support of Wyoming Sage Grouse Policy Project for BLM.

1 **Table M.19**  
 2 **Assumptions for Analysis of Economic Impacts for Oil and Gas Well Drilling and**  
 3 **Completion**

Economic Impact	Primary Study Area	Primary and Secondary Study Area
<b>Drilling Impacts</b>		
Total Drilling Costs	\$1,508,072	\$1,508,072
Total Local Drilling Costs <sup>1</sup>	\$1,342,184	\$1,342,184
Local Direct Impact (\$/well)	\$1,342,184	\$1,342,184
Local Indirect Impact (\$/well)	\$304,672	\$309,819
Local Induced Impact (\$/well)	\$412,742	\$416,457
Local Total Impact (\$/well) <sup>2</sup>	\$2,059,598	\$2,068,459
Multiplier (total impact/direct impact)	1.53	1.54
<b>Completion Impacts</b>		
Total Completion Costs	\$1,191,260	\$1,191,260
Total Local Completion Costs <sup>1</sup>	\$736,199	\$736,199
Local Direct Impact (\$/well)	\$736,199	\$736,199
Local Indirect Impact (\$/well)	\$191,775	\$194,748
Local Induced Impact (\$/well)	\$233,518	\$235,675
Local Total Impact (\$/well) <sup>2</sup>	\$1,161,492	\$1,166,621
Multiplier (total impact/direct impact)	1.58	1.58

Source: Drilling and completion costs (the first row in each part of the table) are from Amendment 6 – Resource Management Plans in Support of Wyoming Sage Grouse Policy Project for BLM. Remaining data is from IMPLAN, as described in the text.

<sup>1</sup>The local cost shares were based on the percent of total drilling or completion costs that would be spent on goods and services purchased from the local economy, assuming similar local shares to those estimated for Southwest Wyoming in the source document.

<sup>2</sup>Total impacts estimated using IMPLAN include direct, indirect, and induced impacts.

4  
 5 **Table M.20**, Assumptions for Analysis of Economic Impacts on Output for Oil  
 6 and Gas Production, provides the assumptions used to determine the economic  
 7 impact associated with the production of oil and gas. For the analysis, the BLM  
 8 estimated a nonlabor production cost (for gas) of \$1.51 per thousand cubic feet  
 9 and \$7.44 per barrel of oil, in year 2011 dollars, based on data from the Energy  
 10 Information Administration for the Rocky Mountain Region (Energy Information  
 11 Administration 2013).

12 The forecasted number of wells and production used for estimating employment  
 13 impacts is the same as for estimating impacts on labor earnings and output.  
 14 **Table M.21**, Assumptions for Employment Impact Analysis for Oil and Gas  
 15 Well Drilling and Completion, shows the direct and total employment impacts  
 16 attributable to drilling and completion.

17 **Table M.22**, Assumptions for Employment Impact Analysis for Oil and Gas  
 18 Production, shows the direct and total employment impacts associated with  
 19 production.

1  
2 **Table M.20**  
**Assumptions for Analysis of Economic Impacts on Output for Oil and Gas Production**

<b>Economic Impact</b>	<b>Primary Study Area</b>	<b>Primary and Secondary Study Area</b>
<b><i>Oil Production (per million barrels)</i></b>		
Direct Economic Impact <sup>1</sup>	\$88,260 <sup>2</sup>	\$88,260 <sup>3</sup>
Indirect Economic Impact <sup>4</sup>	\$15,246	\$15,423
Induced Economic Impact <sup>5</sup>	\$4,554	\$4,613
Total Economic Impact	\$108,061	\$108,296
Multiplier (total impact/direct impact)	1.22	1.23
<b><i>Gas Production (per million cubic feet)</i></b>		
Direct Economic Impact <sup>1</sup>	\$3,960.00	\$3,960.00
Indirect Economic Impact <sup>4</sup>	\$684.07	\$691.97
Induced Economic Impact <sup>5</sup>	\$204.33	\$206.98
Total Economic Impact	\$4,848.40	\$4,858.95
Multiplier (total impact/direct impact)	1.22	1.23

Note: All dollar values are in year 2011 dollars.

<sup>1</sup>Direct economic impact is the market value of output.

<sup>2</sup>Based on an oil price of \$88.26 per barrel, which is the 2011 Colorado Crude Oil First Purchase Price reported by the US Energy Information Administration (2013).

<sup>3</sup>Based on a gas price of \$3.96 per thousand cubic feet, which is the 2010 Colorado Natural Gas Wellhead Price reported by the US Energy Information Administration (2013).

<sup>4</sup>Indirect impacts from IMPLAN reflect increased demand in sectors that directly or indirectly provide supplies to the oil and gas industry.

<sup>5</sup>Induced impacts from IMPLAN reflect increased demand in the consumer sectors.

3

**Table M.21**  
**Assumptions for Employment Impact Analysis for Oil and Gas Well Drilling and Completion**

<b>Employment Impact</b>	<b>Primary Study Area</b>	<b>Primary and Secondary Study Area</b>
<b><i>Drilling Impacts</i></b>		
Direct Employment (jobs/well)	7.1	7.1
Indirect Employment (jobs/well)	2.5	2.5
Induced Employment (jobs/well)	3.5	3.6
Total Employment Impact (jobs/well)	13.1	13.2
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	1.85	1.86
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$58,638	\$58,573
<b><i>Completion Impacts</i></b>		
Direct Employment (jobs/well)	4.6	4.6
Indirect Employment (jobs/well)	1.6	1.6
Induced Employment (jobs/well)	2.0	2.0
Total Employment Impact (jobs/well)	8.2	8.2
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	1.79	1.79
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$53,015	\$52,973

Note: Direct and total employment impact and average earnings per job are calculated using IMPLAN.

4

1 **Table M.22**  
2 **Assumptions for Employment Impact Analysis for Oil and Gas Production**

<b>Employment Impact (annual number of jobs per thousand barrels or million cubic feet)</b>	<b>Primary Study Area</b>	<b>Primary and Secondary Study Area</b>
<b>Oil Production (per thousand barrels)</b>		
Direct Employment	0.017475	0.017475
Indirect Employment	0.101764	0.102558
Induced Employment	0.039011	0.039540
Total Employment	0.158250	0.159574
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	9.06	9.13
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$53,016	\$52,958
<b>Gas Production (per million cubic feet)</b>		
Direct Employment	0.000784	0.000784
Indirect Employment	0.004566	0.004602
Induced Employment	0.001750	0.001774
Total Employment	0.007100	0.007160
Multiplier (Total Impact/Direct Impact)	9.06	9.13
Average Earnings per Job (2011 dollars)	\$53,016	\$52,958

Note: Direct, indirect, and induced employment impact and average earnings per job are calculated using IMPLAN.

3  
4 The analysis of potential changes in tax revenues is based on tax rates of 12.5  
5 percent of taxable value for federal mineral royalties and 5 percent of taxable  
6 value for state severance taxes (Colorado severance tax rates depend on  
7 production value but are 5 percent for production valued over \$300.00).  
8 Taxable value was assumed to be 87.5 percent of value of sales based on a  
9 report from the Colorado Oil and Gas Association (Colorado Oil and Gas  
10 Association 2011). **Table M.23**, Tax Collections from Oil and Gas Production  
11 over 20-Year Period, 2011 \$, shows calculations of tax collection from oil and  
12 gas production over a 20-year period.

**Table M.23**  
**Tax Collections from Oil and Gas Production Averaged Annually over 20-Year Period,**  
**2011 \$**

	<b>Alternative A</b>		<b>Alternative B</b>		<b>Alternative C</b>		<b>Alternative D</b>	
	<b>Gas (MMCF)</b>	<b>Oil (MBO)</b>	<b>Gas (MMCF)</b>	<b>Oil (MBO)</b>	<b>Gas (MMCF)</b>	<b>Oil (MBO)</b>	<b>Gas (MMCF)</b>	<b>Oil (MBO)</b>
Total production	52,650	17,424	38,994	15,702	27,069	12,478	45,822	16,563
Prices	\$3.96	\$88.26	\$3.96	\$88.26	\$3.96	\$88.26	\$3.96	\$88.26
Assessed valuation	87.5%	87.5%	87.5%	87.5%	87.5%	87.5%	87.5%	87.5%
Assessed value	\$182,431	\$1,345,630	\$135,115	\$1,212,615	\$93,794	\$963,651	\$158,773	\$1,279,122
Federal royalties rate	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
Federal royalty tax	\$22,804	\$168,204	\$16,889	\$151,577	\$11,724	\$120,456	\$19,847	\$159,890

**Table M.23**  
**Tax Collections from Oil and Gas Production Averaged Annually over 20-Year Period,**  
**2011 \$**

	Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D	
	Gas (MMCF)	Oil (MBO)	Gas (MMCF)	Oil (MBO)	Gas (MMCF)	Oil (MBO)	Gas (MMCF)	Oil (MBO)
State severance rate	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
State severance tax	\$9,122	\$67,281	\$6,756	\$60,631	\$4,690	\$48,183	\$7,939	\$63,956
Total taxes	\$31,925	\$235,485	\$23,645	\$212,208	\$16,414	\$168,639	\$27,785	\$223,846
Annual average taxes	\$1,596	\$11,774	\$1,182	\$10,610	\$821	\$8,432	\$1,389	\$11,192

1 Source: Production volumes elaborated by BLM staff based on field office Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenarios and  
2 available information. Prices are from Energy Information Administration (2013). Assessed valuation percentage is from  
3 Colorado Oil and Gas Association (2011).  
4 MMCF = million cubic feet; MBO = thousand barrels  
5

### 6 References

7 BLM (United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management).  
8 2012. Data from BLM Rangeland Administration System.

9 Bowker, J. M., D. B. K. English, and H. K. Cordell. 1999. Projections of Outdoor  
10 Recreation Participation to 2050. *In* Outdoor Recreation in American  
11 Life: A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends (ed. H. K.  
12 Cordell). Sagamore Publishing.

13 Colorado Oil and Gas Association. 2011. COGA/Colorado Oil and Gas  
14 Industry Tax Whitepaper. Denver, CO. Internet Web site:  
15 [http://www.coga.org/pdfs\\_policy/Oil%20&%20Gas%20Industry%20Tax%  
16 20White%20Paper.pdf](http://www.coga.org/pdfs_policy/Oil%20&%20Gas%20Industry%20Tax%20White%20Paper.pdf).

17 US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 2012. Commodity  
18 Costs and Returns. Internet Web site: [http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-  
19 products/commodity-costs-and-returns.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/commodity-costs-and-returns.aspx). Accessed in August 2012.

20 US Energy Information Administration. 2011. Petroleum and Other Liquids;  
21 Natural Gas. Internet Web site: [www.eia.gov](http://www.eia.gov).

22 \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. Oil and Gas Lease Equipment and Operating Costs 1994 through  
23 2009. Internet Web site:  
24 [http://www.eia.gov/pub/oil\\_gas/natural\\_gas/data\\_publications/cost\\_indic  
25 es\\_equipment\\_production/current/coststudy.html](http://www.eia.gov/pub/oil_gas/natural_gas/data_publications/cost_indic). Accessed on March  
26 15, 2013.

1 US Forest Service (United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service).  
2 2013. Routt National Forest Permitted and Authorized AUMs. Data  
3 provided in personal communication from Chris Miller, US Forest  
4 Service, February 2013.

5 White, E. M., and D. Gooding. 2012. Estimation of National Forest Visitor  
6 Spending Averages from National Visitor Use Monitoring Round 2. Gen.  
7 Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXX. Portland, OR: US Department of  
8 Agriculture, Forest Service. Pacific Northwest Research Station. 98  
9 pages.

10

I

This page intentionally left blank.