

Summary of Feedback on the Coconino NF Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Recreation	1
Land Exchanges	9
Watersheds	10
Economics	12
Wildlife	30
Grazing	32
General	34

Recreation

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

1. According to the assessment, citing the NVUM, “the five main activities drawing visitors to the Coconino National Forest were hiking/walking (40.5 percent of participants), viewing natural features (21.2 percent of participants), relaxing (8.2 percent of participants), driving for pleasure (6.9 percent of participants), and downhill skiing (5.3 percent of participants). These percentages may be accurate, but seem to exclude other available information that would place OHV recreation and mountain bicycling in this “Top- 5” category.

Response

While we recognize that mountain biking and off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation are growing uses on the Coconino NF, they were not reported as the main activities drawing visitors to the Coconino National Forest in the NVUM (National Visitor Use Monitoring Study) (pg. 82 Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment). Any other information about other recreational studies cannot be combined into the NVUM results, as methodology and sample size would differ.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

2. An Outdoor Industry Association survey in 2003 (maybe 2004?) counted Arizona as the fourth state in the nation when ranked by per capita participation in mountain biking. This same survey found that over 940,000 people in the state, accounting for roughly 24% of the state population at the time, claimed to have “ridden a bicycle on a single-track trail.” These figures, coupled with two nationally known mountain biking destinations on the Coconino National Forest (CNF), Flagstaff, and Sedona, seem to suggest that mountain bicycling on the CNF would account for at least more than the 5.3% attributed to downhill skiing.

None of this takes into account the fact that downhill skiing is at best seasonal on this Forest, and often cannot occur in a given year for lack of snow whereas mountain biking is a four-season sport on the CNF. It is important to note that within Coconino and Yavapai counties, almost all of the opportunities for riding a bicycle on a single track trail occur on the National Forests. These numbers seem to contradict the percentages put forth by the NVUM survey. This information supports a need for a focus on mountain bike trails on the new Forest Plan.

Response

NVUM is an approved Forest Service study that attempted to focus recreation use down to a Forest Level. It is the best available data for the Coconino National Forest. Other National or State surveys do not provide Forest-specific data, and we cannot scientifically extrapolate data from these surveys and apply it to the Coconino NF. Mountain biking is an important recreational use on the Coconino NF, and the need for direction in the revised forest plan for this use has been added to the Economic and Social Sustainability report.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

3. The Assessment contains directly conflicting information on OHV use and demand for opportunities for this activity. The document notes that there were 2.36 million days of OHV recreation within Coconino and Yavapai Counties. It also states that there were 3.25 million total visits to the Coconino National Forest. If we somewhat arbitrarily assume that a third to a half, or 790,000 to 1.18 million, of those OHV days were on the Coconino National Forest that puts OHV use at 24%-36% of visits to the CNF. The third to half estimate, although not based in any particularly sound specific data, is not unreasonable. There is virtually nowhere but Forest land on which to recreate with an OHV in northern Arizona, so most OHV recreation days will occur on one of the three National Forests that overlap Coconino and Yavapai counties.

Other data supports the above assumptions. The Arizona Game and Fish website states that, “twenty percent of adult Arizonans identify themselves as motorized trail users.” Based on 2006 U.S. Census predictions, that calculates to 907,682 adults that use motorized vehicles on trails. Given the Assessment’s assertions to the effect that Northern Arizona is a destination for people from the Phoenix Metropolitan Area to recreate outdoors in the hot summer months; these numbers seem to support the basis for the above-mentioned assertions.

Response

The study stating that Coconino County received 2.3 million days of OHV recreation is a completely different study than the NVUM study that states that there were 3.25 million visits to the Coconino NF. The scope of the studies was different, and the sample sizes and methods were different as well. One focuses on County use and the other focuses on Coconino NF use. Therefore, you cannot compare the two. Other National or State

surveys are not Forest-specific, so we cannot credibly extrapolate data from these surveys and apply it to the Coconino NF. However, we included the County data to show that OHV use is a popular recreational activity and indicate that management direction is needed in the Revised Forest Plan.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

4. Some of my concerns stem from the fact that since there are very few motorized trail heads, this use tends to be more widely dispersed than activities like hiking, which have numerous, Forest Service developed trailheads. Because of this, the NVUM data is bound to be skewed, as typically a Forest Service survey would be based at a developed trailhead, rather than on an unclassified trail or unmarked parking area. The resulting data would not accurately reflect actual Forest use trends.

Response

NVUM is an approved Forest Service protocol that attempted to gauge recreation use at the Forest Level. The limitations in the survey protocol are known by the Forest. Sampling for the NVUM study was done at a myriad of places such as; roads at point of entry or exit, developed recreation sites, hotels and lodges, rest areas and scenic pullouts, and trailheads. Trailheads were only one of the sites for sampling in NVUM. For more information on NVUM protocol please go to <http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/>. For the Forest Plan Revision process, a variety of sources, such as Forest resource managers' professional judgments, will be used, and no topics will be decided by one study. We are aware that motorized use is increasing, and we have acknowledged it in the Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

5. It is also important to note that a recent Coconino Trail Riders [CTR] meeting at which Jennifer Kevil of the Forest Plan Revision Team presented info and took feedback was attended by in excess of 50 OHV users. Two hundred OHV enthusiasts attended another CTR meeting, at which Jim Beard, Landscape Architect for the CNF, and Joe Stringer, Deputy Forest Supervisor, presented information and obtained feedback on the Travel Management Rule. All of these numbers would tend to support the need for OHV trail opportunities on the CNF.

Response

Meeting notes and comments were collected at all of these meetings and we appreciated the feedback. OHV recreational use is recognized and will be considered during Forest Plan Revision.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

6. The Assessment seems to defer the establishment of motorized recreation opportunities to the implementation of the National Travel Management

Rule (TMR) in 2009. Based upon numerous discussions I have had with the Forest Supervisor and her staff, most likely very few, if any, of the unclassified motorized trails will be included in the system as part of the TMR. There are only 24.5 miles of system, motorized trails on the CNF, and classified road miles open to the public are slated for severe reductions to say nothing of the elimination of unclassified roads. Even if many of the more well known unclassified motorized trails were to be adopted as part of the TMR implementation, the demand for legitimate, managed motorized trails would be essentially unmet. Most motorized users are currently using roads and trails which will be closed upon implementation of the TMR, thereby dramatically reducing opportunities for this form of recreation. The backlash from this will be overwhelming, to say the least. The Coconino National Forest, for reasons not entirely of its own making, has to date failed to provide an adequate number of managed motorized trails and is unable to provide adequate facilities for motorized recreation before the 2009 TMR implementation date due to the overwhelming amount of survey work that would be required by NEPA to do so. Because of this, it is imperative that the new Forest Plan call for developing adequate planned and managed opportunities to replace the unmanaged opportunities that will be lost upon closure in 2009.

Response

The implementation of the 2005 Travel Management Rule will determine the initial motorized trail system on the Forest. This process is running concurrent to Forest Plan Revision. When the process is finished and the final routes are chosen, the Forest Plan will be amended to be consistent with the TMR decision. The idea that demand will likely exceed the trail system identified by TMR has been added to the Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment. The Forest recognizes that OHV use is a popular recreational use and that management components are needed in the Revised Forest Plan.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

7. There seems to be a prevailing focus in the Assessment on the increased recreational usage on the CNF and the impacts on primitive and quiet recreation caused by this. Corresponding to this is an apparent lack of focus on the need to provide for legitimate motorized and bicycle recreation planning and implementation. I feel that it is vital to address in this document whether the increases in recreational use are primarily in the “front-country” and urban interface, as my suspicions are that these increases are not significantly affecting the opportunities for quiet and solitude as the Assessment asserts. It is important to note that 8% of the CNF is designated Wilderness. I am a fan of Wilderness, and frequently hike in the Kachina Peaks, Wet Beaver, and West Clear Creek Wildernesses. With the exception of the relatively “front-country” experience in lower Wet Beaver Creek, I rarely if ever see another person or hear a motor. Frankly, on many of my bicycle and motorcycle rides on

well-known and relatively highly used trails outside of Wilderness, I rarely see other people or hear other motors.

Response

The Forest received many comments on the loss of primitive and quiet recreation opportunities. Congressionally designated Wilderness Areas should provide quiet and primitive recreation opportunities as motorized use is not authorized. Many of the public comments on Wilderness Areas revolved around crowding and not motorized use. The Forest also provides primitive recreational opportunities on the Forest outside of Wilderness Areas, and concerns that these opportunities were being lost were expressed, as well. The Coconino NF supports a broad range of recreational uses, and all will be addressed in the Revised Forest Plan.

Feedback by Anthony Quintile (Coconino Trail Riders, Flagstaff Biking Organization)

8. The CNF is a large Forest at 1.8 million acres, and although it is of the utmost importance to be responsible in the administration of the uses that occur on it, it is important to address the recreation needs that are presented in an adequate fashion. It is my observation that the NVUM data and other information in this Assessment are potentially flawed, which may lead to poor decisions being made for prioritization of recreational trails in the new Forest Plan. Failure to prioritize management for these uses will not eliminate these uses; it will only cause disenfranchisement of potential partners in management and dispersed, unmanaged use with unmitigated impacts on the resource.

Response

The Coconino NF supports a broad range of recreational uses and all will be considered in the Revised Forest Plan. Unmanaged recreation is considered one of the Forest Service Chief's four threats and will be considered in Forest Plan Revision.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

9. Although large parts of the report are devoted to documenting how low the income of the assessment area is, and how houses cost too much and jobs are mostly service jobs, there seems to be very little corresponding response to the outcome of those statistics.

The only place that I really see anything is in Table 16 where it says there is a "potential need for the Forest Service to maintain low-cost or free recreational opportunities." Somewhere else it talks about making sure that folks are aware of the availability of fuelwood permits.

This is a critical problem. If the lower income folks who live near the forest cannot access the forest for free, then children are not ever going to gain any sort of outdoor ethic or love of anything other than their TV and computer.

Response

The Assessment was written to determine conditions and trends with the current social and economic environment of the assessment area. Responding with solutions or outcomes was not an objective of the document. The Forest is aware that education and access to the Forest is an important issue.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

10. Look at the document! See how many pages are devoted to talking about managing the forest for a “gentrified” population, and how little of it actually discusses the needs of the population which never has dreamed of going to a ski area. Those that a family’s ski passes for a weekend would buy a month’s worth of food or even pay a month’s rent!
It’s almost as if the statistics are saying one thing, but the document itself is talking about an entirely different situation. On Page 31 it says that 36.3% of the population has incomes below \$25,000, but all the USFS can do for them is offer to sell them fuelwood permits?

As always, the devil is in the details, and while the statistics show that “such and such” a percentage of the population is living in poverty, the actual numbers are no doubt up hugely since that last Plan was written, just as the statistics show that the tribal membership is now a smaller percentage of the population while in fact, the population itself has increased. Either way, one third of the population beats out all of the hunters, or mountain bikers in the whole study area, maybe even both groups combined!

Response

The “gentrified” population is one of many demographic shifts that have taken place in the assessment area. The Forest seeks to provide opportunities to all demographics. The assessment is not intended to find solutions to trends and conditions of demographics, but rather document what they are.

Firewood permits have been available to the public for a nominal fee since the last planning cycle. Every year free use firewood permits are available for specific locations on the Forest. The assessment stated that we should continue the fire wood permits that we currently provide, and not attempt to provide a solution by offering them.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

11. In other places the document seems to be saying that by creating “forest management” jobs, the [U.S. Forest Service] is helping the economy by creating jobs. But my skeptic mind is suspecting that these “forest management” jobs are those created by charging a fee for forest use. Again, this is counterproductive as far as nurturing an ethic of conservation among the local population and especially young people.

Response

The document states that Forest Service expenditures contribute to the economy. This includes all of the jobs that the Forest Service creates, as well as all of the money spent by the Forest Service in the economy. There are no “forest management” jobs that are

created by solely charging a fee for forest use. Any fees collected by the Forest Service at a site must be used for improvements on the site, in addition to staffing. The Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act permits federal land management agencies to continue charging modest fees at campgrounds, rental cabins, high-impact recreation areas and at day-use sites that have certain facilities. There are guidelines about how this money is used in this act. You can find more information on this subject at <http://www.fs.fed.us/passespermits/about-rec-fees.shtml>.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

12. There are 3 recreational uses that aren't mentioned at all in the document, but I think have significant economic impact on the economy, while they have very little impact on the forest. They also require very little in the form of special management by the forest, and perhaps this is why they seem to be so often overlooked. These are XC skiing (NOT at the Nordic Center), snowshoeing, and birding. In the winter, when there is snow on the ground, the first two are going on all the time all over the Forest. But because they do not require anything from the Forest except sometimes parking, and there are no monitors in the Forest counting tracks or doing polls they seem to be overlooked. People are driving here from out of town and doing them, spending money at motels and restaurants just like the downhill skiers do, but they are given no credit. They also are given little peace and quiet which is what they primarily are seeking. (Just to blow another horn here, I sure hope that the Travel Management Plan has been adjusted so that it no longer opens up all of the existing motorized closure areas to snowmobile use by its change in the definition of "motorized vehicles.") If it hasn't then this is a "need for change" in the New Plan. We shouldn't be giving up any ground at all that has thus far been held again the noise of vehicles, especially snowmobiles, which are often the nosiest of all!

Response

Both snowshoeing and cross country skiing are important recreation uses on the forest. The Nordic Center was mentioned in the document. The specific activities of snowshoeing and cross country skiing has been added to the snow play definition. All of these activities fall under recreation in the economic analysis. The 2005 Travel Management Rule will not change the designation of current winter motorized closure areas. The TMR section 261.13 excludes snowmobiles from consideration; a snowmobile remains a motorized vehicle.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

13. Birders are everywhere and deserve to be given a little more credit than just to be lumped in which all the other casual by comparison "wildlife viewers."

According to:

2006 US Fish and Wildlife Service National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation:

- 47.8 million US residents (roughly one in five people) are birders.
- 19.8 million US residents traveled away from home to view birds.

In another study:

David Scott published a survey of American Birding Association members, *An Examination of Activity Preferences and Orientations among Serious Birders*, in March 1997. Over 36% took less than 10 birding trips a year; however, almost 20% reported 41 or more trips, over 16% devoted 81 or more days a year to the activity, and 17% traveled over 10,000 miles the preceding year to go bird watching.

Birders don't ask for much, they often hang out in dumps and sewage lagoons, but the one thing they do need is good wildlife habitat. Too much noise or disturbance by OHVs will drive away the birds, sometimes forever.

I happen to be listed in the phone book under "Birds and Bird Supplies." I know for a fact that people traveling through the state for various and sundry other reasons stop in Flagstaff to look for birds that may not be available to them at home. Because the Coconino has such incredibly diverse habitat, it has an incredibly diverse bird population.

Response

Birding is an important activity that takes place on the Forest. The activity was included in the wildlife watching. This has been clarified in the assessment.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

14. Another group which is not mentioned is equestrians. I know that they may do more damage than birders and XCers, but is it any more than an elk?? Or would it be less if we were encouraged to ride off-trail rather than on that muddy son-of-a-gun.... But anyway, as I mentioned at the meeting, this is an ever-present if not well organized user group that doesn't show up in your study. As it is one which probably has the most conflicts with the mt. bikers I think you need to go out of your way to try to get them involved.

Response

Equestrian recreation users are recognized as an important use on the Coconino NF. Mention of this use has been added to the document.

Feedback by Rick Miller (Arizona Game and Fish Department)

15. Perhaps the most important conclusion that can be drawn from the Coconino National Forest, Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment is that recreation in general is the greatest contribution of the Coconino to the local communities both in terms of economics and social values. As such, we urge the forest to increase the emphasis, attention, staffing, and budget for your recreation program to a level sufficient to

cope with current and future levels of recreation. We believe coping with current and future levels of recreation will require a major increase in your recreation program. Hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching are part of this recreation and the Department [of Game and Fish] looks forward to continuing to work with the Forest where our priorities overlap.

Response

The assessment does conclude that recreation in general is the greatest contribution of the Coconino NF to the local communities both in terms of economics and social values. The revised Forest Plan will include further direction for recreation and the increased demand and growth of all recreational opportunities.

Land Exchanges

Feedback by Bill Eich

16. I feel the commentary on Land Trades, amendment 12 etc. on page 65 is weak and provides little information. I would like to see that expanded covering such issues as just how the municipalities can plan with the Forest, how to handle the interface between municipality and the Forest, use of the Forest adjacent to municipalities, any Open space plans the Municipalities may wish to entertain, just how amendment 12 stands to survive in the overall long run, its chances of extended life in your process, and are amendments like amendment 12 readily acceptable to the Forest. Also more discussion of what amendment 12 and 17 are and the like, probably most readers are uninformed on these issues. There was no mention of items as such as the long enduring plan in Sedona for a National Scenic Area, which I might add is called for in the text of Amendment 12. All these issues are hugely important to the Sedona area which comprises a large population in the Coconino National Forest and thus your future plans are vital to us who live here surrounded by the Forest. It is a fact that visitation is increasing and must be accommodated while protection of the Forest is necessary and highly important to those of us who had committed to live our life here.

Response

The section mentioning Amendment 12 was not meant to list in detail the content of that Amendment. If people would like further clarification on Amendment 12 and Amendment 17 they are available on the Coconino NF website at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/coconino/projects/plan-revision-2006/index.shtml>. Desired conditions of different geographic areas will be addressed in the building of the revised plan. Special area proposals were not included in this assessment and will be addressed in the Comprehensive Evaluation report. The Assessment is not designed to suggest solutions, rather to describe the existing conditions of the socioeconomic environment of the Assessment Area.

Feedback by Mike Raber and Kathy Levin, Dept. of Community Development, City of Sedona

17. "While the start of the paragraph on pg. 65 of the Coconino National Forest's Economic and Social Sustainability Report notes public sentiment against land exchanges near the Sedona and Village of Oak Creek communities, the subsequent statement that there is a segment of the public who want to carry the land exchange restriction around Sedona/Oak Creek areas (Amendment 12) forward into Forest Plan Revision does not seem to accurately characterize the large amount of support that exists in the community for the amendment to be carried forward."

Response

We have received numerous public comments for support of restricted land trades. The Forest is aware that there is support for land exchange restriction around Sedona/Oak Creek areas, especially from these communities. This assessment is not meant to provide details on Amendment 12, or on public comment, rather the purpose is to document current conditions and trends. Public comment summaries received on Forest Plan Revision can be found on our website at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/coconino/projects/plan-revision-2006/index.shtml>.

Feedback by Besty Mckellar (Friends of Walnut Canyon)

18. You know, and I know how many times someone in the Forest Service has claimed that the Walnut Canyon area is not in any danger because it is protected by the Forest Plan. Claiming that the land had to be traded because it lost its "wildland characteristics" is exactly the same words used in the famous letter Jim Golden wrote that everyone said afterwards wasn't referring to the Walnut Canyon area.

Response

The logic leap that you make from the potential for trading Forest Service land if it loses its wildland character (page 13 of the Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment) to the standard in the current Forest plan for land exchanges in the Walnut Canyon MA (pg. 206-111) is not appropriate. The statement about land exchanges and retaining wildland character in the Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment is generally a true statement for the Forest Service and for much of the Coconino NF. However, the Standard regarding land exchanges in the Walnut Canyon MA on page 206-111 is Forest Plan direction would have to be specifically changed or deleted through a Forest Plan Amendment or Revision process. At this time we have only heard support to maintain this standard from both people and groups internal and external to the Forest Service. Unless there is specific need for change associated with this direction on page 206-111, it will not change with the revision process.

Watersheds

Feedback by Bill Eich

19. I feel the section on page 68 and continuing, on water, while being extensive does not address discussion of solutions which I think you are

hinting at. For example, the issue of well drilling in the Flagstaff area is important to Sedona as well as Flagstaff, and to the healthy of the Forest as you indicate - what are you proposing to do about that? I suggest a project be started to address this important issue, and that project to include representatives of all interested parties, including Sedona participants.

Response

Water is a concern to all cities in the assessment area. The assessment is not designed to suggest solutions, rather to describe the existing conditions of the socioeconomic environment of the Assessment Area. Forest Plan Revision will be a strategic plan and will not make project level decisions. The assessment has been updated to include the analysis area in the discussion of water drilling.

Feedback by Rick Erman (Friends of Anderson Mesa)

20. Page 71, Watershed and Soils; in the paragraph starting w/ “ Maintain satisfactory soil conditions” we ask that the 4th sentence should be edited to include “wildlife”.

Just as the loss of soil productivity results in a decrease in profits for the livestock industry, there is a corresponding loss in the quality and quantity of wildlife species. The loss of wildlife directly affects the number of big game permits that can be issued by the AZG&FD as well as the opportunity for wildlife watching. That loss directly affects the local and state economy.

That edit would also be included in Table 21, the sections:

- Page 73, in the Effects to Management column, center section, “Decline in aquatic and fish populations may require additional conservation measures to be implemented by the Forest.” This must include the potential for the loss of fishing opportunities.
- Page 74, in the Effects to Management column, “Reduced soil productivity decreases the amount of commodity items that can be produced from the land including timber products and livestock production, (add: wildlife species), resulting in decreased timber volumes and profits to the timber and ranch industry, (add words that reflect the impacts to fish & wildlife such as: as well as decreases in wildlife populations, increases in erosion which negatively effects aquatic ecosystems thus decreased the opportunities for hunting, fishing and watching wildlife).

Response

The Watersheds and Soils section has been edited to include your feedback.

Economics

Feedback by Rick Miller (Arizona Game and Fish Department)

21. When the process leading to this document began we provided a stack of information to Forest staff. One of the most useful of these documents is one entitled “State and National Economic Effects of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Related Recreation on U.S. Forest Service-Managed Lands” as prepared by the: American Sportfishing Association for the: Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants office of U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture published on January 3, 2007. This report estimates days of use and expenditures across Arizona’s National Forests.

Then in October when it first became available we sent an electronic copy of the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) as another source document for the Socio Economic Assessment. The SCORP plan in chapter 5 even breaks out its data by an area (NACOG) similar to that used in the forest assessment. The general conclusion, like that of your document, is that residents highly value open space (including forest lands).

Another very useful source of data that has just become available is the “2006 National Survey of Fishing Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation data for Arizona” published by U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau.

From these documents and statistics on hunting fishing and wildlife watching we derive estimates of expenditures for hunting in Coconino County alone of \$8.8 million, and for fishing in Coconino County alone of \$58 million. Your methodology produced an estimate for both fishing and hunting contribution to the economy of \$5.8 million for the entire management area. We believe your methodology probably greatly underestimated the contribution of hunting fishing wildlife watching and other recreation to the economy.

Response

The forest did receive the mentioned information. NVUM is the data used and is the best available data for the Coconino National Forest. Other National or State surveys do not provide Forest-specific information, and we cannot scientifically extrapolate data from these surveys and apply it to the Coconino NF. However, we can mention these surveys in the context of the analysis area that they were done in. Information from the “2006 National Survey of Fishing Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation data for Arizona” published by U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau was referenced in the assessment. The State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) was reviewed and considered for this assessment, as well. Please also refer to the response below regarding the economic sections of the assessment.

Feedback by Rick Erman (Friends of Anderson Mesa)

22. In overview we are dismayed to find that values of the various industries, commodities and uses are not displayed or discussed especially their overall value both economic and social importance to the publics, local communities as well as the state and nation historically, currently and potentially. This is especially true for wildlife and outdoor recreation that are not given more consideration / explanation in the analysis.

Specificity:

We would like to point out that on Page 22 in the section titled Historical Content, in the second full paragraph, at the part:

.... The creation of the U.S. Division of Forestry in 1876 was, in part, an effort to deal with the public lands of the western states. In 1891, “An Act to Repeal Timber Culture Laws and for other Purposes...” was passed that was an effort to revise the land laws of the country. Better known as the “Creative Act” or the “Forest Management Act”, it is considered the beginning of the National Forest System (Steen 1992: vii, 8). The act authorized the President to proclaim Forest Reserves to protect watersheds of the western states and to provide sustained production of timber and forage.

It is very important to point out that at the very beginning / creation of the FS there were two primary goals for the establishment of these Forest Reserves:

1. Protection of watersheds
2. Long-term sustainable production of:
 - a. timber
 - b. forage

It must be noted that “production of forage” in this initial context was to satisfy the first primary goal of watershed protection!! it was not the intent to provide food sources for domestic livestock.

Starting on page 37, the section on Methodology for Analysis is a discussion of the database / software used by the Agency for its economic modeling, IMPLAN. To be considered an economic value within this program there must be a NACIS number. Search of the WWW we found the US Census Bureau; <http://www.census.gov/epcd/www/dnaics.htm#q1> where we learned;

“The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS, pronounced Nakes) was developed as the standard for use by Federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments for the collection, analysis, and publication of statistical data related to the

business economy of the U.S. NAICS was developed under the auspices of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and adopted in 1997 to replace the old Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system.”

Thus to have any value in IMPLAN / this model, for the CNF / FS to analyze in any detail your interest must be a business.

It is well accepted that a very large percentage of outdoor recreation, 99% (?) is conducted as an individual, family or a small group of friends rather than through a commercial operation such as a guide service. As such the value of most all the outdoor recreation activities within the area of analysis is not considered.

Quite Simply: No NACIS equals No Value to the economy, IE: No Value to the FS, thus the CNF, the local community or the State.

We fully understand the position that the Agency is trying to assign dollars to uses that are based on valid numbers of use and a valid value(s) which can be established. The decision to only use NACIS as the single deciding factor for consideration & inclusion is ignoring as well as disenfranchising a very large group of individuals & organizations who actively seek out FS lands, i.e.: the CNF for their recreation year-round.

With the FS & CNF disregarding / ignoring this large public sector they do not account for the many multiple millions of dollars spent to recreate on the area of analysis and the multiple millions of dollars generated state wide as those “users” buy equipment, food, fuel & other items to travel to & from northern Arizona including the CNF for their recreation. We believe there are very creditable sources of information to determine at least a portion of the outdoor recreation activities; Camping, Hunting & Fishing, and they should be included in the document / process.

1. In the paper; Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, NVUM Four Year Report by Daniel J. Stynes and Eric M. White; Page 15, Table 9 ; “Spending Averages by Primary Activity & Segment, \$ per party trip” within the 21 out-of-door recreational activities listed are:

Developed Camping	Non-Local	\$146.00
<u>Local</u>		<u>\$131.00</u>
Average	\$138.50	dollars / day
Fishing	Non-Local	\$238.00
<u>Local</u>		<u>\$108.00</u>
Average	\$173.00	dollars / day
Hunting	Non-Local	\$250.00
<u>Local</u>		<u>\$122.00</u>

Average \$186.00 dollars / day

Note:

- This document was developed for and is used by the USDA FS therefore it has validity
- We have displayed an average value in that it is hard / impossible for us to determine how many local or non-local participants were taking part in each activity.

2. From the “Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies” in their just released report, Hunting In America we learn for 2006 for Arizona:

- The value of hunting (w/ the multiplier effect) was \$554,551,000.00
- The number of hunters was 158,929
- The number of hunting days 1,508,551
- The number of deer hunters 75,702
- The number of deer hunting days, 536,106
- The value of deer hunting day is \$248.00

Given this expenditure for deer hunting, it is logical that this same amount would be spent for other big game species as well.

3. From the “American Sport Fishing Association” in their just released report Sport Fishing in America, we learn for 2006 for Arizona:

- The value of fishing (w/ the multiplier effect) was \$1,330,341,000.00
- The number of anglers was 422,000
- The number of fishing days 4,156,000
- That the value of a fishing day in Arizona is \$201.00

Note: Documents 2 & 3 are;

- Sponsored by and used by the Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies, (state wildlife agencies) as well as the US Fish & Wildlife Service. As such we assign them high value
- They have a historical context, are developed on a five year cycle.
- They are State specific
- They include activity specific information

The other key element necessary is valid source to establish the numbers of user days for these “uses” specific to the CNF.

Developed Camping: the number of visitors using developed camping on the CNF and the number of days spent by those visitors can be easily found in:

- the records of the FS Campground Hosts
- the records of the FS camping reservation system specific to the campgrounds on the CNF w/in that system.

A very small view to the value of camping on the CNF can be found in the Anderson Mesa LSA Recreation & Aesthetics Specialist's Report, September 2004. within this document we learn that in 2003 for Ashurst & Kinnikinick lakes :

- camping 11,700 days @ MVUM value of \$138.50/day generated \$1,620,000.00
- day use 11,225 days @ MVUM value of \$42.50/day generated \$477,000.00

\$2,097,000.00 in revenues from the CNF in 2004.

Notes:

- These numbers are for 2 developed campgrounds out of 29, thus a very small portion of the total camping / day use of the CNF.
- Acquisition of additional data to provide a more complete / definitive response would require a FOIA and that process is currently not timely to meet mandated timelines for this document.
- Use by dispersed camping is not currently recorded, commonly supported conjecture is that dispersed camping is much larger than that of the use of developed camping sites.
- Simple prior planning by the FS to establish a systematic method to measure both developed & dispersed camping as well as day use by CNF would have provided very valuable information to include in the economic & social analysis.

Hunting:

The Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZG&FD) started gathering & recording detailed information on big game hunting & big game hunters since 1974 specific to their Hunt Units.

The table below shows specific data for 2006, for the Hunt Units specific to the CNF. The table displays: the big game species, hunt unit, the number of "tags" available for drawing, the number of applicants, the number of days spent hunting, the value of the fixed costs paid to the AZG&FD for appropriate licenses and tags as well ask the associated values by both the MVUM and the Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies.

2006	Species	Unit	Permits	Applicants	Days Hunting	G& F value licenses & tags	FS Value (/ day)	NSSF Value (/ day)
	antelope	5A	11	768	64	\$966.0	\$11,904.0	\$15,872.0
		5B	17	1,436	91	\$1,539.0	\$16,926.0	\$22,586.0
		6A	3	447	8	\$272.0	\$1,488.0	\$1,984.0
		7	27	3,012	72	\$2,444.0	\$13,392.0	\$17,856.0

		58	5,663	235	\$5,221.0	\$43,896.0	\$58,298.0
deer	5	1,409	5,389	6,282	\$523,986.0	\$1,168,452.0	\$1,557,936.0
	6A	725	6,755	3,060	\$14,625.0	\$569,160.0	\$758,880.0
	6B	400	1,338	1,646	\$9,450.0	\$306,156.0	\$408,208.0
	7	394	2,541	1,546	\$18,000.0	\$287,556.0	\$383,408.0
		2,928	16,023	12,534	\$566,061.0	\$2,331,324.0	\$3,108,432.0
elk	5A	1,030	8,550	4,878	\$104,655.0	\$907,308.0	\$1,209,744.0
	5BN	1,533	10,508	7,081	\$158,666.0	\$1,317,066.0	\$1,756,088.0
	5BS	1,945	13,486	8,527	\$201,308.0	\$1,586,022.0	\$2,114,696.0
	6A	2,081	22,315	3,268	\$149,662.0	\$607,848.0	\$810,464.0
	6B	769	2,874	3,542	\$61,065.0	\$658,812.0	\$878,416.0
	7E	842	3,503	4,034	\$61,583.0	\$750,324.0	\$1,000,432.0
		8,200	61,236	31,330	\$736,939.0	\$5,827,380.0	\$7,769,840.0
Totals		11,186	82,922	44,099	\$1,308,221.0	\$8,202,600.0	\$10,936,570.0

NVUM value @ \$186.00 / day of \$8,202,000.00

NSSF value @ \$248.00 / day of \$10,936,570.00

This “economy” was generated from the CNF specific to a niche market for 2006.

Notes:

- 71,736 applicants **did not** receive bag game tags on the CNF in 2006.
- From that some 282,000 days of hunting on the CNF were not realized
- From that some \$8,389,000.00 potential revenue lost to the AZG&FD
- From that some \$70,136,000.00 potential revenue lost to the local community & state economy.

Fishing: Given the short amount of time to respond to the analysis we were not successful at finding much information to the specific number of days spent fishing on the CNF. However we do have some insight to the magnitude of fishing from the water bodies on Anderson Mesa from the Recreation & Aesthetics Specialist’s Report, Anderson Mesa [AMesa] Landscape Scale Assessment, September 2004.

On page 12 we learn there was an estimated 18,000 days fishing on the Mesa, April through October.

Using the values above those 18,000 days produces:

- NVMU average value of \$173.00 / day \$3,114,000.00
- ASA value of \$201.00 / day \$3,618,000.00

Notes:

- The fishing value shown is from the AMesa area only.

- No user days or values know for the other fishing areas on the CNF such as Oak Creek Canyon & Upper & Lower Lake Mary.

Summary of Value from wildlife & camping on the CNF from what little knowledge at our disposal:

➤ Camping in 2004 AMesa only	\$ 2,097,000.00
➤ Big game hunting for in 2006	\$ 10,936,000.00
➤ Fishing in 2004 AMesa only	\$ 3,618,000.00
Total	\$ 16,651,000.00

We ask the CNF to re-write or edit the Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment to include:

- Those activities such as hunting, fishing, and camping as well as others which can be supported w/ good data in the economic portion of the analysis. Clearly some aspects specific to wildlife and out-door recreation can be quantified & qualified from valid sources w/ valid values. Those values must be displayed and given full weight in future considerations of management decisions.
- A cost benefit analysis must be conducted for all to see what is the true generation of value weighed against the true value / costs to conduct / administer that program.
- Indeed if IMPLAN must be used, then it must be modified in such a way to give camping-hunting-fishing a NAICS type designation, assigning value to these activities.

For the FS not include genuine / valid wildlife / out-of-door recreation values in this key stone document to the current round of planning disenfranchises a very large group of CNF “stake-holders”

Another aspect of not assigning a “honest value” to these user groups will be in not providing the public good, accurate information to the public for future use with decision makers when it comes time to seek the funding for improvement of and construction of camping, day-use & recreational facilities on the CNF.

Response

The following response was prepared by Barb Ott of the TEAMS Planning Enterprise group to answer the above feedback. However, the information contained in this response is applicable to this and the other feedback we have received regarding economic analysis concerns.

Response to Concerns about Economic Sustainability Analysis for the Coconino National Forest

The letter from the Friends of Anderson Mesa asserts that the economic contribution of the recreation and wildlife programs has been underestimated. The letter states the following:

“The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS, pronounced Nakes) was developed as the standard for use by Federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments for the collection, analysis, and publication of statistical data related to the business economy of the U.S.... to have any value in IMPLAN / this model, for the CNF / FS to analyze in any detail your interest must be a business...a very large percentage of outdoor recreation, 99% (?) is conducted as an individual, family or a small group of friends rather than through a commercial operation such as a guide service. As such, the value of most all the outdoor recreation activities within the area of analysis is not considered.”

This statement is based on a misunderstanding of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) and how it is used to gather and summarize economic activity in the United States. It is incorrect to assume that since individuals and families are not assigned a NAICS code, economic activity associated with their recreation activities is not measured.

NAICS codes are assigned to each business or industrial unit that *produces or distributes goods or performs services*. The economic activity is stimulated by the demand of individuals and families for goods and services during the course of engaging in recreational activities on the Coconino National Forest. This activity is measured when visitors purchase goods and services from the businesses and industries that produce them.

The National Visitor Use Survey (NVUM) conducted for all national forests, was designed to provide a statistically valid assessment of not only the number of national forest visitors (an estimated 3,250,600 National Forest visits annually to the Coconino National Forest), but also the average spending profile of visitors. This data was used to estimate the economic contribution (jobs and income stimulated) of visitors to the Coconino National Forest within the analysis area, which consists of Coconino County, and portions of Gila, Navajo, and Yavapai Counties. In other words, the report attempts to estimate how much economic activity (jobs and income) were stimulated in the defined analysis area in order to produce the goods and services purchased by national forest visitors.

The letter dated February 7, 2008, signed by Mr. Rick Erman, suggests that by not citing total estimated expenditures by recreation and wildlife related visitors to the Coconino National Forest, economic contributions are understated. While total expenditures (estimated at \$124,557,530 annually in 2003 dollars) is indeed a larger number, it does not present an accurate picture of the economic contribution to the local economy. This total expenditure figure represents an estimate of the final demand for products and services by visitors to the Forest, but requires further analysis and interpretation to determine the level of economic activity supported locally and the degree to which the local economy is dependent on those expenditures.

The following example is presented to explain why the total purchases figure overstates the economic activity stimulated within the analysis area:

A visitor to the Coconino National Forest purchases \$100 of gasoline at a gas station located in a community within the analysis area as a result of his or her visit. That \$100 pays for such costs as the drilling and production of crude oil, the cost of shipping the crude oil to a refinery, processing at the refinery to produce gasoline, shipping from the refinery to the gas station, the cost of the labor to man the gas station and sell the gas, overhead costs to manage the gas station (e.g., rent, utilities, etc.), and advertising. Not all of these activities occur within the analysis area. The owner of the gas station must use a large portion of the \$100 purchase price to pay suppliers from outside the analysis area. Therefore the jobs and income that are needed to produce crude oil, refine it, and ship the resulting gasoline to gas stations for final sale are located outside the analysis area. A relatively small portion of the \$100 purchase price (in this case approximately \$20) actually stays in the local community to support employment and labor income *within the analysis area*.

Most proponents of a particular program area have a strong interest in making certain that full credit is given for as much economic activity as can reasonably be claimed. The question may well be asked: “Why does the report examine a relatively small analysis area? Doesn’t the small analysis area artificially constrain the estimated economic contribution of recreation and wildlife visitors?” The answer has to do with the objective of the report and our assumptions about the nature of human recreation and the response if a given recreation opportunity is no longer available.

The report seeks to assess the degree to which local communities rely on the economic activity supported by the management and use of the Coconino National Forest. The analysis assumes that Coconino National Forest visitors come and spend their money within the defined analysis area because of the existence of the Forest. If the Forest were no longer available for recreational activities, it is reasonable to assume that those people would not come to the analysis area and spend their money. However, we cannot assume that these people would not recreate at all if they are unable to come to the Coconino. It is more likely that they would chose other locations to recreate and would still spend their recreation dollars, but in another area.

If a larger analysis area was used, such as the state of Arizona as an example, it would no longer be reasonable to assume that if visitors were denied an opportunity to recreate on the Coconino National Forest, they would not spend their recreation dollars anywhere in Arizona. These visitors would likely still pursue their recreation activity of choice, but would be forced relocate to other public lands. Because Arizona is a large state with an abundance of public lands, visitors would very likely move their recreation activities to another location within the state. Therefore, at the state level, the ability to show any potential for economic change as a result of an increase or decrease in recreation opportunities on the Coconino National Forest is lost due to the availability of substitute opportunities and locations.

In addition to the above referenced letter, Mr Erman, by phone, also requested additional information about the calculations used to derive the estimates cited in the Economic and Social Sustainability Report. Appendix A, attached below, displays in detail, the calculations used to derive the economic contributions of the recreation, wildlife, and grazing programs.

The information above, together with the attached Appendix A, elaborate on the rationale and methodology used to assess the market valued economic contributions of recreation and wildlife uses on the Coconino National Forest. The Forest Service also recognizes that there are a many non-market values associated with the recreational opportunities provided by the Coconino National Forest that are not quantified in the economic assessment. It is acknowledged that these values are also important considerations. Non-market values are addressed qualitatively throughout the social assessment and through the consideration of and balancing of other resource benefits associated with forest management choices.

APPENDIX A

Data and Process Used to Develop Coconino National Forest Contribution Analysis for Grazing, Recreation, and Wildlife Programs

Recreation and Wildlife:

Data Needs:

- National Forest visitation estimate for year of analysis
 - 3,250,600 National Forest Visits
 - Source: National Visitor Use Monitoring Report for the Coconino National Forest
- Division of total visitation between wildlife and recreation related activities.
 - Wildlife: 9 percent
 - Recreation: 91 percent
 - Source: *Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, NVUM Four Year Report* by Stynes and White, page 42, Table B-6 (Case Weights column)
- Division of visits by visitor use segments
 - Non-local day use: 16 percent
 - Non-local overnight on national forest: 7 percent
 - Non-local overnight off forest: 24 percent
 - Local day use: 31 percent
 - Local overnight on national forest: 2 percent
 - Local overnight off forest: 4 percent
 - Nonprimary (national forest was not reason for presence): 16 percent
 - Source: *Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, NVUM Four Year Report* by Stynes and White, page 26, Table A-2.
- Average persons per vehicle surveyed
 - Non-local day use: 2.3 persons
 - Non-local overnight on national forest: 2.5 persons
 - Non-local overnight off forest: 2.7 persons
 - Local day use: 2.1 persons
 - Local overnight on national forest: 2.5 persons
 - Local overnight off forest: 2.5 persons
 - Source: *Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, NVUM Four Year Report* by Stynes and White, page 31, National Average.
- Visitor spending profiles (\$'s per party)
 - Wildlife Related
 - Non-local day: \$40.71
 - Non-local overnight on national Forest Service: \$203.78
 - Non-local overnight off forest: \$249.95
 - Local day: \$44.03

- Local overnight on national Forest Service: \$151.92
 - Local overnight off forest: \$116.49
 - Source: *Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, NVUM Four Year Report* by Stynes and White, page 40, Table B-3, 2001 dollars.
- Non-Wildlife Related
 - Non-local day: \$53.76
 - Non-local overnight on national Forest Service: \$151.33
 - Non-local overnight off forest: \$244.46
 - Local day: \$30.79
 - Local overnight on national Forest Service: \$119.49
 - Local overnight off forest: \$116.03
 - Source: *Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, NVUM Four Year Report* by Stynes and White, page 40, Table B-4.
- Response Coefficients per \$1,000,000 change in final demand (from IMPLAN model)
 - Wildlife Related
 - Non-local day: \$383,496.40 of labor income and 14.3 jobs
 - Non-local overnight on national Forest Service: \$504,729.30 of labor income and 15.1 jobs
 - Non-local overnight off forest: \$425,864.70 of labor income and 18.0 jobs
 - Local day: \$380,880.90 of labor income and 13.5 jobs
 - Local overnight on national Forest Service: \$451,350.20 of labor income and 13.8 jobs
 - Local overnight off forest: \$380,186.70 of labor income and 14.7 jobs
 - Non-Wildlife Related
 - Non-local day: \$445,126.00 of labor income and 16.6 jobs
 - Non-local overnight on national Forest Service: \$543,384.00 of labor income and 16.3 jobs
 - Non-local overnight off forest: \$448,438.00 of labor income and 18.8 jobs
 - Local day: \$429,066.00 of labor income and 15.0 jobs
 - Local overnight on national Forest Service: \$530,293.00 of labor income and 15.2 jobs
 - Local overnight off forest: \$445,863.00 of labor income and 16.9 jobs
 - Source: IMPLAN model, 2003 data
- GDP deflators for 2001, 2003, and 2006
 - 2001: 1.0940
 - 2003: 1.1221

- 2006: 1.1747

Process for estimating the economic contribution of Forest Service Wildlife and Recreation use:

1. Divide total recreation between wildlife and recreation related visits.
 - $\text{National Forest Visits} * \text{Percent Wildlife related visits} = \text{Wildlife related National Forest Visits}$
 - $\text{National Forest Visits} * \text{Percent Recreation related visits} = \text{Recreation related National Forest Visits}$
2. Calculate the visits by visitor use segments
 - $\text{Wildlife related National Forest Visits} * \text{percentage for each visitor use segment} = \text{Wildlife related use by visitor use segment}$
 - $\text{Recreation related National Forest Visits} * \text{percentage for each visitor use segment} = \text{Recreation related use by visitor use segment}$
3. Convert spending profiles from \$'s per party to \$'s per visit for each visitor use segment
 - $\text{Expenditure per party by visitor use segment} * \text{Persons per vehicle by visitor use segment} = \text{Expenditure per visit (2001 dollars)}$
4. Convert from 2001 dollars to 2003 dollars (2003 is the IMPLAN model data year)
 - $\text{Expenditure per visit (2001 dollars)} * (\text{2003 GDP deflator} / \text{2003 GDP deflator}) = \text{Expenditure per visit (2003 dollars)}$
5. Calculate total estimated expenditures for each visitor use segment
 - $\text{Wildlife related use by visitor use segment} * \text{Expenditure per visit} = \text{Total expenditure per wildlife related visitor use segment}$
 - $\text{Recreation related use by visitor use segment} * \text{Expenditure per visit} = \text{Total expenditure per recreation related visitor use segment}$
6. Calculate Labor Income and Employment estimates
 - $\text{Response coefficient for each wildlife related visitor use segment} * (\text{Total expenditure per wildlife related visitor segment} / 1,000,000) = \text{Labor Income or jobs supported.}$
 - $\text{Response coefficient for each recreation related visitor use segment} * (\text{Total expenditure per recreation related visitor segment} / 1,000,000) = \text{Labor Income or jobs supported.}$
7. Convert Labor Income estimates from 2003 dollars to 2006 dollars
 - $\text{Estimated wildlife related labor income} * (\text{2006 GDP deflator} / \text{2003 GDP deflator}) - \text{Estimated wildlife related labor income in 2006 dollars.}$

- Estimated recreation related labor income * (2006 GDP deflator / 2003 GDP deflator) – Estimated recreation related labor income in 2006 dollars.

The following are the actual calculations of the labor income contributions of Coconino NF wildlife and recreation related visitor use.

1. Division of National Forest Visit between wildlife and recreation:

- 3,250,600 National Forest Visits * 9% Wildlife Related = 292,554 wildlife related National Forest Visits
- 3,250,600 National Forest Visits * 91% Recreation Related = 2,958,046 recreation related National Forest Visits

2. Calculation of visits by visitor use segments:

Use Segment	Total Visits		*Segment percentage	Recreation visits	Wildlife visits
	Recreation	Wildlife			
Non-Local day	2,958,046	292,554	16%	473,287	46,809
Non-Local overnight on forest			7%	207,063	20,479
Non-Local overnight off forest			24%	709,931	70,213
Local day			31%	916,994	90,692
Local overnight on forest			2%	59,161	5,851
Local overnight off forest			4%	118,322	11,702

*NOTE: percentages do not total to 100% because 16 percent of visitors indicated that the National Forest was not the primary reason for their presence.

3 and 4. Convert spending profiles from \$'s per party to \$'s per visit and convert to 2003 dollars:

Use Segment	Avg. persons per vehicle	Conversion: 1/Avg. person per vehicle	2003 GDP / 2001 GDP 1.1221 / 1.0940	Expenditure per Party	Expenditure per Visit (Expenditure per Party * Conversion * GDP)
WILDLIFE RELATED					
Non-Local day	2.3	0.4348	1.0257	\$40.71	\$18.15
Non-Local overnight on forest	2.5	0.4000		\$203.78	\$83.61
Non-Local overnight off forest	2.7	0.3704		\$249.95	\$94.95
Local day	2.1	0.4762		\$44.03	\$21.51
Local overnight on forest	2.5	0.4000		\$151.92	\$62.33
Local overnight off forest	2.5	0.4000		\$116.49	\$47.79
RECREATION RELATED					
Non-Local day	2.3	0.4348	1.0257	\$53.76	\$23.97
Non-Local overnight on forest	2.5	0.4000		\$151.33	\$62.09
Non-Local overnight off forest	2.7	0.3704		\$244.46	\$92.87
Local day	2.1	0.4762		\$30.79	\$15.04

Use Segment	Avg. persons per vehicle	Conversion: 1/Avg. person per vehicle	2003 GDP / 2001 GDP 1.1221 / 1.0940	Expenditure per Party	Expenditure per Visit (Expenditure per Party * Conversion * GDP)
Local overnight on forest	2.5	0.4000		\$119.49	\$49.02
Local overnight off forest	2.5	0.4000		\$116.03	\$47.60

5. Calculate total estimated expenditures for each visitor use segment:

Use Segment	Visits	2003 Expenditure per visit	Total Expenditure per Use Segment
WILDLIFE RELATED			
Non-Local day	46,809	\$18.15	\$849,800.28
Non-Local overnight on forest	20,479	\$83.61	\$1,712,160.74
Non-Local overnight off forest	70,213	\$94.95	\$6,666,857.11
Local day	90,692	\$21.51	\$1,950,350.25
Local overnight on forest	5,851	\$62.33	\$364,686.16
Local overnight off forest	11,702	\$47.79	\$559,271.86
TOTAL WILDLIFE RELATED			\$12,103,126.40
RECREATION RELATED			
Non-Local day	473,287	\$23.97	\$11,346,717.44
Non-Local overnight on forest	207,063	\$62.09	\$12,855,878.69
Non-Local overnight off forest	709,931	\$92.87	\$65,928,686.63
Local day	916,994	\$15.04	\$13,790,217.90
Local overnight on forest	59,161	\$49.02	\$2,900,289.16
Local overnight off forest	118,322	\$47.60	\$5,632,614.46
TOTAL RECREATION VISITOR EXPENDITURES			\$112,454,404.28
TOTAL WILDLIFE AND RECREATION VISITOR ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES			\$124,557,530.68

6. Calculate Labor Income estimates:

Use Segment	Total Expenditure per Use Segment	Total Expenditure / 1,000,000	Labor Income Response Coeff.	Est. Labor Income (2003 \$'s)	Jobs Response Coeff.	Est. Jobs
WILDLIFE RELATED						
Non-Local day	\$849,800.28	0.84980028	\$383,496	\$325,895	14.3	12
Non-Local overnight on forest	\$1,712,160.74	1.71216074	\$504,729	\$864,178	15.1	26
Non-Local overnight off forest	\$6,666,857.11	6.66685711	\$425,865	\$2,839,179	18.0	120

Use Segment	Total Expenditure per Use Segment	Total Expenditure / 1,000,000	Labor Income Response Coeff.	Est. Labor Income (2003 \$'s)	Jobs Response Coeff.	Est. Jobs
Local day	\$1,950,350.25	1.95035025	\$380,881	\$742,851	13.5	26
Local overnight on forest	\$364,686.16	0.36468616	\$451,350	\$164,601	13.8	5
Local overnight off forest	\$559,271.86	0.55927186	\$380,187	\$212,628	14.7	8
RECREATION RELATED						
Non-Local day	\$11,346,717.44	11.34671744	\$445,126	\$5,050,720	16.6	189
Non-Local overnight on forest	\$12,855,878.69	12.85587869	\$543,384	\$6,985,682	16.3	210
Non-Local overnight off forest	\$65,928,686.63	65.92868663	\$448,438	\$29,564,928	18.8	1,238
Local day	\$13,790,217.90	13.79021790	\$429,066	\$5,916,910	15.0	207
Local overnight on forest	\$2,900,289.16	2.90028916	\$530,293	\$1,538,003	15.2	44
Local overnight off forest	\$5,632,614.46	5.63261446	\$445,863	\$2,511,375	16.9	95
TOTAL LABOR INCOME AND JOBS				\$56,716,950		2,180

7. Convert Labor Income estimates from 2003 dollars to 2006 dollars:

Use Segment	Est. Labor Income (2003 \$'s)	2006 GDP / 2003 GDP (1.1747 / 1.1221)	Est. Labor Income (2006 \$'s)
WILDLIFE RELATED			
Non-Local day	\$325,895	1.0469	\$341,179
Non-Local overnight on forest	\$864,178		\$904,708
Non-Local overnight off forest	\$2,839,179		\$2,972,336
Local day	\$742,851		\$777,691
Local overnight on forest	\$164,601		\$172,321
Local overnight off forest	\$212,628		\$222,600
TOTAL WILDLIFE RELATED LABOR INCOME			\$5,390,835
RECREATION RELATED			
Non-Local day	\$5,050,720	1.0469	\$5,287,599
Non-Local overnight on forest	\$6,985,682		\$7,313,310
Non-Local overnight off forest	\$29,564,928		\$30,951,523
Local day	\$5,916,910		\$6,194,413
Local overnight on forest	\$1,538,003		\$1,610,135
Local overnight off forest	\$2,511,375		\$2,629,158
TOTAL RECREATION RELATED LABOR INCOME			\$53,986,138

GRAZING:

Data Needs:

- Forest Service Actual Head Months of Grazing for the year of IMPLAN data

- 124,186 HM (2003)
 - Source: Coconino National Forest Range staff
- Total State cattle inventory
 - 1,706,000 animals (January 1 inventory + Calves + in-shipping)
 - Source: National Agricultural Statistics Service (2003)
- Total cattle inventory for each county in the analysis area
 - Coconino County: 34,000 animals
 - Yavapai County: 47,500 animals
 - Gila County: 8,230 animals
 - Source: National Agricultural Statistics Service (2003)
- Total state marketings
 - 812,000 animals
 - National Agricultural Statistics Service
- Total state gross income (from sale of cattle)
 - \$693,891,000
 - Source: National Agricultural Statistics Service (2003)
- Final Demand factor
 - 0.825713
 - Source: IMPLAN Model (reciprocal of type SAM multiplier), 2003 data year
- Response Coefficient (from IMPLAN model)
 - \$218,005 of labor income and 15.5 jobs per \$1,000,000 change in final demand
 - Source: IMPLAN Model, 2003 data year
- GDP deflation factors for 2003 and 2006
 - 2003: 1.1221
 - 2006: 1.1747

Process for estimating the economic contribution of Forest Service Grazing:

1. Total state marketings / Total state inventory = State Proportion of cattle marketed
2. State gross income / State total marketings = Price per animal
3. FS Head Months (HM) grazed / Total HM in Impact area (total of county inventories * 12) = Proportion FS HM.
4. Total of county inventories * State proportion of cattle marketed * Price per animal * Proportion FS HM = Total FS selling price

5. Total FS selling price / FS HM grazed = FS selling price per HM
6. Change in Total Industrial Output (TIO) * Final Demand Factor = Change in Final Demand
 - Change in Total Industrial Output (TIO) is the HM of FS grazing for year of analysis (in this case we used the same year, 2003, as the IMPLAN data)
 - Final Demand Factor is used to adjust the output to remove intermediate demand (demand of cattle producers from other cattle producers), so that we are left with the change in Final Demand.
7. Change in final demand /1,000,000 * Response Coefficient = Economic Impact
8. Economic Impact * GDP Inflator = Economic impact in today's dollars.

The following are the actual calculations for the economic contribution of Coconino NF grazing.

1. 812,000 animals / 1,706,000 animals = 0.4759
2. \$693,891,000 / 812,000 = \$854.55
3. 124,186 HM / [(34,000 HM + 47,500 HM + 8,230HM) * 12] = 0.1153
4. (34,000 HM + 47,500 HM + 8,230 HM) * 0.4759 * \$854.35455 * 0.1153 = \$4,209,239.34
5. \$4,209,239.34 / 124,186 HM = \$33.8946
6. (124,186 HM * \$33.89) * 0.825713 = \$3,475,622 Total change in Final Demand
7. \$3,475,622 / 1,000,000 * \$218,005 = \$757,702.97 Labor Income (2003 dollars)
8. \$757,702.97 * (1.1747 / 1.1221) = \$793,221 Labor Income (2006 dollars)

Summary: Total estimated contribution to final demand as a result of the grazing authorized on the Coconino National Forest is **\$3,475,622**. Total Labor income supported is **\$793,221**. The total number of jobs (full-time, part-time, intermittent, and temporary) supported is **54**.

NOTE: The calculations above were completed in a Microsoft Excel Workbook referred to as FEAST. If they are recalculated based on the numbers displayed, slightly different answers may be obtained than were displayed in the Coconino National Forest Economic and Social Sustainability report due to the effects of rounding. Additionally, although the inputs are the same, the results above are slightly different than what was displayed in the report due to some minor adjustments that were made to the FEAST since the original report was written. The difference is relatively insignificant at approximately 0.75 percent less than the original labor income and 0.59 percent less than the original number of jobs reported.

Wildlife

Feedback by Rick Erman (Friends of Anderson Mesa)

23. Page 84 Wildlife In the first paragraph, the last sentence; “Nationally, from 1996 to 2006, the number of anglers & hunters has declined 15 percent.....”

A detailed review of AZG&FD big game tag sales data comparing 1996 to 2006 on the hunt units on the CNF support that statement, big game hunting has declined 19%.

The tables below were developed from G&F (Game and Fish) hunt data.

Species	Unit	Year	Applicants		Tags	%	Permit	%
			Number	Loss/Gain		Success Drawing	Loss/Gain	Loss/Gain
Antelope	5A	1996	496		5	1.0%		
		2006	690	194	6	0.9%	1	20.0%
	5B	1996	1,522		20	1.3%		
		2006	1,220	-302	7	0.6%	-13	-65.0%
	6A	1996	401		10	2.5%		
		2006	447	46	3	0.7%	-7	-70.0%
	6B	1996	399		30	7.5%		
		2006	447	48	3	0.7%	-27	-90.0%
	7	1996	2,553		55	2.2%		
		2006	6,024	3,471	55	0.9%	0	0.0%
	summary	1996	5,371		120	2.2%		
		2006	8,828	3,457	74	0.8%	-46	-38.3%

Species	Unit	Year	Applicants		Tags	%	Permit	%
			Number	Loss/Gain		Success Drawing	Loss/Gain	Loss/Gain
Deer	5	1996	4,039		1,877	46.5%		
		2006	5,082	1,043	798	15.7%	1,079	57.5%
	summary	1996	9,925		2,200	22.2%		
		2006	26,662	-4,536	6,981	26.2%	-1,750	-79.5%
	6A	1996	11,246		2,200	19.6%		
		2006	6,755	-4,491	725	10.7%	-1,475	-67.0%
	6B	1996	1,462		704	48.2%		
		2006	1,338	-124	400	29.9%	-304	-43.2%
	7	1996	2,553		55	2.2%		
		2006	6,024	3,471	55	0.9%	0	0.0%

Species	Unit	Year	Applicants			Tags	%	Permit	%
			Number	Loss/Gain	Loss/Gain		Success Drawing		Loss/Gain
Elk	5A	1996	2,266			550	24.3%		
		2006	2,081	-185	-8.2%	310	14.9%	-240	-43.6%
	5BN	1996	6,540			650	9.9%		
		2006	8,011	1,471	22.5%	1,330	16.6%	680	104.6%
	5BS	1996	7,335			550	7.5%		
		2006	9,448	2,113	28.8%	1,391	14.7%	841	152.9%
	6A	1996	6,227			900	14.5%		
		2006	22,315	16,088	258.4%	2,081	9.3%	1,181	131.2%
	6B	1996	2,665			425	15.9%		
		2006	2,135	-530	-19.9%	589	27.6%	164	38.6%
	7	1996			no data				
		2006	845			242	28.6%		
	summary	1996	25,033			3,075	12.3%		
		2006	43,990	18,957	75.7%	5,701	13.0%	2,626	85.4%
Total		1996	57,076			10,176			
		2006	71,382	14,306	109.7%	8,148		-2,028	-18.9%

Digging into the details relating to that statement one quickly sees the reason for this reduction in “hunting” is not due to loss of interest in hunting, Fact: there is a loss of permits available to hunters! Loss of Opportunity to Hunt! Simply, the land today can not support wildlife populations to a level that would allow the G&F to offer the number of permits to match historical numbers.

Notes:

- The demand / interest for big game permits remains very high, in fact it has increased:
 - Applicants in 1996 of 57,067
 - Applicants in 2006 of 71,382
 - An increase of 14,315 or 25%

- The Deer tags shown are for firearm hunts only.
- The land is in such poor condition the availability of permits is continuing to decline, the loss of 2,028 tags or 19.9% in just 10 years. When one looks at a longer period of time, loss is even greater.
Clearly outdoor recreation: camping, day-use, hunting & fishing are very large revenue generation centers on the CNF. From what little we have been able to document in a very short period of time, w/ limited information available, some \$16,000,000.00 annual production w/ very little costs is an attractive “business” by any measure.
We feel that much more value(s) would be found in many other outdoor uses if there was a way to quantify the number of user-days associated w/ there use.

Response

The assessment has been edited to include your feedback.

Grazing

Feedback by Rick Erman (Friends of Anderson Mesa)

24. Relating to the decline in habitat quality / quantity / carry capacity is found on page 78, in the section Livestock Grazing:
 - In the 3rd paragraph we learn: “.... And the combination of allotments (93 allotments in 1940 to 33 in 2006). These combinations have been made to improve management and make the remaining allotments more economically viable.”
 - in the 4th paragraph we learn: “The total permitted use on the Forest has decreased by half in the past sixty-five years. The reductions occurred prior to the Forest Plan being implemented. Since the Forest Plan was signed, the number of permitted livestock on the Forest has increased slightly.”

Questions:

When did it become the responsibility of the FS to prove that any commercial enterprise to be profitable?

Response

The Forest Service Manual (FSM 2202.1) states that one of the objectives of the range management program for National Forests and National Grasslands is:

4. *To contribute to the economic and social well being of people by providing opportunities for economic diversity and by promoting stability for communities that depend on range resources for their livelihood.*

Feedback by Rick Erman (Friends of Anderson Mesa)

25. From the very first day of the first Forest Planning event, 1982, that the use of the land / the forage produced will be managed for a balance of 50% for wildlife & 50% livestock, never would wildlife go wanting for habitat & forage. How can it be that wildlife populations are declining so much that hunting permits are reduced by 19% over the past 10 years, and yet livestock AUM's are static to increasing?

Response

The information presented in the report is based on the records available to the forest. No discussion of why something did or did not occur were included in the records available, and the objective of this Assessment is to determine the current social and economic conditions and trends of the assessment area. The balance between grazing and large game needs will be considered during the Forest Plan Revision process.

Feedback by Rick Erman (Friends of Anderson Mesa)

26. We have been told many times that wildlife numbers are declining for some "great mysterious" reason that no one understands, most speculated is something to do with global climate change, i.e.: global warming. How can it be that the FS / CNF are to manage our resources for the long term sustainability, there are static to increasing AUM's in a period of drought that started in 1996, when:

- 1996 was the 4th ranked driest year recorded
 - 2002 was the 6th ranked driest year recorded
 - 2000 was the 15th ranked driest year recorded
- Note: Record years: 1899 to 2004 from NOAA.

We would possibly offer more comments on the livestock section however our request for additional information was turned into a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request and as of today is yet to be successfully answered. We learned this week that the information we requested is not recorded by the CNF.

Response

The information presented in the report is based on the records available to the forest. No discussion of why something did or did not occur were included in the records available, and the objective of this Assessment is to determine the current social and economic conditions and trends of the assessment area.

Feedback by Rick Miller (Arizona Game and Fish Department)

27. The Arizona Game and Fish Department is writing to comment on the Coconino National Forest, Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment. We appreciate the large amount of work that went into the preparing the document, however I was disappointed in the level of analysis. Take livestock grazing for an example, the document only gives

1940 and 2006 livestock numbers and nothing in between. The analysis of current economic and social impact is very different if livestock numbers have been highly variable or very stable for the last twenty years and it is impossible to tell. Other sections of the document had similarly scanty data, and analysis for economic and social conditions and impacts.

Response

This report presents a broad level overview of information, not a detailed analysis. The forest does have data from additional years, which were considered and is in the project record. Livestock numbers are highly variable and including other years in the assessment wouldn't result in different conclusions.

General

Feedback by Randy Marlatt

28. The Assessment is incredibly comprehensive and well constructed. I can't imagine more additions, but if any changes are incorporated keep me appraised.

Response

Thank you for your feedback. The assessment has been updated in response to public feedback and will continue to be updated as circumstances change throughout the Forest Plan Revision process. Updated documents will be posted to the Coconino NF website.

Feedback by Rick Miller (Arizona Game and Fish Department)

29. The risk assessments were well done but would have benefited from discussion in the text. Discussion of the effects of management and potential ways of dealing with the effects on management would have been particularly welcome. At some point a discussion of the tradeoffs between budgets, programs, staffing and effects might have added to the usefulness of the document.

Response

The risk assessments are discussed in several sections of the document. The areas titled Current Conditions and Trends of... contain the discussion of risk with the whole section in mind. The Assessment was written to determine conditions and trends with the current social and economic environment of the assessment area. Responding with solutions, trade offs, or outcomes to the conditions and trends were not an objective of the document.