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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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Note to Users:
Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV $>40 \%$.

[^0]
Data Sources. U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Sureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S.
Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Divisioion, Washington, D.C.



This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age
Median Age: The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e, half the people are younger than this age and
haff are older.

Age \& Gender Distribution, 2013*

|  | Coconino County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 134,795 | 311,536,594 |
| Under 5 years | 8,734 | 20,052,112 |
| 5 to 9 years | 8,419 | 20,409,060 |
| 10 to 14 years | 8.492 | 20,672,609 |
| 15 to 19 years | 13,349 | 21,715,074 |
| 20 to 24 years | 17,278 | 22,099,887 |
| 25 to 29 years | 9,545 | 21,243,365 |
| 30 to 34 years | 8,223 | 20,467,912 |
| 35 to 39 years | 7,496 | 19,876,161 |
| 40 to 44 years | 7,827 | 20,998,001 |
| 45 to 49 years | 8,119 | 22,109,946 |
| 50 to 54 years | 9,052 | 22,396,322 |
| 55 to 59 years | 8,770 | 20,165,892 |
| 60 to 64 years | 6,775 | 17,479,211 |
| 65 to 69 years | 4,701 | 13,189,508 |
| 70 to 74 years | 3,297 | 9,767,522 |
| 75 to 79 years | 2,030 | 7,438,750 |
| 80 to 84 years | 1,522 | 5,781,697 |
| 85 years and over | 1,166 | 5,673,565 |
| Total Female | 67,954 | 158,289,182 |
| Total Male | 66,841 | 153,247,412 |
| Change in Median Age, 2000-2013* |  |  |
| Median Age^ ( $2013^{*}$ ) | 31.0 | 37.3 |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 29.6 | 35.3 |
| Median Age \% Change | 4.7\% | 5.7\% | The datatin this table erae calculuat

characteristics during this period.


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S.
Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

Age \& Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Coconino County, Az | s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Under 5 years | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 3.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 3.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 3.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 25 to 29 years | 0.8\% | 0.0\% |
| 30 to 34 years | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |
| 35 to 39 years | 3.4\% | 0.1\% |
| 40 to 44 years | 3.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 45 to 49 years | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| 50 to 54 years | 0.9\% | 0.0\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 2.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 4.5\% | 0.1\% |
| 65 to 69 years | 4.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 70 to 74 years | 4.5\% | 0.1\% |
| 75 to 79 years | 6.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 80 to 84 years | 8.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 85 years and over | 9.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Total Female | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Total Male | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age^ (2013*) | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age \% Change | 8.7\% | 3.0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
and the change in median age.
$\frac{\text { Median Age: }}{\text { Older. }}$ The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are

Why is it important?
Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of reitrees, the age distribution may be
skewed towards categories 65 years and older. in counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group $18-29$. In skewed towards categories 65 years and older. In counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group 18-29. In many counties, the largest segment of the population is in the Baby Boomer generation (people born between 1946 and 1964).
The change in median age is one indicatoo of whether the population has gotten older or younger.
Methods
Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5 -year estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5 -year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, $2009^{*}$ may be listed as the year, but this is a 5 -year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of all people
regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and entorcement of environmental laws, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej
An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliancelejeresources(policylei_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pdf ${ }^{(1)}$. The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at: stateotheusa.org ${ }^{(5)}$.

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: ers. usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx ${ }^{(6)}$. Wiliam H. Frey's website provides links to pubications, issues, media stories, data tools and
and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.f.frey-demographer.org ${ }^{(1)}$.
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at
The U.S. Department of Health and Human S
aoa.gov/aoarootlaging_statisticsindex.aspx ${ }^{(\theta)}$
The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas. This information is available at: htp://www.census.gov/popest ${ }^{(9)}$.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: countyhealthrankings.org/ ${ }^{(0)]}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ******** |  |  |
| This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups. |  |  |
| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013* |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2013* |
| Total Population | 116,320 | 134,795 |
| Under 18 | 33,425 | 31,159 |
| 18-34 | 33,086 | 42,881 |
| 35-44 | 17,637 | 15,323 |
| 45-64 | 24,029 | 32,716 |
| 65 and over | 8,143 | 12,716 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Under 18 | 28.7\% | 23.1\% |
| 18-34 | 28.4\% | 31.8\% |
| 35-44 | 15.2\% | 11.4\% |
| 45-64 | 20.7\% | 24.3\% |
| 65 and over | 7.0\% | 9.4\% | *The data in this ta

during this period.
during this period.


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of
Dala Sources. U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American
Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into
Why is it important?
For public land m managers, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups has alarge retired population, or soon-to-be-retired population, for example, the needs and interests of the public may place different demands on public land managers than a geography with a large number of minorors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation Hose born between 1946 and 1964). As this generation enters retirement age, their mobility, spending patterns, and consumer demands (for health care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develop economically. An aging population can also affect changing emands on land use (e.g., recreation).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughou a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:
.o.rgJJournaistswebcasts/2009/distilleddemographics 1.aspx ${ }^{(11)}$
For a discussion on the implications or rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave will
.
The Census maintains a useful web site with data, aricles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: census.gov/population/age/ ${ }^{[2]}$
 1138.pdff ${ }^{[12]}$

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and Its Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29 . Washington, DC. ers.usda.gov/publications/er-economic-research-reportlert79.aspx ${ }^{(14)}$

Frey, W.H. 2006. Amentas Instiution, Washington, D.C

Frey, W. H. 2007. Mapping the Growth of OIder America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21 st Century. Brookings Census 2000 Series. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program.
Jacobsen, L. A., and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." Population Bulletin 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C.
Population Reference Bureau. ence Bureau
S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030." census.gov/poppulation/www/projections/projectionsagesexhtml ${ }^{(25)}$. Retrieved September 1, 2010.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Divivion, Washington, D.C.

|  | 2000 | 2009* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Under 18 | 0\% | 1\% |
| 18-34 | 0\% | 1\% |
| 35-44 | 0\% | 2\% |
| 45-64 | 0\% | 1\% |
| 65 and over | 0\% | 3\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 009 |
| Under 18 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 18.34 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 35.44 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 45-64 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 65 and over | 0\% | 0\% |




|  | Coconino County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or Atrican American alone | 8\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 7\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawailian \& Other Pacific is alone | 29\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 9\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 10\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Coconino County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or Aftican American alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 8\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific is. alone | 54\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 10\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 10\% | 0\% |



Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term
"Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers }}{\text { race and }}$ Eace and Hispanic origin to be wo separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the speciif }}{\text { Hispanic }}$ Hispanic cr Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they
are "other are other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." "rigin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of
any race. any race.

## Why is it important?

Hispanics are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the
U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S will be bispanic by U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by
2050. Between 2000 and 2010 , Hispanics accounted for over one-half of the nation's population growth.

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of the
Hispanic community in an area can be an important consideration for public land managers working to meet the needs of the public or evaluating potentially adverse impacts on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e,
promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and envirommental riskss" and promoting equal employment opporumniess assessing racial disparities in heald and environmental isks)" and "Data on ethnic groups are
important tor putting into effecta number of federal stautes (ie enforcing biingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act monitoring and important tor putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e. enforcing bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act: monitoring and
enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed hy local govermments to run programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identitifing segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Heath Act evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Communiy Reinvestment Acl)."

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geogranhic

## Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity
(1997).see: whitehouse.gover (1997), see: whitehouse.gov/omb/fedree_1997standards ${ }^{\text {(12) }}$.

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-1.pdff ${ }^{(17)}$.
Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/js/pages/index.xhtm| ${ }^{1818)}$.
Additional information on the U.S. Hispanic population from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at:
census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.ppff ${ }^{20}$.
For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land mana
subject, see: icbemp.gov/sciencelhansistichard 10pg. pf ${ }^{(21)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Coconino County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 7\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 7\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 30\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 54\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 10\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Coconino County, Az | U.s. |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 54\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 10\% | 0\% |




| Region |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races. |  |  |
| American Indian \& Alaska Native Population, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Coconino County, AZ | U.S. |
| Total Population | 134,795 | 311,536,594 |
| Total Native American | 36.510 | 2,540,309 |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 35,988 | 1,997,487 |
| Apache | 599 | 69,740 |
| Blackeet | 0 | 26,474 |
| Cherokee | 62 | 273,192 |
| Cheyenne | 7 | 11,774 |
| Chickasaw | 0 | 22,917 |
| Chippewa | 31 | 115,253 |
| Choctaw | ${ }^{86}$ | 90,189 |
| Colville | 0 | 8,182 |
| Comanche | 15 | 12,228 |
| Cree | 0 | 2,191 |
| Creek | 0 | ${ }^{41,521}$ |
| Crow | 24 | 11,424 |
| Delaware | 0 | 7,471 |
| Houma | 0 | 9,488 |
| Iroquois | 3 | 45,639 |
| Kiowa | 11 | 8,691 |
| Lumbee | 0 | 68,171 |
| Menominee | 0 | 8,259 |
| Navaio | 31,578 | 305,552 |
| Osage | 0 | 8,332 |
| Otawa | 30 | 7,026 |
| Paiute | 30 | 10,545 |
| Pima | 149 | 24,212 |
| Potawatomi | 0 | 19,337 |
| Pueblo | 1,779 | 71,029 |
| Puget Sound Salish | 0 | 13,971 |
| Seminole | 19 | 13,987 |
| Shoshone | 23 | 9,470 |
| Sioux | 16 | 124,383 |
| Tohono O'Odham | 141 | 20,343 |
| Ute | 0 | 8,629 |
| Yakama | 0 | 8,614 |
| Yaqui | 193 | 19,942 |
| Yuman | 497 | 7,944 |
| All other tribes | 695 | 491,367 |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 98 | 60,370 |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 22 | 108,836 |
| Alaska Athabaskan | 0 | 15,882 |
| Aleut | 10 | 11,709 |
| Eskimo | 12 | 60,926 |
| Tlingit-Haida | 0 | 15,622 |
| All other tribes | 0 | 4,697 |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | 167 | 10,616 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; |  |  |
| ${ }^{*}$ The data in this table are calculated by ACS | ucted during 2009-20 | verage |

Not Specified
$\begin{aligned} & \text { The data in this table eareclcuated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average } \\ & \text { characterisicics during this period. }\end{aligned}$ 235

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
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What do we measure on this page?
That do we measure on this page?
This page describes in genear terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination
with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes

 Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Siouxx, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

Alaska Native: This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska
Native race and ettnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the }}{\text { Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" o " "Alaska Native, ' or tribal entries not elsewhere classified. }}$
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and
historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helptut to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coofficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accurachy throughout and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dols) indicales a coefficient of variation >

Additional Resources
The U.S. Forest Service Office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-tribal

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Coconino County, Az | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Native American | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 1\% | 0\% |
| Apache | 40\% | 2\% |
| Blackeet | na | 3\% |
| Cherokee | 53\% | 1\% |
| Cheyenne | 96\% | 6\% |
| Chickasaw | na | 3\% |
| Chippewa | 69\% | 1\% |
| Choctaw | 42\% | 1\% |
| Colville | na | 5\% |
| Comanche | 73\% | 6\% |
| Cree | na | 11\% |
| Creek | na | 2\% |
| Crow | 89\% | 5\% |
| Delaware | na | 7\% |
| Houma | na | 6\% |
| Iroquois | 182\% | 2\% |
| Kiowa | 122\% | 7\% |
| Lumbee | na | 1\% |
| Menominee | na | 4\% |
| Navaio | 2\% | 1\% |
| Osage | na | 6\% |
| Otawa | 101\% | 7\% |
| Paiute | 81\% | 4\% |
| Pima | 42\% | 4\% |
| Potawatomi | na | 3\% |
| Pueblo | 18\% | ${ }^{2 \%}$ |
| Puget Sound Salish | na | 4\% |
| Seminole | 86\% | 4\% |
| Shoshone | 69\% | 5\% |
| Sioux | 76\% | 1\% |
| Tohono O'Odham | 50\% | 5\% |
| Ute | na | 6\% |
| Yakama | na | 5\% |
| Yaqui | 80\% | 5\% |
| Yuman | 35\% | 6\% |
| All other tribes | 29\% | 1\% |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 85\% | 3\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 69\% | 1\% |
| Alaska Athabaskan | na | 4\% |
| Aleut | 97\% | 5\% |
| Eskimo | 91\% | 1\% |
| Tlingit-Haida | na | 4\% |
| All other tribes | na | 6\% |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | 55\% | 6\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; $\mathrm{Ns}^{\text {c }}$ | $31 \%$ | 1\% |

## Page 7

＋$\square$ ○米雷

## 

This page describes what people do tor work in terms of the type of work（occupation）and where they work（by industry）．
Employment by Occupation， 2013

| Civilian employed population $>16$ years ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management，professional，\＆erelaed | ${ }^{20,926}$ | 51，341，226 |
| Senice | 14，976 | 25，64，065 |
| Sales and difice | 15．478 | 34，957，520 |
| Foaming，titing，and toresty |  |  |
| Constuction extaction mant．，Repain | 5．554 <br> 7.133 |  |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Management，protessional，\＆elelaed | 32．5\％ | 36．2\％ |
| Senice | 23．2\％ | 18．1\％ |
| Sales and office | 24．0\％ |  |
| Comity | ${ }_{8}^{0.68 \%}$ | 0，73\％ |
| Production，transonotation，\＆material movin！ | ${ }_{11214 \%}$ | ${ }_{12.0 \%}^{\text {120\％}}$ |
|  characteristics during this period |  |  |
| Employment by Industry，2013＊ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | －${ }_{\text {64，440 }}^{1,163}$ | ${ }_{\substack{141.864,697 \\ 2,731,302}}^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | 4，073 | ${ }_{8,864,48}^{2,488}$ |
| Manutacturing | 4.019 | 14，867，423 |
| Wholesale trat |  | ${ }^{3,9,977,876}$ |
| Reatar rade | 何， 7.864 |  |
| Intomation | ， 605 |  |
| Finance and insurance，and real estaie | 2.535 | 9，499，756 |
| Prot，scientita，mgmt．admin．\＆w waste mgr | ${ }^{4,377}$ | 15，300，528 |
| Education，health care，e socala assistance | 17，649 | ${ }^{32,871,216}$ |
|  |  | －1，262，892 |
| Public administation | 4．163 | 7，034，048 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Agriculure，foresty，fssting \＆hunting，minin | 1．8\％ | 1．9\％ |
| Constrection | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{6.3 \% \%}$ |  |
| Whindesalet tade | ${ }^{\text {5，} 2.28}$ | ${ }_{2} 2.58$ |
| Retail trade | 122\％ | 1．6\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utilites | 4．9\％ | 4．9\％ |
| Intimation Finance and insurance，and real estate | － |  |
| Prot，scientific，mgmt，admin．\＆waste mgr | 6．8\％ | －0．8\％ |
| Education，heallt care，\＆social assistance | 27．4\％ | 23．2\％ |
| Ars，eneetain，rec，accamodation，\＆tood |  | （9．3\％\％ |
| Public administraion | c．5\％ | ¢．0\％ |

Data Surres．U．S．Departmen t ot commerec．2013．Census Bureau，Ameicican Community Surey ofitice，Wastington，D．C．

| Employment by occupation，Coefficients of variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Management．professional，\＆erlated | 3\％ | \％ |
| Senice | 3\％ | \％ |
| Sales and ofice | ${ }^{3 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Famming，fsting，and toresty | 24\％ | 1\％ |
| Construction，extracion，manit，\＆ereair | ${ }^{7 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Production，transporation， Q material movin！ | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficieients of Variation |  |  |
| Menagement，protessional，\＆erelated | 3\％${ }_{\text {3\％}}^{3 \%}$ | \％\％ |
| Serice | ${ }^{3 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{3 \% 6 \\ 2106}}$ | \％\％ |
| Famming，isting，and foresty | ${ }^{21 \%}$ | \％\％ |
| Constuction，extaction，maint，\＆eepair | 6\％ | \％\％ |
| Employment by Industry，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 106 |  |
| Agiciulure，toresty，fissing \＆hunuing． | ${ }^{133 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| Constuction | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Manuacturing | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 14\％\％ | \％ |
| Reati trade | 5\％ | \％\％ |
| Transporation，waenhousing，and utulites | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | \％\％ |
| Intormaion | 16\％\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and creal estate | ${ }_{\text {8\％}}^{8 \%}$ | \％\％ |
| Prot，scientific，mgnt．admini．\＆waste mgr | ${ }^{7 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Education，heall care，\＆social assistance | 3\％ | \％\％ |
| Ars，enietain．，rec，accamodation，\＆tood | ${ }^{4 \%}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0 \%}$ |
| Other senices，exeept public administraion | 9\％ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| $\frac{\text { Public administation }}{\text { Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation }}$ | 7\％ | \％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficieients of Variation |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{13 \% \\ 9 \% 6}}$ | \％\％ |
| Constuction Manutacuring | ${ }_{79} 9$ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 12\％ | \％ |
| Realit tade | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Transootation，waerhousing，and uxilites | 9\％ | \％\％ |
| Intormation | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| Prot，scientict，mgnt．admin．\＆waste mgr | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，health care，\＆social assistance | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Ars，enetetain，rec，accomodation， $\mathbf{\&}$ tood | ${ }^{4 \%}$ | \％\％ |
| Oiter senices，excepp pubilica amimistataion | ${ }_{7 \%}^{9 \%}$ | 0\％ |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page？
This page describes what people do tor
This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work（occupation）and where they work（by industry）．
$\frac{\text { Employment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification（SOC）system，where workers are classified into occupations }}{\text { with similar job duties，skills，education，andlor tratining，regardiless of industry．}}$
$\frac{\text { Employment by industry：Reters to the employment by industry，listed according to the North American Industry Classification System }}{\text {（NAICS）．}}$
Why is it Important？
Employment statistics are usually reported by industry（as with other reports in EPS－HDT）．This is a usetul way to show the relative diversity of
the economy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors．Employment by occupation offers additional intormation that describes what people do tor a living and the type of work they do，regardless of the industry．For example，management and protessional occupations are
generally of higher wage and require tormal education，and these occupations could exist in any number of industrise for example，managers generaraly of higher wage and require tormal education，and these occupations could exst in any number of tinustries（tor example，managers
could be eovking tor a sotware firm，amme，or co construction company）．Occupation intormation describes what peopile do，while employment
by industry describes where people work．

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as tollows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$ ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between
12 and $40 \%$ ； 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD（preceeded with two dots）indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$ ．If data have consistenty low accuracy
throughouta a rep
dditional Resources
The Census Bureau provides a deffition of socs：census．gov／hhes／wwwioindexioverview．html ${ }^{\text {² }}$
Occupations are also deffined by U．S．Bureau of Labor Statistics：bls．govisoc $l^{(26)}$ ？
The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs，including training and education neede earnings，working conditions，and what workers do on the job：bls．gov／coc／／${ }^{(27)}$ ．

## Data Sources

U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey office，Washington，D．C．


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> 

What do we measure on this page?
-
Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irrespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual
worked 10 or 40 hours per week, if they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year".

Why is it important?
Otten, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human
capital translating to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living For example labor incomes in capital, translating to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have consistentiy been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the US Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Par-time jobs (those that average less
than 35 hourswweek) are o oten ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to
remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a tull schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to
telecommute and work shorter and more fiexible hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal tourism, or recreation related
 hours/week).

To understand the degree to which the data on this page are reated to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, To understand the degree to which the data on this page arr
data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count full time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large
percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain falling wages or rates of employment that outpace percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain allling wages or rates of employment that outpac
population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$ II dita have consistently low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Maynard, D. C. \& Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G $06-12$ (501). Available at:
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs
ceo.usc.edulpdffico612501.pdff

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-ime employment, see: bls.gov/opub/is/pati/opbis 571. pof ${ }^{(29)}$.
For information on unemployment, fun the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


|  |
| :---: |
| This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to w |

Commuting Characteristics, 2013*


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## What do we measure on this page? <br> What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers who do not work

Place of Work: The values reported under "place of work" describe the number of workers that live in the selected geographic area who worked
either in or outside the county they live in. If the selected geography is not a county, the workers may or may not work within the selected
 residents that worked in Maricopa County (but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix).

## Why is it important?

High rates of out-commuting are more common in non-metro areas, and in parts of the U.S. where communities are closer together.
Economic development ts sometimes affected by commuting in unanticipated ways: strategies aimed at increasing iobs in a community will not
necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing iobs into that necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing jobs into that
community.
High out-commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for services, complicating fiscal planning for local governments.
"Bedroom communities," those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggle to provide social services, housing, and water and sewer


Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient tof variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$.If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (precededed with two dotss) indicates a cooefficient tof variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report a a a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Aldrich, L... Beale, B. and $K$. Kasse. 1997 . Commuting and the EConomic Function
Perspectives 12 (3) ers. usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.puf ${ }^{\text {(30) }}$.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Coconino County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over | 1\% | 0\% |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 1\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 7\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 11\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 9\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 21\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 15\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 11\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 3\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 1\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 7\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 11\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 9\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 21\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 18\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 11\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 9\% | 0\% |



| Study Guide and Supplemental Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| What do we measure on this page? |  |
|  |  |
| Per Capita licome: Total personal income divided by total population of an area. |  |
| Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as the |  |
| Gini Coeficient: provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of |  |
|  |  |
| Lorenz Curve: a graphic representation comparing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect inequality. Every point on the Lorenz curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom _ \% of households have _\% of all |  |
| Why is it important? |  |
|  |  |
| For public land managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographies helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing economic hardship. |  |
| The distribution of income can help to highlight several important aspects of economic well-being. A large number of households in the lower end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpreted as the size of the middle class. A figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geography characterized by "haves" and "have-nots." |  |
| Income distribution has always been a central concern of economic theory and economic policy. Classical economists were mainly concerned with the distribution of income between the main factors of production, land, labor, and capital. Modern economists have also addressed this issue, but have been more concerned with the distribution of income across individuals and households. |  |
| According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage gains and those at the bottom real wage losses... At the same time, long-run changes in society's living arrangements have taken place also tending to exacerbate household income differences. For example, divorces, marital separations, births out of wedlock, and the increasing age at first marriage have led to a shift away from married-couple households to single-parent families and nonfamily households. Since non-married-couple households tend to have lower income and less equally distributed income than other types of households... changes in household composition have been associated with growing income inequality." |  |
| Methods |  |
| While the Census Bureau does not have an official definition of the "middle class," it does derive several measures related to the distribution of income and income inequality. Two standard measures of income equality are the Lorenz Curve and the Gini Coefficient. Mean values for each cohort were used to calculate total income, in the case of the top income cohort, income was assumed to be $\$ 250,000$, a value which tends to yield lower than actual values for income disparity. For details on how to calculate, see Additional Resources below. |  |
| Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. |  |
| Additional Resources |  |
| The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-metro income levels and inequality. McLaughlin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf ${ }^{(31)}$. |  |
| For useful remarks and scholarly references on the level and distribution of economic well-being, see Federal Reserve System Chaiman Ben s . |  |
| Bermanke's speech on February 6, 2007, available at: federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bermanke20070206a.htm ${ }^{(32)}$. |  |
| For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885\&type=educator (33). |  |
| For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZZY\&hl=en ${ }^{(34)}$. |  |
|  |  |
| Data Sources |  |
| U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C. Study Guide |  |


| Coconino County, Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Per-Capita Income | 2\% | 0\% |
| Median Household Income^ (2013) \$s | 2\% | 0\% |
| Total Households | 1\% | 0\% |
| Less than \$10,000 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 9\% | 0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 7\% | 0\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 10\% | 0\% |
| Gini Coefficient | 2\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 7\% | 0\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 8\% | 0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 7\% | 0\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 11\% | 0\% |

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line．
$\frac{\text { Poverty：Following the Office of Management and Budget＇s Directive } 14 \text { ，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by }}{\text { tamily size and composition to detect who is poor If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty }}$ family size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a family or an unrelated in
threshold，then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Poverty，2013＊

|  | Coconino County，Az | U．S． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 126，967 | 303，692，076 |
| Families | 29，860 | 76，744，358 |
| People Below Poverty | 29，171 | 46，663，433 |
| Families below poverry | 4，638 | 8，666，630 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| People Below Poverty | 23．0\％ | 15．4\％ |
| Families below poverty | 15．5\％ | 11．3\％ | The data in this table are calcula）．

characteristics during this period．

－Percent below poverty level by age and family type is calculated by dividing the number of people by demographic in poverty by the
total population of that demogapapic． total population of that demographic

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．


## Poverty，Coefficients of Variation



|  |  | *口隶 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty. |  |  |
| Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. |  |  |
| Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity^, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Coconino County, Az | U.s. |
| Total Population (all races) in Poverty | 29,171 | 46,663,433 |
| White alone | 12,217 | 28,254,647 |
| Black or African American alone | 315 | 10,165,935 |
| American Indian alone | 12,863 | 701,439 |
| Asian alone | 576 | 1,872,394 |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 54 | 99,943 |
| Some other race | 1,665 | 3,872,191 |
| Two or more races | 1.481 | 1,696,884 |
| All Ethnicities in Poverty |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 5,469 | 12,507,866 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 23,702 | 34,155,567 |
| Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) |  |  |
| White alone | 41.9\% | 60.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 1.1\% | 21.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 44.1\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 2.0\% | 4.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Some other race | 5.7\% | 8.3\% |
| Two or more races | 5.1\% | 3.6\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 18.7\% | ${ }^{26.8 \%}$ |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 81.3\% | 73.2\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or ethnic category by the total population. <br> *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |
| Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty-, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Coconino County, AZ | U.S. |
| White alone ${ }^{\text {Black or Atrican American alone }}$ | 15.7\% | 12.5\% |
| Black or African American alone American Indian alone | 35.7\% | 28.6\% |
| Asian alone | 33.0\% | 12.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 35.5\% | 19.6\% |
| Some other race alone | 30.0\% | 26.8\% |
| Two or more races alone | 35.7\% | 20.1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 32.0\% | 24.7\% |
| ~Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that race. |  |  |
|  |  |  |



Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source． |  |  |
| Number of Households Receiving Earnings，by Source，2013＊＊ |  |  |
|  | Coconino County，Az | U．S． |
| Total households： | ${ }^{46,198}$ | 115，610，216 |
| Labor earnings | 38，357 | 90，436，935 |
| Social Security（SS） | 10，680 | 33，386，448 |
| Reirement income | 7，733 | 20，504，523 |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 2，094 | 5，716，592 |
| Cash public assistance income | 1，043 | 3，255，213 |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 6，060 | 14，339，330 |
| Percent of Total＾ |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 83．0\％ | 78．2\％ |
| Social Security（SS） | 23．1\％ | 28．9\％ |
| Reitement income | 16．7\％ | 17．7\％ |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 4．5\％ | 4．9\％ |
| Cash public assistance income | 2．3\％ | 2．8\％ |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 13．1\％ | 12．4\％ |



Number of Households Receiving Earnings，By Source，Coefficients of Variation

| － | Coconino County，Az | U．S． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total households： | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Labor earnings | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Social Security（SS） | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Retirement income | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Supplemental Security income（SSI） | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Cash public assistance income | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Social Security（SS） | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Reirement income | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Cash public assistance income | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Coconino County，Az | U．S． |
| Mean earnings | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Mean Social Security income | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Mean retirement income | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Mean Supplemental Security Income | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| Mean cash public assistance income | 19\％ | 0\％ |

##  <br> Educational Attainment, 2013*



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Coconino County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population 25 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| No high school degree | 4\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 2\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 5\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or protessional | 4\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| No high school degree | 4\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 2\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 5\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 4\% | 0\% |
| School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Coconino County, AZ | u.s. |
| Total Population over 3 years old: | 0\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in school: | 1\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 10\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in kindergatten | 11\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 2\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 10\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 1\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Enrolled in school: | 1\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 8\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | 10\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 2\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 10\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 1\% | 0\% |

$\qquad$

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

* tovoz*

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes levels of education attainment
Educational Attainment: This refers to the evel of education completed by people 25 years and over in terms of the highest degree or the
highest level of schooling completed
School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private
school or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interview. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business


Why is it important?
Sudies show that geograshies with a higher than average educated worktorce growew faster, have have higher incoumes, and sutfer less during Ludies show that geographies with a higher than average educated worktorce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during
conomic downturn than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geographic areas migh
anperience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication
Shool enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age, access to education. and potential for future growth. Some government agencies also use this intormation for funding allocations.

Methods
Dala accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low ccuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-found employment, and unemployment rates, see:
The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.goviemplep_chart_001.htm (41).
U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available
at: census.goviprod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf ( 42 ).

Card, David (1999). "The Causal Effect of Education on Earnings" in Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, eds., Handbook of Labor Economics, wol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

## Data Source

S. Wentrent of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington D.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ** |  |  |  |
| This page measures the p pinay language people speak at home. |  |  |  |
| Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a nonEnglish language which is used in addition to English or in place of English. |  |  |  |
| Language Spoken at Home, 2013* |  |  |  |
|  |  | Univ, Az |  |
| Population 5 ys Sor order |  |  | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{291.484 .4882}$ |
| Speak a lanuuge other than Eng |  | ${ }^{29,6929}$ |  |
|  |  | 9,446 | 37,456,624 |
|  |  | ${ }_{1}^{1,414}$ | 10,737.607 |
| Astin and Pacticict sland languages |  |  |  |
| Speaker Enorlaguyages |  | (17.562 |  |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| Speak ony English |  | 76.5\% | 79.3\% |
| Speak a language other than Engish |  | 23.5\% | 20.7\% |
|  |  | 7.5\% | 12.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Asian and Pacticicliand languages |  | $1.09 \%$ | - |
| Speek Enolish less han very well' |  | ${ }_{8.19}$ | ${ }^{\text {8.6\% }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent t f Population that Speaks English Less Than 'Very well', |  |  |
| - In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people thatspoke English less than 'very well' ( $8.6 \%$ ), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowes (8.1\%). | $\left.\begin{array}{c} 10 \% \\ 98 \% \\ 88 \% \end{array}\right]$ | ${ }^{8.1 \%}$ |  |
|  |  |  | 8.6\% |
|  | 6\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 4 \% \\ 3 \% \\ 3 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{1 \%}^{2 \%}$ | coonino Count, Az | u.s. |
|  |  |  |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information **
What do we measure on this page?
This page measures the primary language people speak at home.
Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English
language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.
Why is it important?
For public land managers who are tring to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent to public clands, it its important to know whether
a significant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation may need to be conducted in multitile languages.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates betwe
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. It data have consistenty low accuracy
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United
States. This tool is available at: mla.org/map_single
Data Sources
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation


大 1 人

## 

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.
Housing Characteristics, 2013*

|  |  | Coconino County, AZ | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units |  | 63,679 | 132,057,804 |
| Occupied |  | 46,198 | 115,610,216 |
| Vacant |  | 17,481 | 16,447,588 |
| For rent |  | 11.094 | 3,230,123 |
| Rented, not occupied |  | 275 | 599,884 |
| For sale only |  | 807 | 1,682,020 |
| Sold, not occupied |  | 121 | 608,590 |
| For seasonal, recreational, occasional us |  | 13,480 | 5,122,778 |
| For migrant workers |  | 10 | 34,233 |
| Other vacant |  | 1,694 | 5,169,960 |
| Year Built |  |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later |  | 315 | 771,765 |
| Built 2000 to 2004 |  | 12,545 | 19,385,497 |
| Built 1990 to 1999 |  | 13,227 | 18,390,124 |
| Built 1980 to 1989 |  | 15.730 | 18,345,244 |
| Built 1970 to 1979 |  | 12,170 | 21,042,566 |
| Built 1960 to 1969 |  | 4,523 | 14,634,125 |
| Built 1959 or earier |  | 5,169 | 39,488,483 |
| Median year structure built^ |  | 1986 | 1976 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| Occupancy |  |  |  |
| Occupied |  | 72.5\% | 87.5\% |
| Vacant |  | 27.5\% | 12.5\% |
| For rent |  | 1.7\% | 2.4\% |
| Rented, not occupied |  | 0.4\% | 0.5\% |
| For sale only |  | 1.3\% | 1.3\% |
| Sold, not occupied |  | 0.2\% | 0.5\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional |  | 21.2\% | 3.9\% |
| For migrant workers |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Other vacant |  | 2.7\% | 3.9\% |
| Year Built |  |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later |  | 0.5\% | 0.6\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 |  | 19.7\% | 14.7\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 |  | 20.8\% | 13.9\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 |  | 24.7\% | 13.9\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 |  | 19.1\% | 15.9\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 |  | 7.1\% | 11.1\% |
| Built 1959 or earier |  | 8.1\% | 29.9\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Median year structure built is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations. <br> * The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. <br> Housing Occupancy, Coconino County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County, $A Z$ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing ( $27.5 \%$ ), and the U.S. had the lowest ( $12.5 \%$ ). | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ 80 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | menem |
|  | 60\% |  |  |
|  | 40\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 20\% |  | u.s. |
|  |  | Coconino County, Az |  |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
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What do we measure on this page?
Rent: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and
$\frac{\text { Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied }}{\text { vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview. }}$
$\frac{\text { For Seasonal. Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other }}{\text { Oche }}$
For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

Why is it important?
Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data is used to assess the demand for housing, to identify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing arket over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic
levels.
Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirability of a place for recreation and tourism. This could aso be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990 and early 2000 were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when
housing grew ata a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the erlative growth rates of housing is ceusing grew at a tast rate (hee late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country. Understanding the relaive grownt rates of housing is home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast future demand of services, such as energy consumption and fire protection.
Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
*]
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
$\frac{\text { owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid }}{\text { for. }}$
Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.
Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
$\frac{\text { Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, }}{\text { and condominium fees. }}$

- $x$
$\frac{\text { Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels }}{\text { (oil, coal, kerosene, wood etc) jit }}$

Why is it important?
An inportant indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share
devoted to housing that is below 15 percent is a good proxy for highly affordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

## Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 pe
excessive (or unaffordable) housing costs that exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >40\%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey has additional information on housing and housing affordability. See:

For housing prices, for-profit online real-estate senvices may have the most recent price information. See, for example, zillow.com ${ }^{(45)}$.
For current calculations on housing afford abiility, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at
realtor.org/research/research/housinginx ${ }^{(46)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs
for owner-occupied homes ( $\$ 1,540$ ), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest
( $\$ 1.515)$.
- In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County,
AZ had the highest estimated monthly

AZ had the highest estimated monthly
gross rent for renter-occupied homes
( $\$ 9966$ ) and the U.S. had the lowest $(\$ 904)$.


- In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County,
AZ had the highest estimated percent of renter-occupied households where greater than $30 \%$ of household income was spent g gross rent ( $51.0 \%$ ), and the U.S. had the west (48.3\%).
- Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household incom
edian Monthly Mortgage Costs and Gross Rent, 2013


Median monthy mortgage cost $n$
median gross rent ${ }^{\wedge}$
Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation

| Coconino County, Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage | 2.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 6.6\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 2.4\% | 2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 7.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 4.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Median monthly mortgage cost^ | 1.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Median gross rent^ | 1.8\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 6.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 5.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 7.9\% | 0.6\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 4.4\% | 0.1\% |



Indicators

|  | Region | us |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age (2009*) | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population White Alone (2009*) | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native | 1.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Population "Baby | 1.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Family Income (2009*) | 2.1\% | .1\% |
| Per Capita Income (2009*) | 2.0\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*) | 4.2\% | .4\% |
| Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*) | \% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Households with Retirement and Social | 2.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income | 4.6\% | 0.3\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High | 4.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's | 2.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population That Speak English Less Than | 5.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*) | 2.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 5.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Renter.Occupied Homes where Greater than 30\% of | 4.4\% | 0.1\% |

EPS－HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：
－ 2000 Decennial U．S．Census
Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750

## －American Community Survey

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750
The on－line ACS data retrieval tool is available at：
http：／／www．census．gov／acs／www／

## ＊柬縕紫 <br> EPS－HDT core approaches

EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－Regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## About the American Community Survey（ACS）

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1－3，all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey（ACS）of the Census Bureau．

The ACS is a nation－wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic，social，economic，and housing information about communities every year－information that until recently was only available once a decade．The ACS is not the same as the decennial census，which is conducted every ten years（the ACS has replaced the detailed，Census 2000 long－form questionnaire）．

Data used in this report are 5 －year ACS estimates．Moreso than the 1 or 3 －year estimates，the 5 －year estimates are consistently available for small geographies，such as towns．We show 5 －year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross－geography comparisons．The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period，only what the average value is over the full period．

Because ACS is based on a survey，it is subject to error．The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error（MOE）for every data point．In this report，we alert the user to the data accuracy using color－coded text in the tables：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation（CV）＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD （preceded with two dots）indicates a CV $>40 \%$ ．

The CV is a measure of relative error in the estimate，and is calculated directly from the MOE as the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself．To get the standard error，the MOE is divided by 1.645 （for a 90 percent confidence interval）．The CV is expressed as a percentage．For example，if you have an estimate of $60+/-20$ ，the CV for the estimate is 20.3 percent．This estimate should be used with caution，since the sampling error represents more than 20 percent of the estimate．

## 成米日

## 

headwaterseconomics．org／eps－hdt

## 

Throughout this report，references to on－line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses．These resources are provided as hyperlinks here．

```
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej guidance nepa ceq1297.pdf
www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology main/
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej
www.stateoftheusa.org
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
www.frey-demographer.org
www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging statistics/index.aspx
www.census.gov/popest/
www.countyhealthrankings.org/
www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
uww.census.gov/population/age/
www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg 1997standards
www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22 cspan hispanics.pdf
www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard 10pg.pdf
www.bia.gov/index.htm
uww.indians.org/index.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
www.bls.gov/soc/
www.bls.gov/ocol
www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
uww.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009 ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
www.bls.gov/emp/ep chart 001.htm
www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
www.mla.org/map single
www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
www.zillow.com
www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.

Page

## Land Ownership

What is the breakdown of land ownership? 1
What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 2
What are the different types of federal lands? 3
Land Cover
What is the breakdown of forest, grassland, and other land cover types?
4

Residential Development

What are the trends in residential land-use conversion? ..... 5-6
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 7
Links to Additional Resources ..... 8

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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## 

This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
U.S. Forest Service Land Types (Acres), 2009

|  | Coconino County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Area | 11,941,017 | 2,286,279,509 |
| Forest Service Lands | 3,277,932 | 192,750,310 |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 2,495,261 | 146,630,207 |
| National Wiiderness | 169,935 | 36,155,579 |
| National Monument | 0 | 3,661,327 |
| National Recreation Area | 0 | 2,950,660 |
| National Game Refuge | 612,736 | 1,198,099 |
| National Wild River | 0 | 568,059 |
| National Recreation River | 0 | 398,207 |
| National Scenic River | 0 | 289,617 |
| National Scenic Area | 0 | 230,459 |
| Primitive Area | 0 | 173,762 |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0 | 167,427 |
| Special Management Area | 0 | 164,707 |
| Protection Area | 0 | 45,051 |
| Recreation Management Area | 0 | 43,900 |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0 | 39,171 |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0 | 12,645 |
| National Botanical Area | 0 | 8,256 |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0 | 6,637 |
| National Historic Area | 0 | 6,540 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Forest Service Lands | 27.5\% | 8.4\% |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 20.9\% | 6.4\% |
| National Widerness | 1.4\% | 1.6\% |
| National Monument | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| National Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Game Refuge | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| National Wild River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Recreation River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Primitive Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Special Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Protection Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Recreation Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Botanical Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Historic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. |  |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
Note: All acreages on this page were reported by the U.S. Forest Services' Land Areas Report 2009. The total acreage of Forest Service land
on this page may differ from that reported on previous page due to differences in values reported by the data sources.
Why is it important?
orest Service lands have special designations scat may maferect Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forent Service lands have special designations

Methods
County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Retuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia
Additional Resources
A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available
at.ts. fed. us/land/statiflar/2009/larogindex.htm/ ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$

Data Sources
USDA, FS - Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database





8 \&
The EPS-HDT Land-Use report uses national data sources to represent land cover and residential development. In an effort to report more accurate statistics for land ownership, a compilation of state level data was used. All the data in this report were the result of calculations made in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- TIGER/Line County Boundaries 2012

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html

- Developed Areas 2000 and 2010

Theobald, DM. 2013. Land use classes for ICLUS/SERGoM v2013. Unpublished report, Colorado State University.

- Protected Areas Database v 1.32012
U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006

National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm

- USDA, Forest Service

Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html

## 

EPS-HDT core approaches
EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-county regions, to accommodate a flexible range of userdefined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
www.nhd.usgs.gov
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.htm|
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions of terms.htm
headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php
```


## 

## 

Produced by
Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit

## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

www.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Note to Users:

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.

Components of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department Agricuture. 2009. Forest Senice, Washington, D.C.; U. U. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Asthington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Oftice of Natural Resource
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
ederal land payments: These are tederal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals).
$\frac{\text { Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is }}{\text { based on a maximum per-acre payment reduced by the sum ot all }}$ Sest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local Forest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools.

BLM Revenue Sharing: The BLM shares a portion of receipts generated on public lands with state and local governments, including grazing fe Urough the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California ( O \& C) grant lands.
USFWS Refuge: These payments share a portion of receipts from National Wildlife Refuges and other areas managed by the USFWS directiy with the counties in which they are located.
$\frac{\text { Federal Mineral Royalies: These payments are distributed to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may }}{\text { Share at their discretion: }}$ Federal Fiscal Year: FY refers to the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1 and ends September 30 .

Why is it important?
State and local govermment cannot tax federally owned lands the way they would if the land were privately owned. A number of federal programs exist to compensate county yovernments for the eresence of ef edearal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of
local govermment revenue in rural counties with lagge feedera land holdings.

Before 1976, all federal payments were linked directly to receipts generated on public lands. Congress funded PILT with appropriations
beginning in 1977 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing programs. PITT was intended to stabilize and begining in 1977 in recognition of the volatility and Inadequacy of ederara revenue sharing programs. PILT was intended to stabilize and crease federal land payments to county govermments. More recently, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of
2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several maior concer around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment level, and the incentives provided to counties by linking federal land payments directly to extractive uses of public lands.
PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Despite the increased appropiations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011 , PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget concern are creating uncertainty for the future of both.
Methods
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported du
Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively insignificant at the federal level (data gaps on local distributions of
USFWS Refuge revenue sharing is less than one percent of total federal land payments in FFY 2009) but may be important to specific loca governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royalties represent a more significant omission in states that share a portion governments with significant USFW S acreage. Federal mineral royaties represent a more signififant omission in states that
royalties with local governments. Federal mineral royalties made up $68 \%$ of federal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M
Gorte, Ross W., M. Lymne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic import
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdtt ${ }^{(1)}$
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2007. U. Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## ****
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What do we measure on this page?


Why is it important?
A variety of state and local governments receive federal land payments, and the way these payments are distributed explains who benefits. For example. PLTT is directed to county government only while USFS payments are shared between county government and schools. II USSS
payments decine
phen payments decine, the PILT tormula ensures that county govermment payments will increase, but school distsicts will not share in the increased
PITT payments. While PILT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal
land payments delivered to state government (mineral royaties, BLM revenul shaing payments) are silll liked directly to ho, land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenue sharing payments) are still inked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and govemors have a different set of expectations and incentives to lobby for particular outcomes on public lands than do county commissioners or school officials.

Methods
State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) federal mineral royalties and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and federal statute (see note about datat limitations). County Government Distributions: Consist of (1) PILT; ( 2 ) portions of Forest Service payments including Secure Rural Schools and
Community Selt-Determination Act (SRS) Titte I and Title III, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands ; (4) LLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discretionary state govermment distributions of federal mineral royaties where these data are availiable. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Titte I, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands

Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distributions: Consist of SRS Titte II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on pub
land projects on the nationa forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and
 interests and areas of expertise, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national forest personnel.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLL Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Data Limitations: Local goverment distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). -
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.

Gorte, Ross W., M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanenty Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service,
 Fish and Widlilife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic
Additional sources and methods available at www headwaterseconomics

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agricuture. 2009. Forest Sevice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wiidlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlifie Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart
Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.orgleps-hdt

This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distributed to the state
school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Government by Permitted Use, FY 2013 ( 2013 \$s)
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What do we measure on this page?
county government federal and distribute the state, school districts grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Why is it important?
County govermments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For ay for law entiorcement maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must the Forest Senvice, are specifically tarcyeted to help pay for these costs.

Methods
$\frac{\text { Unrestricted: Consist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Widlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral }}{\text { royaties from the state government. }}$
Restricted-County Roads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Title I, (2) Forest Service $25 \%$
Fund, (3) Forest Service Owl payments (between 1993 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law) mandates payments be insd for county roads and public schools. Each state determines how to split tunds between the two services.
Restricted-Special County Projects: Consist of (1) SRS Titie ell funds that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, protection plans.

Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations trom USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royalties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be

Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Un
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000. Forest Service Payments to Counties ongressional Research Senvice Report RL33822.

Data Sources
.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Wishhington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. ish and Wildifife Seviice, Washington. D.C..: U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic


## TTis page comporases fededal land payments as a propoprion of otatal general county government revenues, based on local government financial data e neereded direetly into the table by the user.

$\frac{\text { Instructions: Use the Interactive Table below to input data (enter data only in the shaded cells). Data entered will automatically }}{\text { update the table and figures below. See the instuctions in the Sudy }}$ ( Guide for help on where to to find count data.
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## What do we measure on this page?

proporion of total general county government reveruus, based on local government financial
y is it important?
 Instructions
 Financia Statemen
figures on tisis page
Audied Financial Satements: Most states require county governments 10 complete annual audits of government financial reports and tor report these to the state. Audited anvual financial statements are the best source for Iocal financial data because they report st
general county goverment
 are nos standardizized across local govermments and some work may be required to understand the accounting basis tor these reports. 2. Enter Federal Land Payments Data: Fill in the shaded dells in the interactive Table with federal land payments datat or the year immediately
prior to the year for which you entered goverment t inancial data These datac can be found on page 2 of this report, or in the tidden "calcs" prior to the year tor which you enered government finacial datat These data can b
worksheet. To unhide worksheets. fight cicick on any worksheet tab and dick unhide.
3 Update Tex in Tables, Figures, and Bulles: Table and figure headings and bullets that describe the reporing period and geographies covered must te updated to toffect the year of datai enterecd, and the geographies sovered.

Additional Resources
Honade

Data Sources



Data Sources. U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014 . Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington. D.C. U. U. Department
of thereior. 2009 Payments in ien




This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PLTT).
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Payments in Lieu of $T$
This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).
Congress authorized PILT in 1976 in recognition of the volatitity and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing payment programs to compensate
counties for non-taxable federal lands within their borders (Public aww $94-565$ ) P PLT Thacreases and sharing payments by paying counties based on a per-acre avercac Law 94-565). PILT increases and stabilizes county government revenue and is subject to a population cap.

A low average per--acre PILT payment may indicate significant revenue sharing payments from the previous year or that the county's population
is below the
Alow average per-acre PLTT payment may indicate signiticant rev.
is below the population cap that limits the base per acre payment.
PILT is permanently authorized, but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis. PILT was typically not fully funded until FY 2008
when counties received a guarantee of five years at tull payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Why is it important?
As county payments became more important to local goverrmment atter wwil (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-wa
housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PIIT increased and stablized payments by appropriations rather than directly trom commodity receipts. PILT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local govermment services, but can be used at the discretion of county commissioners to fund any local government needs.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Department of the Interior maintains an online searchable database of PILT payments and eligible PILT acres by county and state total. Data are available back to FY 1999 at: doi. govinhbc/index.cfm ${ }^{(4)}$

Schuster, Evin G. 1995. PILT - Its Purpose and Performance. Journal of Forestry. 93(8):31-35.
Corn, M. Lynne. 2008. PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes): Somewhat Simplified. Congressional Research Service Report RL31392.

Data Sources
S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.


This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self
Determination Act (SRS), $25 \%$ Fund, and Forest Grasslands. Determination Act (SRS), 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Forest Service Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)



## Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Forest Service revenu
This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act
U.S. Forest Service 25 Percent Fund: The $25 \%$ Fund, established in 1908 , shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on . publict land with the ecounty where the activities take place. Twenty-five percent of the value of public land receipts are distributed directly to counties and must be used to tund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services.
The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS), or Public Law 106-393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to $\frac{\text { The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of } 2000 \text { ( (SRS), or Public Law } 106 \text {--393: SRS was enacted in FY } 2001 \text { to }}{\text { provide } 5 \text { years of transitional assistance to rural counties affected by the decline in revenue from timber havests on federal lands. SRS was }}$ reauthorized for a single year in 2007 , and again in 2008 for a period of four years. The SRS Act has three titles that allocate payments for specific purposes.

- Title $I$ - these payments to counties make up 80 to 85 percent of the total SRS payments and must be dedicated to funding roads and

(RAte ll - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal
( the community level help make spending determinations and monitor project progress.
- Tite III- these payments may be used to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program, to reimburse the county for search
and rescue and other emergency services, and to develop community wildfire protection plans.
What is the Relationship Between the $25 \%$ Fund and SRS? Counties elect to receive Secure Rural Schools Payments or to continue with $25 \%$
Fund payments. Most counties have elected to receive Secure Rural Schools payments. Some counties, particularly in the East, continue to prefer $25 \%$ Fund payments to Secure Rural Schools.
 210). The Act authorized acquisisition of damaged lands to rehabilitate and use them for various purposes. Receipts from activities on Forest
Grasslands are shared directly with county governments. Grasslands are shared directly with county goverments.

Special Acts: These include Payments to Minnesota (Act of June 22, 1948,16 U.S.C. 577 g), payments associated with the Quinault Special
Management Area in Washington (P.L. $100-638,102$ Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quartz from the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas ( 5423 , Interior Appropriations Act tor FY1989; P.L. 100-446, 102 Stat. 17744 ). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment ( $75 \%$ of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in st. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receits from the Quinault Special Management Area with both the Quinault Indian Tribe and with the State of
Washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quartz from the Ouachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (rathe Wansington. Congress directed the Forest Sevice to sell quart from the Ouachita National Forest as common variety mineral maienalas (ranher
than being avalable under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkansas counties with Ouachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

Why is it important?
USFS revenue sharing is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royalties are distributed to
states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became imporant after WWII when tiates). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Paymenis became

As the timber economy shitted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it.
Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owl" transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owl" transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of
transition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS act. SRS changed USFS revenue shaaing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decourt transition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS act. SRS changed USFS revenue sharing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decoupled
county payments from National Forest receipts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewardship through Titte ll funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment equity concerms by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Titte I formula is adjusted using each county's per capita personal income).
SRS transition payments are only authorized through FY 2011, at which point Congress must decide to extend and/or reform SRS, or allow it expire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the $25 \%$ Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on
Additional Resources
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act payments available at: fs. . gsdagov/pts//(5).
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools al
Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.
Data Sources
.S. Deparment of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at
U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. For
www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

## ****


This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived from a variety of revenue-generating activities on BLM land, including revenue from the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.

BLM Payments to States and Local Governments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Coconino County, Az | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total BLM Payments (\$) | 36,868 | 66,579,030 |
| Proceeds of Sales | 14,534 | 9,841,676 |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0 | 53,150 |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 22,334 | 12,684,340 |
| State Payments | 0 | 3,922,509 |
| National Grasslands | 0 | 447,217 |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0 | 39,630,138 |
| Titte I | 0 | 33,685,617 |
| Titte II | 0 | 3,343,873 |
| Title III | 0 | 2,600,648 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Proceeds of Sales | 39.4\% | 14.8\% |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 60.6\% | 19.1\% |
| State Payments | 0.0\% | 5.9\% |
| National Grasslands | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0.0\% | 59.5\% |
| Titte I | 0.0\% | 50.6\% |
| Titte II | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Titte III | 0.0\% | 3.9\% |



```
O&C and CBWR land grants
-Taylor Grazing Act
```

Data Sources: U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hd
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are BLM land, including revenue trom the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.
Mineral Leasing Act: These include oil and Gas Right of Way lease revenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do
not include royatites trom mineral leasing on BLM lands, which are distributed by the office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). For ONRR payments see worksheet 10
Taylor Grazing Act: The Taylor Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, established grazing allotments on public land and extended tenure to district restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predator control, noxious weed programs) in cooperation with BLM orl livestock organizations. - Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerms grazing permits issued on public lands within grazing districts established under the Act. - Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns issuing grazing leases on public lands outside the original grazing district established under the

National Grasslands: Revenue derived from the management of National Grasslands under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.s.C.
1012), and Executive Order 10787, November 6, 1958.

Oregon and Califormia Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (O\&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road
(CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. Amounts include Titte I Title ll, and Titt payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report tor definitions and information on the Secwre Pur schools and Community Self-Determination Act).
Why is it important?
The BLM is the nation's largest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adijacent communities public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local govermments in lieu of property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT).
Methods
BLM data on this page are from BLM FRD 196 and FRD 198 reports. The FRD 196 reports receipts by county and state of origin while the
FRD 198 reports act FRD 198 reports actual distribution amounts to state and local governments. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 repo
 govermment are related to the previous FY's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2008 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2009.)
Additional Resources
an and Reports and Publa
blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct_Links_to_Publications/ann_rpt_and_pls.htmi ${ }^{(6)}$.

Data Source
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of and Management, Washington, D.C.; Additiona sources and menods avaliable at
W.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau

## * *

This page describes U.S. Fish and Widllife Service Refuge revenue sharing.

USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  |  |  | Coconino County, Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USFWS Refuge Revenue Share |  |  | 0 |  | 936,12 |
|  |  | USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing per FY, Coconino County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 0.0$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0- |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 言 |  |
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## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes U.S. Fish and Widlilife Service Refuge revenue sharing.
Twenty-five percent of the net receipts collected from the sale of various products or privileges from Refuge lands, or three-quarters of one percent $(0.75 \%)$ of the adjusted purchase price of Refuge land, whichever is greater, is shared with the counties in which the Refige is located.

Why is it important?
National Wildifife Refuges and other lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wiillife Service do not pay property taxes to local governments.
The Refuge revenue sharing program is intended to compensate counties tor non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing rograms, these payments can be important ited to compensate counties for non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing 1 ernment to raise sufficient tax revenue to provide basic services. In addition, inking p payments to revenue derived from USFW S lands can create incentives for local government officials to lobby for particular uses of public land.

## Methods

Data Limitations: The USFWS publishes a database of Refige revenue sharing payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007 only, and does not make ata available for other years for the nation. Data on Refuge revenue sharing may be obtained directly from the receiving county government. County govemments may request county-specific Retuge revenue sharing payment data from U.S. Fish and Wildilife Services, Division .

Significance of Data Limitations: Data limitations are relatively insignificant on the national scale (USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments .

Additional Resources
A detailed description of USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments is available on the U.S. Fish and Wildilife Service Realty website at fws.gov/refiges/realty/rs. htmm ${ }^{(5)}$.

The Refuge Revenue Sharing Database is available at: fws.gov/refuges/reaty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing_Search_2007.cfm. The database currenty only includes payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007. The agency does not provide data tor the nation for additional years

Data Sources
US. Dena in interior. 2007. U. . F. Fish and Widdife Service, Washington, D.C.

## 


This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments.
Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources US Department of interior 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue Washington. D.
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for
the region.
Royalties, rents, and bonus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the stata of origin (49\% of revenue is returned to from offshore drilling the Gulf of Mexico (GOMESA) are shared directly with county governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of federal mineral royaties within broad tederal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or economically impacted to spend their share of tederal mineral royatites within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socialy

Royalties: Royalty payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royaty may be an established Royalies: Royaty payments represent a stated share or peyalty rate increases by steps as the average production on the lease increases. A sliding--ccale royalty rate is based on on average production and applies to all production trom the leaseage A productition is on the when pease producreasestion begins. Geothermal: Geothermal payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. OOMESA: The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (GOMESA) makes distributions of offshore federal mineral royalties to coastal states and communities. The tour s.
Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Rents: A rent schedule is established at the time a lease is issued. Rents are annual payments, normally a fixed dollar amount per acre required to preserve the right to a lease.
Bonuses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Bonuses represent the cash amount successtully bid to win the rights to a lease.
Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royaty, rent, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalies, settlement payments,
Why is it important?
Mineral royaties are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significicant emands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royaty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed ongoing pubic benefit from the depletion of non-renewable resources owned by the public.
Methods
Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalties were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25
percent of the state govermment's share of federal mineral royalties with the county of origin. Because information about royalties by county of origin and state govemment distributions to local governments are not published by ONRR, EPS-HDT users must contact each stated directly hese data. Headwaters Economics includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in http://headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdt

Additional Resources
Headwaters Economics provides a methods document specific to the EPS.-HDT Federal Lands Payments report that includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Governmen .
HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdff ${ }^{10)}$
For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at
onr.gov/Stats/pdtfocs/glossary.pdffili .
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C

8 \＆
The EPS－HDT Government report uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：

## －U．S．Census of Governments

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce
www．census．gov／govs
Tel．800－242－2184
－U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service
Realty Division，U．S．Department of Interior
www．fws．gov
Tel．703－358－1713

## －U．S．Bureau of Land Management

U．S．Department of Interior
www．blm．gov
Tel．202－208－3801

## －U．S．Forest Service

U．S．Department of Agriculture
www．fs．fed．us
Tel．800－832－1355
－U．S．Office of Natural Resources Revenue
U．S．Department of Interior
www．onrr．gov
Tel．303－231－3078

## ＊来的卫粦

EPS－HDT core approaches
EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－county regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## Adjusting dollar figures for inflation

Because a dollar in the past was worth more than a dollar today，data reported in current dollar terms should be adjusted for inflation．The U．S．Department of Commerce reports personal income figures in terms of current dollars．All income data in EPS－HDT are adjusted to real（or constant）dollars using the Consumer Price Index．Figures are adjusted to the latest date for which the annual Consumer Price Index is available．

## 

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
www.census.gov/govs/
www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
www.fs.usda.gov/pts/
www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct Links to Publications/ann rpt and pls.html
www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing Search 2007.cfm
10 headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT Federal Land Payments Documentation 1-30-2011.pdf
www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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Note to Users:
Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV $>40 \%$.

[^1]

| Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| Population (2013*) | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
| Population (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Population Change (2000-2013*) | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
| Population Percent Change (2000-2013*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |




This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age
Median Age: The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e, half the people are younger than this age and
half are older.

Age \& Gender Distribution, 2013*

|  | Gila County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 53,335 | 311,536,594 |
| Under 5 years | 3,098 | 20,052,112 |
| 5 to 9 years | 3,113 | 20,409,060 |
| 10 to 14 years | 3,023 | 20,672,609 |
| 15 to 19 years | 3,113 | 21,715,074 |
| 20 to 24 years | 2,494 | 22,099,887 |
| 25 to 29 years | 2,668 | 21,243,365 |
| 30 to 34 years | 2,247 | 20,467,912 |
| 35 to 39 years | 2,450 | 19,876,161 |
| 40 to 44 years | 2,484 | 20,998,001 |
| 45 to 49 years | 3,269 | 22,109,946 |
| 50 to 54 years | 3,874 | 22,396,322 |
| 55 to 59 years | 4,218 | 20,165,892 |
| 60 to 64 years | 4,472 | 17,479,211 |
| 65 to 69 years | 4,319 | 13,189,508 |
| 70 to 74 years | 3,268 | 9,767,522 |
| 75 to 79 years | 2,068 | 7,438,750 |
| 80 to 84 years | 1,624 | 5,781,697 |
| 85 years and over | 1,533 | 5,673,565 |
| Total Female | 26,838 | 158,289,182 |
| Total Male | 26,497 | 153,247,412 |
| Change in Median Age, 2000-2013* |  |  |
| Median Age^ ( $2013^{*}$ ) | 47.9 | 37.3 |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 42.3 | 35.3 |
| Median Age \% Change | 13.2\% | 5.7\% | The datatin this table erae calculuat

characteristics during this period.


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S.
Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.

Age \& Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Gila County, Az | s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Under 5 years | 1.3\% | 0.0\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 5.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 6.5\% | 0.1\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 3.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 8.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 25 to 29 years | 4.2\% | 0.0\% |
| 30 to 34 years | 1.8\% | 0.0\% |
| 35 to 39 years | 6.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 40 to 44 years | 7.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 45 to 49 years | 1.1\% | 0.0\% |
| 50 to 54 years | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 6.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 65 to 69 years | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 70 to 74 years | 5.5\% | 0.1\% |
| 75 to 79 years | 7.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 80 to 84 years | 8.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 85 years and over | 8.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Total Female | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Total Male | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age^ (2013*) | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age \% Change | 3.3\% | 3.0\% |
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What do we measure on this page?
and the change in median age.
$\frac{\text { Median Age: }}{\text { older. }}$ The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are

Why is it important?
Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of reitrees, the age distribution may be
skewed towards categories 65 years and older. in counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group $18-29$. In skewed towards categories 65 years and older. In counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group 18-29. in many counties, the largest segment of the population is in the Baby Boomer generation (people born between 1946 and 1964).
The change in median age is one indicatoo of whether the population has gotten older or younger.
Methods
Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5 -year estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5 -year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, $2009^{*}$ may be listed as the year, but this is a 5 -year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of all people
regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and entorcement of environmental laws, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej
An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliancelejeresources(policylei_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pdf ${ }^{(1)}$. The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at: stateotheusa.org ${ }^{(5)}$.

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: ers.usda.gov/topics/ural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx ${ }^{(6)}$ Wiliam H. Frey's website provides links to pubications, issues, media stories, data tools and
and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.f.frey-demographer.org ${ }^{(1)}$.
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at
The U.S. Department of Health and Human S
aoa.gov/aoarootlaging_statisticsindex.aspx ${ }^{(\theta)}$
The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas. This information is available at: http://www.census.gov/popest ${ }^{(9)}$.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: countyheathrankings.org/ ${ }^{\text {(10) }}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups. |  |  |
| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013* |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2013* |
| Total Population | 51,335 | 53,335 |
| Under 18 | 12,890 | 11,214 |
| 18-34 | 8,006 | 8,542 |
| 35.44 | 6,704 | 4,934 |
| 45-64 | 13,576 | 15,833 |
| 65 and over | 10,159 | 12,812 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Under 18 | 25.1\% | 21.0\% |
| 18-34 | 15.6\% | 16.0\% |
| 35-44 | 13.1\% | 9.3\% |
| 45-64 | 26.4\% | 29.7\% |
| 65 and over | 19.8\% | 24.0\% |

The data in this
during this period.
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into
Why is it important
For public land managers, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups has a large retired population, or soon-to-be-retired population, for example, the neadus, and atitudes of different age groups. If gegeography on public land managers than a geographyy with a large number of of minors or or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation (those born between 1946 and 1964 ). A s shis generation enters reitrement age, their mobility, spending patterms, and consumer demands (for health care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develop economically. An aging population can also affect changing emands on land use (e.g., recreation).

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout areport, we suggest tunning another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
Additional Resources
The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:
.orgJJournaistswebcasts/2009/distilleddemographics 1.aspx ${ }^{(11)}$
For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will
The Census maintains a useful web site with data, ariciles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: ensus.govipopulation/age/
The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.goviprod/2010pubs/p25 1138.pdf ${ }^{\text {(13) }}$

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and IIs Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29. Washington, DC. ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-reportlert79.aspp ${ }^{(14)}$

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's. Insitution, Washington, D.C

Frey, W. H. 2007. Mapping the Growth of OIder America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21 st Century. Brookings Census 2000 Series.
Washington.D. Brookings instiution Merropolitan Poolicy Program Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program

Jacobsen, L. A., and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." Population Bulletin 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C.. , Lerce
S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesexhtmI ${ }^{(15)}$. Retrieved September $1,2010$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U. S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Con
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Suppor Division, Washington, D.C.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C. U. S. Department of
Commerce. 2000. Censusus Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washingtont D.C.

| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | $2009+$ |
| Total Population | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Under pr | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| $18-34$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | $00 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| 65 and over | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  | 2000 |
| Under 18 | 000 | $0 \%$ |
| $18-34$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 65 and over | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |




|  | Gila County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or Atrican American alone | 19\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 29\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawailian \& Other Pacific is alone | 95\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 15\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 17\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or Atrican American alone | 21\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 33\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific is. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 15\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 17\% | 0\% |



Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term
"Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers }}{\text { race and }}$ Eace and Hispanic origin to be wo separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Hispanic or L Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latin" are those who classity themselves in one of the specific }}{\text { Hispanic or Latino catego }}$ Hispanic cr Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they
are "other are other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." "rigin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

## Why is it important?

Hispanics are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the
U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the poph
2050. Between 2000 and 2010 , Hispanics accounted for over one-half of the nation's population growth.

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of the
Hispanic community in an area can be an important consideration for public land managers working to meet the needs of the public or evaluating potentially adverse impacts on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e,
promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and envirommental riskss" and "Data on ethnic grous ale promoting equal employment opporumities; assessing racial disparities in healu and environmental isks)" and "Data on ethnic groups are
important tor putting into effecta number of federal stautes (ie enforcing biingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act monitoring and important tor putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e. enforcing bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act: monitoring and
enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed hy local govermments to run programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identitifing segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Heath Act evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Communit Reinvestment Acl)."

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geogranhic

## Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity
(1997), see whithouse (1997), see: whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards ${ }^{\text {(12) }}$

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-1.pdff ${ }^{(17)}$.
Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/js/pages/index.xhtm| ${ }^{1818)}$.
Additional information on the U.S. Hispanic population from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at:
census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.ppff ${ }^{20}$.
For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land mana
subject, see: icbemp.gov/sciencelhansistichard 10pg. pf ${ }^{(21)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 17\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 29\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 95\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 97\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 22\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 12\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 33\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 120\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 20\% | 0\% |




| Region |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races. |  |  |
| American Indian \& Alaska Native Population, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Gila County, AZ | U.S. |
| Total Population | 53,335 | 311,536,594 |
| Total Native American | 7,910 | 2,540,309 |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 7,893 | 1,997,487 |
| Apache | 6,393 | 69,740 |
| Blackeet | 0 | 26,474 |
| Cherokee | 13 | 273,192 |
| Cheyenne | 0 | 11,774 |
| Chickasaw | 0 | 22,917 |
| Chippewa | 0 | 115,253 |
| Choctaw | 0 | 90,189 |
| Colville | 0 | 8,182 |
| Comanche | 0 | 12,228 |
| Cree | 0 | 2,191 |
| Creek | 6 | 41,521 |
| crow | ${ }^{23}$ | 11,424 |
| Delaware | 0 | 7,471 |
| Houma | 0 | 9,488 |
| Iroquois | 0 | 45,639 |
| Kiowa | 0 | 8,691 |
| Lumbee | 0 | 68,171 |
| Menominee | 0 | 8,259 |
| Navaio | 399 | 305,552 |
| Osage | 0 | 8,332 |
| Ottawa | 0 | 7,026 |
| Paiute | 0 | 10,545 |
| Pima | 95 | 24,212 |
| Potawatomi | 9 | 19,337 |
| Pueblo | 70 | 71,029 |
| Puget Sound Salish | 7 | 13,971 |
| Seminole | 7 | 13,987 |
| Shoshone | , | 9,470 |
| Sioux | 21 | 124,383 |
| Tohono O'Odham | 230 | 20,343 |
| Ute |  | 8,629 |
| Yakama | - | 8,614 |
| Yaqui | 1 | 19,942 |
| Yuman | 11 | 7,944 |
| All other tribes | 616 | 491,367 |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 0 | 60,370 |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 0 | 108,836 |
| Alaska Athabaskan | 0 | 15,882 |
| Aleut | 0 | 11,709 |
| Eskimo |  | 60,926 |
| Tlingit-Haida | 0 | 15,622 |
| All other tribes | 0 | 4,697 |
| ${ }^{\text {American Indian or Alaska Native; }}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Not Specified | 17 | 363,000 |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
What do we measure on this page?
This page describes.in general terms, the number of people who self-identity as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination
with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes
 or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackteet, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Chocktaw, Colville, Comanche, Cree,
Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, roquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navajo, Osage, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Siouxx, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

Alaska Native: This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska
Native race and etthic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the }}{\text { Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" o " "Alaska Native, ' or tribal entries not elsewhere classified. }}$
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where theses populations reside and have a
historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helptut to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 .
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dols) indicales a coefficient of variation >

Additional Resources
The U.S. Forest Service Office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-tribal

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Gila County, Az | Us. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Native American | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 1\% | 0\% |
| Apache | 4\% | 2\% |
| Blackeet | na | 3\% |
| Cherokee | 89\% | 1\% |
| Cheyenne | na | 6\% |
| Chickasaw | na | 3\% |
| Chippewa | na | 1\% |
| Choctaw | na | 1\% |
| Colville | na | 5\% |
| Comanche | na | 6\% |
| Cree | na | 11\% |
| Creek | 101\% | 2\% |
| Crow | 98\% | 5\% |
| Delaware | na | 7\% |
| Houma | na | 6\% |
| Iroquois | na | 2\% |
| Kiowa | na | 7\% |
| Lumbee | na | 1\% |
| Menominee | na | 4\% |
| Navaio | 23\% | 1\% |
| Osage | na | 6\% |
| Otawa | na | 7\% |
| Paiute | na | 4\% |
| Pima | 56\% | 4\% |
| Potawatomi | 101\% | 3\% |
| Pueblo | 56\% | 2\% |
| Puget Sound Salish | na | 4\% |
| Seminole | 96\% | 4\% |
| Shoshone | na | 5\% |
| Sioux | 78\% | 1\% |
| Tohono O'Odham | 52\% | 5\% |
| Ute | na | 6\% |
| Yakama | na | 5\% |
| Yaqui | na | 5\% |
| Yuman | 99\% | 6\% |
| All other tribes | 35\% | 1\% |
| American Indian; Not Specified | na | 3\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | na | 1\% |
| Alaska Athabaskan | na | 4\% |
| Aleut | na | 5\% |
| Eskimo | na | 1\% |
| Tlingit-Haida | na | 4\% |
| All other tribes | na | 6\% |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | na | 6\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; $\mathrm{Ns}^{\text {c }}$ | 75\% | 1\% |

## Page 7

＋$\square$ ○ $\bigcirc$ 米雷

## 

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work（occupation）and where they work（by industry）．
Employment by Occupation，2013＊

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 18，378 | 97 |
| Management，protessional，\＆elated | 5.402 | 51，34，1226 |
| Senice | 4，741 | 25，45，065 |
| Sales and office | 4.010 | 34，95，5，50 |
| Farming，fsting，and torestry | 130 | 1．，330，881 |
| Corstuction，extacation，mant，，repar | （1．428 | （1， $1.832,435$ |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Management，protessional，\＆elaled | 29．4\％ | 36．2\％ |
| Senice | ${ }_{\text {25，}}^{25.9 \%}$ | \％ |
| Ses and oftice | ${ }_{\substack{21.89 \%}}^{21.89 \%}$ | 2\％ |
| Constuction，extraction，mant |  | 8．3\％ |
| Production，trasotataion，\＆materia |  |  |

 Chenatait intins taing are e palaulat．
Employment by Industry，2013＊

| Iy，Az uns |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agriculure，toesty，fissing \＆hunting，minin | ， 68 | ，11．84，697 |
| Constuction | 1，868 | ${ }_{8,864,481}$ |
| Manutacturing | 591 | 14，867，423 |
| Wholesale |  |  |
| Transsoration，warehousing，and utulites | 2，092 | 10，45，277 |
| Transporation，waeehousisg，and unilies | 昞 |  |
| France and | 944 | 9，499756 |
| Prot，scientitic，mgmt，admin．\＆waste mgr |  | 9．528 |
| Education，heath care， $\mathbb{Q}$ social assistan | 4.618 | 32，871．216 |
| Ats，enteratin，rec，accomotation， 8 tood | 2.219 | 13，262，892 |
| Other senices，except pubuicic administation | $\begin{array}{r}125 \\ \hline 1.53 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Agticulure，toesty，fsthing \＆hunting | 10．2\％ | 9\％ |
|  |  | 6．2\％ |
| Manutacuing | ${ }^{3.2 \%}$ | ${ }^{10.5 \%}$ |
| Wholesale trade | －11．4\％ | ${ }_{\text {cke }}^{2.88 \%}$ |
| Trasporation，waethousing，and ututies | 4．9\％ | 4．9\％ |
| Intomation | 1．0\％ | 2．2\％ |
| france and insuracce，and real estate | 5．1\％ | ．7\％ |
| Prot，scientitic，mgnt．admin．\＆\％waste mgr | ${ }^{72 \%}$ | 10．8\％ |
| Education，heatht care，esocola assistance | ${ }^{25.1 \%}$ | ${ }^{23.2 \% \%}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\text {cke }}^{12.15}$ |  |
| Public administration | 8．3\％ | 5．0\％ |

Data Surres：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，Ameicican Community Surey oftice，Wastington，D．C．

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page？
This page describes what people do tor
Employment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification（SOC）system，where workers are classified into occupations
with similar iob duties，skills，education，and／or training，regardless of indusustry
Employment by Industry：Reters to the employment by industry，listed according to the North American Industry Classification System
（NAICS）．
Why is it Important？
 people do tor al living and the type of work they do，regardless of the industry．For exampliele，managementit and professional occupations are people do tor alwing and the yppe of work they do，regardiess or he iddustr．．For example，management and professional occupations are
generaly of higher wage and require tormal education，and these occupations could exist in any number of industries for example，managers could be working for a sottware firm，a mine，or a construction company）．Occupation information describes what people do，while employmen
by industry describes where people ework by industry describes where people work

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation＜ $12 \%$ ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between
12 and $40 \%$ and 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD（preceded with two dots）indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$ ．If data have consistenty low accuracy

Additional Resources
The Census Bureau provides a deffitition of Socs：census．govihhes／wwwioindex／overiew．htm｜${ }^{(255}$
Occupations are also defined by U．S．Bureau of Labor Statistics：bls．govisoc ${ }^{(22)}$
The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for earnings，working conditions，and what workers do on the job：bls．gov／ocol ${ }^{(27)}$

## Data Sources

U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．

| miv Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Management，protessiona，\＆related | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Serice | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and dffice | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Farming，fishing，and forestry | 45\％ | 1\％ |
| Construction，extraction，maint，\＆repair | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movin！ | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Management，protessiona，\＆related | 7\％ | \％\％ |
| Serice | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and fifice | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Farming，fisting，and torestry | 43\％ | \％ |
| Constuction，extraction，maint．\＆repair | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movin！ | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Employment by Industry，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | ${ }^{3}$ | 0\％ |
| Agriculture，foresty，fishing \＆hunting，minin | 12\％ | 0\％ |
| Constuction | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 35\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utilities | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| Intormation | 33\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Prot，scientific，mgmt，admin．，\＆waste mgr | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，healh care，\＆social assistance | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Ars，entertain．，rec，accomodation，\＆food | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Other senices，except public administration | 17\％ | 0\％ |
| Pubic administation | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Agricultue，foresty，fishing \＆hunting，minin | 12\％ | 0\％ |
| Construction | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 39\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utitities | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| Intormation | 31\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Prof．，scientific，mgmt，admin．，\＆waste mgr | 14\％ | \％\％ |
| Education，heath care，\＆socia assistance | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Ats，entetain，．，ree．，accomodation，\＆food | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Other serices，except public administraion | 17\％ | 0\％ |
| Public administration | 10\％ | 0\％ |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> 

What do we measure on this page?
.
Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irrespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual
worked 10 or 40 hours per week, it they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year".

## Why is it important?

Often, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, translating to ower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture
employment have consistenty been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the U.S. Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Part-time jobs (those that average less
than 35 hours'week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to
remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a tull schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to
telecommute and work shorter and more fiexible hours. And, in some cases, young aduilts seek out seasonal, tourism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960 s. during periods of economic stability, the vast majoity of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, orly about one in seven part-ime workers were involuntary (individuals wanting full-time jobs but working less than 35 hours (week).

To understand the degree to which the data on this page are related to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, To understand the degree to which the dala on this page ar
data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count full time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain falling wages or rates of employment that outpace
population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOL and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40$ report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
a

Additional Resources
Maynard, D. C. \& Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G $06-12$ (501). Available at:
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs
ceo.usc.edulpdffico612501.pdff

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-ime employment, see: bls.gov/opub/is/pati/opbis 571 .pdf ${ }^{(29)}$.
For information on unemployment, run the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.

| ( Glia conny, Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEEKS WORKED PER Y EAR : |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Worked 50 to 52 weeks | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 27 to 49 weeks | 10\% | 0\% |
| Worked 11026 weeks | 9\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 4\% | 0\% |
| Hours Worked per week: |  |  |
| Worked 35 or more hours per week | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 15 to 34 hours per week | 7\% |  |
| Worked 11014 hours per week | 16\% |  |
| Did not work | 4\% |  |
| Mean usual hours worked tor workers | 1\% | \% |
| $\overline{\text { Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation }}$ WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR |  |  |
| Worked 50 to 52 weeks | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 27 to 49 weeks | 9\% | 0\% |
| Worked 11026 weeks | 9\% | \%\% |
| Did not work | 4\% | 0\% |
| HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: |  |  |
| Worked 35 or more hour per week | ${ }^{3 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Worked 15 to 34 h hurs per week Worked 1 10 14 hous per week | 7\%\% | - ${ }_{\text {O\% }}$ |
| Worked 1 to 14 hours per week Did not work | 16\%\% | O\% <br> 0 |


|  |
| :---: |
| This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work |

Commuting Characteristics, 2013*

|  | Gila County, Az | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over | 17,863 | 139,786,639 |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 15,737 | 101,321,530 |
| Worked outside county of residence | 2,126 | 38,465,109 |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 5,219 | 18,023,639 |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 4,001 | 19,150,654 |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 2,253 | 20,753,054 |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 1,404 | 19,796,414 |
| 25 to 29 minutes | '398 | 8,189,640 |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 1,369 | 18,220,851 |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 229 | 3,673,571 |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 251 | 4,920,004 |
| 45 to 59 minutes | '337 | 10,154,523 |
| 60 or more minutes | 1.550 | 10,857,904 |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 21 | 26 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 88.1\% | 72.5\% |
| Worked outside countv of residence | 11.9\% | 27.5\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 29.2\% | 12.9\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 22.4\% | 13.7\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 12.6\% | 14.8\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 7.9\% | 14.2\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 2.2\% | 5.9\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 7.7\% | 13.0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 1.3\% | 2.6\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 1.4\% | 3.5\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 1.9\% | 7.3\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 8.7\% | 7.8\% | characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the
highest estimated percent of people that
worked outside the county of residence worked outside the county of residence
(27.5\%), and Gila County, AZ had the $(27.5 \%)$ and Gil
lowest (11.9\%).

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

##  <br> What do we measure on this page?

This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work.
Place of Work: The values reported under "place of work" describe the number of workers that live in the selected geographic area who worked
either in or outside the county they live in. If the selected geography is not a county, the workers may or may not work within the selected geography. For example, for the city of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worked in county of residence" describes the number of city of Phoenix residents that worked in Maricopa County (but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix).

Why is it important?
-High rates of out-commuting are more common in non-metro areas, and in parts of the U.S. where communities are closer together.
Economic development is sometimes affected by commuting in unanticipated ways: strategies aimed at increasing jobs in a community will not necessanly mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing jobs into that
community.
-
High out-commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for services, complicating fiscal planning for local governments.
"Bedroom communities, "those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggle to provide social services, housing, and water and sewer
facilities without an adequates source ef feverue. Higheren levels and longeng ristance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This
can result trom unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.
can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient tof variation <12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (precededed with two dotss) indicates a cooefficient tof variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report a a a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Addrich, L.,., eseale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the EConomic Function
Perspectives 12(3). ers.usda goviPublications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697.pdf ${ }^{(30)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

| conny. Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workersibyear and over PLACE OF Work: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 4\% | \% |
| Worked ousiside county of esidence | 7\% | \% |
| TRAVEL TME TO Work: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 7\% | \% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 9\% | \% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 10\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 18\% | \% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 12\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 45\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 23\% | \% |
| 451059 minutes | 21\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minues | ${ }^{13 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 7\% | \% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation PLACE OF WORK |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Workee in couny of residence | ${ }^{4 \%}$ | \%\% |
| Worked oulside county of residence TRAVEL TMME TO WORK: | 8\% | \% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 8\% | \% |
| 15.019 minutes | 9\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 10\% | 0\% |
| 251029 minutes | 19\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minues | ${ }^{12 \%}$ | 0\% |
| 351039 minutes | 43\% | 0\% |
| 401044 minutes | 22\% | 0\% |
| ${ }^{4} 51059$ minules | 19\%\% | 0\% |
|  | 13\% | 0\% |



[^2]

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the povery line．
$\frac{\text { Poverty：Following the Office of Management and Budget＇s Directive } 14 \text { ，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by }}{\text { tamily size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty }}$ family size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a family or an unrelated in
threshold，then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Poverty，2013＊

|  | cila County，Az | U．S． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 52，403 | 303，692，076 |
| Families | 13，546 | 76，744，358 |
| People Below Poverty | 11，301 | 46，663，433 |
| Families below poverty | 1，813 | 8，666，630 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| People Below Poverty | 21．6\％ | 15．4\％ |
| Families below povery | 13．4\％ | 11．3\％ | cheracterisitics during this period．


－Percent below poverty level by age and family type is calculated by dividing the number of people by demographic in poverty by the
total population of that demogapapic． Iotal population of that demographic

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．


## Poverty，Coefficients of Variation

|  | Gila Count，AZ | u．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family Type，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County，Az | U．S． |
| People | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Under 18 years | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| 65 years and older | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Families with related children＜ 18 years | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| Married couple families | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 20\％ | 1\％ |
| Female householder，no husband present | 18\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 20\％ |  |


|  |  | *口湯 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty. |  |  |
| Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. |  |  |
| Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity^, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population (all races) in Poverty | 11,301 | 46,663,433 |
| White alone | 6,773 | 28,254,647 |
| Black or African American alone | 112 | 10,165,935 |
| American Indian alone | 3,970 | 701,439 |
| Asian alone | 0 | 1,872,394 |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacifici is. alone | 97 | 99,943 |
| Some other race | 197 | 3,872,191 |
| Two or more races | 249 | 1,696,884 |
| All Ethnicities in Poverty |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 1.811 | 12,507,866 |
| Not Hispanic or Lationo (of any race) | 9,490 | 34,155,567 |
| Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) |  |  |
| White alone | 59.9\% | 60.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 1.0\% | 21.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 35.1\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 0.0\% | 4.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacificic is. alone | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| Some other race | 1.7\% | 8.3\% |
| Two or more races | 2.2\% | 3.6\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 16.0\% | 26.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 84.0\% | 73.2\% |
| ${ }^{\text {n Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or }}$ ethnic category by the total population. <br> *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |
| Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty-, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Gila County, AZ | U.S. |
| White alone | 16.2\% | 12.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 48.1\% | 27.1\% |
| American Indian alone | 50.7\% | 28.6\% |
| Asian alone | -0.0\% | 12.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 0.0\% | 19.6\% |
| Some other race alone | 15.6\% | 26.8\% |
| Two or more races alone | 21.4\% | 20.1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 19.3\% | 24.7\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 15.6\% | 10.6\% |
| -Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is ca race. | er of people by rac | lation of that |
| Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County, Az | U.s. |
| Total Population (all races) | 7\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 10\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 47\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 9\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | na | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | na | 2\% |
| Some other race | 33\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 38\% | 0\% |
| All Ethnicities |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 18\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 9\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| White alone | 10\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 49\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | $9 \%$ | 0\% |
| Asian alone | na | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | na | 0\% |
| Some other race | 35\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 39\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 3\% | 0\% |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 10\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 53\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 9\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | na | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | na | 18\% |
| Some other race alone | 37\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races alone | 42\% | 1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 18\% | 0\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 10\% | 1\% |


| ＊＊＊＊＊W＊＊ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source． |  |  |
| Number of Households Receiving Earnings，by Source，2013＊ |  |  |
|  | Gila Count，Az | U．s． |
| Total households： | 20，601 | 115，610，216 |
| Labor earnings | 12，791 | 90，436，935 |
| Social Security（SS） | 9，601 | 33，386，448 |
| Retirement income | 6，401 | 20，504，523 |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | ${ }^{1,326}$ | 5，716，592 |
| Cash public assistance income | 503 | 3，255，213 |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 3.375 | 14，339，330 |
| Percent of Total＾ |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 62．1\％ | 78．2\％ |
| Social Security（SS） | 46．6\％ | 28．9\％ |
| Reitirement income | 31．1\％ | 17．7\％ |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 6．4\％ | 4．9\％ |
| Cash public assistance income | 2．4\％ | 2．8\％ |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 16．4\％ | 12．4\％ |

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> ＊＊＊＊ <br> What do we measure on this page？ <br> This page describes household earnings by source．

Labor Earnings：Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self－employment．
Social Securit：Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor bene efits，permanent disabiity
insurance payments smade by the Social Security Administration before decuctions for medical insurance，and railfoad retirement insurance． insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance，and railroad retirement insurance． sement
Retirement income：Consists of families that receive income from：（1）retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer；la govermment，and the U．S．military；（3）periodic receipts from annuities and insurance：and（4）regular income from IRA and Keogh plans．It dose not include Social security income．

Supplemental Security Income（SSI）：Refers to housenolds that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a $\frac{\text { Supplemental Security Income（SSI）：Refers to housenolds that receive }}{\text { minimum level of income for needy aged，blind，or disabled individuals．}}$
$\frac{\text { Cash Public Assistance Income：Are housenolds that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to }}{\text { Nose }}$ Needy Families（TANF）．It does not include separate payments received for hospital or other medical care（vendor payments）or Supplemental
Security Income（SSI）or noncash benefits such as Food Stamps． ，
Food Stamps／SNAP：Refers to households that receive coupons or cards that can be used to purchase food．This program was recently
renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program（SNAP）．ACS does not report mean dollar amounts for this tem．

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and 40\％；and RED BOLD（preceeded with two dots）indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$ ．If datat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report，we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale．

Why is this important？
Earnings are not the only source of income，and for many families and communities a significant portion of income can be in the form of additional sources，such as retirement and Social Security．While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of retires（retirement payments），other measures（for example，SSI or Food Stamps）are an indication of economic hardship．

## Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS，see

## Data Source

[^3]|  | Gila County，Az | U．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean earnings | \＄47，961 | \＄75，017 |
| Mean Social Security income | \＄18，038 | \＄17，189 |
| Mean retirement income | \＄22，902 | \＄23，589 |
| Mean Supplemental Security Income | \＄10，260 | \＄9，152 |
| Mean cash public assistance income | \＄4，377 | \＄3，808 |

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Gila County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population 25 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| No high school degree | 6\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 2\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 7\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 6\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 7\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 9\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| No high school degree | 6\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 2\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 7\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 6\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 7\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 9\% | 0\% |
| School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Gila County, AZ | U.S. |
| Total Population over 3 years old: | 0\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in school: | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 20\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | 21\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 8\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 9\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 28\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 1\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Enrolle in school: | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 22\% | 0\% |
| Enroled in kindergarten | 17\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 10\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 26\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 1\% | 0\% |

$\qquad$



Nopuliation 25 yrs or or degree
High school graduate Associates degree helor's degree or highe

Bachelor's degree | $0 \%$ |
| :--- |
| $0 \%$ |

## Graduate or professional

school graduate
Associates degree
Bachelor's degree
School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation
N
U.S.

Enrolled in kindergarten
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12
Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea
of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Enrolled in kindergarten
nroled in grade 1 to grade 4
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12
college, undergraduate

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

* tovoz*

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes levels of educat antainment
Educational Attainment: This refers to the level of education completed by people 25 years and over in terms of the highest degree or the
highest level of schooling completed
School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private
school or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interview. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business


Why is it important?
 tudies show that geographies with a higher than average educated worktorce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during
conomic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the dififerences in education levels can highilight whether certain people in geographic areas migh
experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communicatio
School enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age access to education, and potential for future growh. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

Methods
Data accuracy ys indicated as follows: : LACK indicates a coeficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates eetween 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wwo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-found employment, and unemployment rates, see:
The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.goviemplep_chart_001.htm (41).
U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available
at: census.goviprod/2002pubs/(p23-210.pdf ( 42 ).

Card, David (1999). The Causal Effect of Educ
vol. 3A. New York: Flseverer. po. $1801-63$.
vol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washinglon, D.C.
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What do we measure on this page?
This page measures the primary language people speak at home.
Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English
language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.
Why is it important?
For pubbic land managers who are trying to communicate with citizens of communites adiacent to public lands. it is important to know whether
a siginicant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation a signifcant portion of that population has trouble
may need to be conducted in multipiel languages.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates betwe
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots indicates a coefticient of variation $>40 \%$. It data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United
States. This tool is available at
Data Sources
U.S. Departm
S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 5 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak only English | 1\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 5\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 7\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 81\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 45\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 8\% | 1\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 13\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Speak only English | 1\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 5\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 7\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 81\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 53\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 8\% | 0\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 13\% | 0\% |

大 1 人

## 

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year buill.
Housing Characteristics, 2013*


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
Rent: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and
$\frac{\text { Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied }}{\text { vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview. }}$
$\frac{\text { For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other }}{\text { occasional use throughout the year. }}$
For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

Why is it important?
Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data is used to assess the demand for housing, to identify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing arket over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic
levels.
Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirability of a place for recreation and tourism. This could also be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990 and early 2000 were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when
housing grew ata a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the erlative growth rates of housing is nousing grew at a fast rate (hhe late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country.) Understanding the relative grownt rates of housing is home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast future demand of services, such as energy consumplion and fire protection.
Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.

|  | Gila Count, AZ | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units | 0\% | 0\% |
| Occupied | 2\% | 0\% |
| Vacant | 3\% | 1\% |
| For rent | 22\% | 1\% |
| Rented, not occupied | 43\% | 1\% |
| For sale only | 19\% | 1\% |
| Sold, not occupied | 122\% | 1\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional | 4\% | 0\% |
| For migrant workers | 77\% | 2\% |
| Other vacant | 12\% | 1\% |
| Year Built |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later | 37\% | 0\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 9\% | 0\% |
| Built 1959 or earlier | 6\% | 0\% |
| Median year structure built | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Occupancy |  |  |
| Occupied | 2\% | 0\% |
| Vacant | 3\% | 1\% |
| For rent | 23\% | 0\% |
| Rented, not occupied | 37\% | 0\% |
| For sale only | 19\% | 0\% |
| Sold, not occupied | 199\% | 0\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional | 3\% | 0\% |
| For migrant workers | 87\% | 0\% |
| Other vacant | 12\% | 2\% |
| Year Built |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later | 33\% | 0\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 9\% | 0\% |
| Built 1959 or earlier | 6\% | 0\% |

*]
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

## *] warnce: : <br> What do we measure on this page?

This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
Owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if tit is mortgaged or not fully paid
Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.
Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
$\frac{\text { Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, }}{\text { and condominium fees. }}$

- $x$

Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilites (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels

Why is it important?
An important indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share
devoted to housing that is below 15 percent is a good proxy for highly affordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

## Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 pe
excessive (or unaffordable) housing costs that exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >40\%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
had the highest estimated percent of owner ccupied households where greater the
$0 \%$ of household income was spent mortgage costs (42.1\%), and the U.S. had the lowest ( $35.4 \%$ ).


- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of renter
occupied households where greater $30 \%$ of household income was spent on
gross rent ( $48.3 \%$ ), and Gila County, $A Z$ gross rent ( $48.3 \%$ ), and
had the lowest ( $43.1 \%$ ).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs
for owner-occupied homes $(\$ 1.540$ ) and Gila County, AZ had the lowest (\$1,182).

In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly yross rent for
renter-0ccupied homes (\$9004) and fila renter-occupied homes (\$9904), and
County, AZ had the lowest (\$743).


Data Sources: U. . Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied housing units with a | 4.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 12.1\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 8.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 6.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 17.5\% | 0.3\% |
| Gross rent >30\% of household income | 9.9\% | 0.1\% |
| Median monthly mortgage cost^ | 2.9\% | \% |
| Median gross rent^ | 2.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 12.3\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 8.1\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 17.5\% | 0.6\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 9.9\% | 0.1\% |



Indicators

|  | Region | us |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age (2009*) | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population White Alone (2009*) | 0.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native | 1.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Population "Baby | 2.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Family Income (2009*) | 3.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Per Capita Income (2009*) | 2.9\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*) | 7.0\% | 0.4\% |
| Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*) | 10.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Households with Retirement and Social | 3.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income | 6.5\% | 0.3\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High | 5.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's | 5.7\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population That Speak English Less Than | 12.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*) | 3.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 8.1\% | 0.2\% |
| Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 9.9\% | 0.1\% |

EPS－HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：
－ 2000 Decennial U．S．Census
Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750

## －American Community Survey

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750
The on－line ACS data retrieval tool is available at：
http：／／www．census．gov／acs／www／

## ＊柬縕紫 <br> EPS－HDT core approaches

EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－Regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## About the American Community Survey（ACS）

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1－3，all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey（ACS）of the Census Bureau．

The ACS is a nation－wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic，social，economic，and housing information about communities every year－information that until recently was only available once a decade．The ACS is not the same as the decennial census，which is conducted every ten years（the ACS has replaced the detailed，Census 2000 long－form questionnaire）．

Data used in this report are 5 －year ACS estimates．Moreso than the 1 or 3 －year estimates，the 5 －year estimates are consistently available for small geographies，such as towns．We show 5 －year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross－geography comparisons．The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period，only what the average value is over the full period．

Because ACS is based on a survey，it is subject to error．The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error（MOE）for every data point．In this report，we alert the user to the data accuracy using color－coded text in the tables：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation（CV）＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD （preceded with two dots）indicates a CV $>40 \%$ ．

The CV is a measure of relative error in the estimate，and is calculated directly from the MOE as the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself．To get the standard error，the MOE is divided by 1.645 （for a 90 percent confidence interval）．The CV is expressed as a percentage．For example，if you have an estimate of $60+/-20$ ，the CV for the estimate is 20.3 percent．This estimate should be used with caution，since the sampling error represents more than 20 percent of the estimate．

## 成米日

## 

headwaterseconomics．org／eps－hdt

## 

Throughout this report，references to on－line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses．These resources are provided as hyperlinks here．

```
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej guidance nepa ceq1297.pdf
www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology main/
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej
www.stateoftheusa.org
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
www.frey-demographer.org
www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging statistics/index.aspx
www.census.gov/popest/
www.countyhealthrankings.org/
www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
uww.census.gov/population/age/
www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg 1997standards
www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22 cspan hispanics.pdf
www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard 10pg.pdf
www.bia.gov/index.htm
uww.indians.org/index.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
www.bls.gov/soc/
www.bls.gov/ocol
www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
uww.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009 ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
www.bls.gov/emp/ep chart 001.htm
www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
www.mla.org/map single
www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
www.zillow.com
www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Land Ownership

What is the breakdown of land ownership? 1
What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 2
What are the different types of federal lands? 3
Land Cover
What is the breakdown of forest, grassland, and other land cover types?
4

Residential Development

What are the trends in residential land-use conversion? ..... 5-6
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 7
Links to Additional Resources ..... 8

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
U.S. Forest Service Land Types (Acres), 2009

|  | Gila County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Area | 3,069,101 | 2,286,279,509 |
| Forest Service Lands | 1,704,500 | 192,750,310 |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 1,448,421 | 146,630,207 |
| National Wilderness | 250,450 | 36,155,579 |
| National Monument | 0 | 3,661,327 |
| National Recreation Area | 0 | 2,950,660 |
| National Game Refuge | 0 | 1,198,099 |
| National Wild River | 4,508 | 568,059 |
| National Recreation River | 1,121 | 398,207 |
| National Scenic River | 0 | 289,617 |
| National Scenic Area | 0 | 230,459 |
| Primitive Area | 0 | 173,762 |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0 | 167,427 |
| Special Management Area | 0 | 164,707 |
| Protection Area | 0 | 45,051 |
| Recreation Management Area | 0 | 43,900 |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0 | 39,171 |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0 | 12,645 |
| National Botanical Area | 0 | 8,256 |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0 | 6,637 |
| National Historic Area | 0 | 6,540 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Forest Service Lands | 55.5\% | 8.4\% |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 47.2\% | 6.4\% |
| National Widerness | 8.2\% | 1.6\% |
| National Monument | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| National Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Game Refuge | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Wild River | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| National Recreation River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Primitive Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Special Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Protection Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Recreation Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Botanical Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Historic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. |  |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
Note: All acreages on this page were reported by the U.S. Forest Services' Land Areas Report 2009. The total acreage of Forest Service land
on this page may differ from that reported on previous page due to differences in values reported by the data sources.
Why is it important?
orest Service lands have speecial designations scat may ar affect .rrice land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any conent Service lands have special designations uses of associated lands.

Methods
County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia
Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.
Additional Resources
A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available
at.ts. fed. us/land/statillar/2009/larogindex.htm/ ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$

Data Sources
SSDA FS - Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database





8 \&
The EPS-HDT Land-Use report uses national data sources to represent land cover and residential development. In an effort to report more accurate statistics for land ownership, a compilation of state level data was used. All the data in this report were the result of calculations made in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- TIGER/Line County Boundaries 2012

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html

- Developed Areas 2000 and 2010

Theobald, DM. 2013. Land use classes for ICLUS/SERGoM v2013. Unpublished report, Colorado State University.

- Protected Areas Database v 1.32012
U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006

National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm

- USDA, Forest Service

Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html

## 

EPS-HDT core approaches
EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-county regions, to accommodate a flexible range of userdefined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
www.nhd.usgs.gov
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.htm|
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions of terms.htm
headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php
```
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Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit

## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

www.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
Page
Federal Land Payments
What are federal land payments? ..... 1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? ..... 2
How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? ..... 3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? ..... 4
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments (user input data)? ..... 5
Federal Land Payment Programs
What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)? ..... 6
What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing? ..... 7
What is BLM Revenue Sharing? ..... 8
What is U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing? ..... 9
What are Federal Mineral Royalties? ..... 10
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 11
Links to Additional Resources ..... 12

## Note to Users:

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.

Components of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.;. U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management. Asthington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of titerior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes all federal land paym
This page describes al federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
Cederal land payments: These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals).
Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is Sest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and locel Payments include the $25 \%$ Fund, Secure Rural Schools \& Community Self-Determination Act, and Bankhead-Jones Forest Grasslands.

BLM Revenue Sharing: The BLM shares a portion of receipts generated on public lands with state and local governments, including grazing fees Hrough the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California ( $O \& C$ ) grant lands.
USFWS Refuge: These payments share a portion of receipts from National Wildlife Refuges and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located.
$\frac{\text { Federal Mineral Royalies: These payments are distributed to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may }}{\text { Share at their discretion: }}$ Federal Fiscal Year: FY refers to the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1 and ends September 30 .

Why is it important?
State and local govermment cannot tax federally owned lands the way they would if the land were privately owned. A number of federal programs exist to compensate county yovernments for the eresence of ef edearal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of
local govermment revenue in rural counties with lagge feedera land holdings.

Before 1976, all federal payments were linked directly to receipts generated on public lands. Congress funded PILT with appropriations
beginning in 1977 in recognition of the volatility and inadecuacy of federal revenue sharing programs. PITT was intended to stabilize and begining in 19 in in recognition of the volatility and Inadequacy of ederara revenue sharing programs. PILT was intended to stabilize and crease federal land payments to county govermments. More recently, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of
2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several maior concern around receip-based programs-volatility, the payment level, and the incentives provided to counties by linking federal land payments directly to extractive uses of public lands.
PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget concern are creating uncertainty for the future of both.
Methods
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR Dala Limitaions.
and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments.
Significance of Data limitations. USFWS datal
Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively insignificant at the federal level (data gaps on local distributions of
USFWS Refuge revenue sharing is less than one percent of total federal land payments in FFY 2009) but may be important to specific loca governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royalties represent a more significant omission in states that share a portion governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royaties represent a more signififant omission in states that
royalties with local governments. Federal mineral royalties made up $68 \%$ of federal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.
Gorte, Ross W., M. Lymne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts Congressional Research Senvice Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic import
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt ${ }^{(1)}$.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## - *



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widllife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page dean

Why is it important?
A variety of state and local governments receive federal land payments, and the way these payments are distributed explains who benefits. Fo example. PILT is directed to county government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schools. If USFS
payments decline, the PILT formula ensures that county govemment payments will icrease, but school districts will hot share in the increased payments decine, the PILT formula ensures that county govemment payments will increase, but school districts will not share in the increased
PILT payments. While PILT and SRS have decoupled local government payments trom commercial activities on public lands, al the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenue sharing payments) are still inked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legistators and govemors have a different set of expectations and incentives to lobby for particular outcomes on public lands than do county commissioners or school officials.

## Methods

State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) federal mineral royaties and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent istributions to local government according to state and federal statute (see note about data limitations). county Government Distributions: Consist of (1) PILT; (2) portions of Forest Serice payments including Secure Rural Schools and
Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Titte l and Title III, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands ; (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discretionary state government distributions of federal mineral royatities where these data are available. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Titte I, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distributions: Consist of SRS Titte II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on pub
land projects on the national forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and
 interests and areas of expertise, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national forest personnel.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist t f BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). -
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station,
USDA Forest Sevice, Missoula, MT.

Gorte, Ross W., M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanenty Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socieeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service,
 Fish and Widlilife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic
Additional sources and methods available at www headwaterseconomics

This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distributed to the state
school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Government by Permitted Use, FY 2013 ( 2013 \$s)


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
to county governments (federal land payment distributed to the state, school districts. grazing districts, and RACs are excludeded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Why is it important?
County goverments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For ay for law enforcement mandtain county roads used by logging truck and recreational traftic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must the Forest Senvice, are specifically tarcyeted to help pay for these costs.

Methods
Unrestricted: Consist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlifie Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral
royaties from the state government.
Resticte-County Roads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Title I, (2) Forest Serice $25 \%$
$\frac{\text { Rest }}{}$ Fund, (3) Forest Service Owl payments (between 1993 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law mandates payments be used for county roads and public schools. Each state determines how to split tunds between the two services
Restricted-Special County Projects: Consist of (1) SRS Titte Ill funds that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, suct astion plans.
protect

Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royalies and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
availible). available).

Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee,
W ashing Washington, D.C. by Research Unit
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT

Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007 . ish and w idicie Service, washington, D.C., U.s. Department of interior. 2012. Offic

## *****



Federal Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)
 percent of total general 0.8 to 3.8 revenue, an increase of 386 percent.

In FY 2007, federal land payments as a percent of total general governm
revene.
$3.8 \%$.
of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C. U. . Departs Dent of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Senvartmen of interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Serice
Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widldife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state government general revenue.
Reporting Period: State and local financial data is from the U.S. Census of Governments, conducted every five years. The latest was for Fiscal
Year (FY) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. teractive Table Census of Govemment cold
neractive Table: Census of Govemment county financial statistics are based on a national survey and may not match local government limitations and update data for the latest year.
Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax
tergovernmental Revenue: Payments, grants, and distributions trom other governments, including federal education, heath care, and otal Charges: Charges imposed for All Other (Miscellaneous): All other general government revenue from their own sources.
Why is it important?
County payments are an important component of local government fiscal health for a handitul of rural counties with a large share of land in federal ownership. For counties with fewer public lands and larger economies, federal land payments are a small piece of a much broader
revenue stream. Counties most dependent on federal land payments are aftected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For the counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.
Methods
Reporting Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July 1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the
 2008, during the Census of Government FY 2008. To cocrect for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2000 are
20are compared to local govermment revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations
from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

Census of Governments Data Limitations: (1) county financial statistics may not match local govermment financial reports for three main reasons: (a) The Census of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to to it (includuding government and quasi-governmentiontal entitites). This may differ from the way local governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) dififerent reporting periods between the Census of Goverments fiscal year and the
reporting period used by local governments (for example, some counties use a calendar year for reporting purposes); and (c) survey methods reporting period used by local governments (for example, some counties use a calendar year for reporting purposes); and (c) survey methods
introduce error; (2) the last published edition of the Census of Governments was FY 2007, before the recent increase in payments from SRS and PILT; and ( 3 ) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other sources
of county revenue. Addion

Additional Resources
U.S. Census Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census.gov/govslestimatel $l^{(2)}$.

For a detailed description of Census of Governments survey methods, survey year (fiscal year), and definitions, see: 2006 Government Finance and Employment Classification Manual at census.gov/govs ${ }^{(3)}$
Schuster, Enin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May Ingles, Brett. 2004. Changing the Funding Structure: An Analysis of the Secure Rural School and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 on National Forest Lands. Environmental Science and Public Policy Research Institute, Boise State University.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Govemments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Sevice, Washington
D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. orgleps-hdt



This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).

|  | Gila Count, Az | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Acres | 1,775,022 | 605,353,942 |
| BLм | 64,368 | 241,711,116 |
| Forest Service | 1,704,500 | 189,274,098 |
| Bureau of Reclamation | 5,034 | 4,030,856 |
| National Park Service | 1,120 | 76,781,845 |
| Military | 0 | 328,157 |
| Army Corps of Engineers | 0 | 7,969,080 |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | 0 | 85,235,272 |
| Other Eligible Acres | 0 | 23,518 |
| PILT Payment (2013 \$s) | 3,197,536 | 397,256,089 |
| Avg. Per-Acre Payment (2013 Ss) | 1.80 | 0.66 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| BLM | 3.6\% | 39.9\% |
| Forest Service | 96.0\% | 31.3\% |
| Bureau of Reclamation | 0.3\% | 0.7\% |
| National Park Service | 0.1\% | 12.7\% |
| Military | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Army Corps of Engineers | 0.0\% | 1.3\% |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | 0.0\% | 14.1\% |
| Other Eligible Acres | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |



Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)
Congress authorized PILT in 1976 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing payment programs to compens sharing payments by paying counties based on a perd-acr (Public Law $94-565$ ). PILT increases and stabilizes county government revenue sharing payments by paying countie
and is subject to a population cap.
A low average per-acre PILT payment may indicate significant revenue sharing payments from the previous year or that the county's population
A low average per-acre PLT payment may indicate significant rev.
is below the population cap that limits the base per acre payment.
PILT is permanently authorized, but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis. PILT was typically not tully funded until FY 2008
PILT is permanently authorized, but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis. PLTT was typical.
when counties received a guarantee of five years at tuil payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Why is it important?
As county payments became more important to local goverrmment atter wwil (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-wa
housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PIIT increased and stablized payments by appropriations rather than directly trom commodity receipts. PILT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local govermment services, but can be used at the discretion of county commissioners to fund any local government needs.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Department of the Interior maintains an online searchable database of PILT payments and eligible PILT acres by county and state total. Data are available back to FY 1999 at: doi. gov/nbcc/index.ctm ${ }^{(4)}$

Schuster, Evin G. 1995. PILT - Its Purpose and Performance. Journal of Forestry. 93(8):31-35.
Corn, M. Lynne. 2008. PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes): Somewhat Simplified. Congressional Research Service Report RL31392.

Data Sources
S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

## *****


This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell Determination Act (SRS), 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Forest Service Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture.
at www.headwaterseconomics. org'eps-hdt

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act
U.S. Forest Service 25 Percent Fund: The $25 \%$ Fund, established in 1908 , shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on Fublict land with the ecounty where the activities take place. Twenty-five percent of the value of public land receipts are distributed directly to counties and must be used to tund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services.
The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS), or Public Law 106-393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to $\frac{\text { The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of } 2000 \text { ( (SRS), or Public Law } 106 \text {--393: SRS was enacted in FY } 2001 \text { to }}{\text { provide } 5 \text { years of transitional assistance to rural counties affected by the decline in revenue from timber havests on federal lands. SRS was }}$ reauthorized for a single year in 2007, and again in 2008 for a period of four years. The SRS Act has three titles that allocate payments for specific purposes.
-Titte 1 - these payments to counties make up 80 to 85 percent of the total SRS payments and must be dedicated to funding roads and


- Titte II - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal la
(RACs) at the community level help make spending determinations and monitor project progress.
- Titte III - these payments may be used to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program, to reimburse the county for search
and rescue and other emergency services, and to develop community wildfire protection plans.
$\frac{\text { What is the Relationship Between the } 25 \% \text { Fund and SRS? Counties elect to receive Secure Rural Schools Payments, or to continue with } 25 \%}{\text { Fund payments. Most counties have elected to receive Secure Rural Schools payments. Some counties, particularly in the East, continue to }}$ prefer $25 \%$ Fund payments to Secure Rural Schols.
Forest Grasslands: Forest Grasslands are lands acquired by the Forest Service through the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (P.L. 75 . 210). The Act authorized acquisition of damaged lands to rehabilitate and use them for various purposes. Receipts from activities on Forest
Grasslands are shared directly with county governments.

Special Acts: These include Payments to Minnesota (Act of June 22, 1948,16 U.S.C. 577 g), payments associated with the Quinault Special
Management Area in Washington (P.L. $100-638$, 102 Stat. 3327 ) and receipts from the sale of quartz from the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas (S423, Interior Appropriations Act for FY1989; P.L. 100-446, 102 Stat 1 1774) Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment ( $75 \%$ of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in St. Louis. Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receitits from the Quinault $\$$ special Management Area with both the Quinaunt Indian Tribe and with the State of Washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quartz from the Ouachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (ratt)
than being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipits to Arkansas counties with Ouachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

Why is it important?
USFS revenue sharing is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (tederal mineral royaties are distributed to
 timber harvests on the National Forests increased sharoly in response to post-war housing and economic growth

As the timber economy shitted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it Cngsess addressed these changes by authorizing "ow" "transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of
transiton payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS
act. SRS changed USFS revenue sharing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decoupled frough Title II funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment equity concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Titte I formula is adjusted using each county's per capita personal income).

SRS transition payments are only authorized through FY 2011, at which point Congress must decide to extend and/or reform SRS, or allow it expire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the $25 \%$ Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on

Additional Resources
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act payments available at: fsusca
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties.
Data Sources
U.S. Departmen of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at
U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Fo
www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

## *****

*     * 

This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived from a variety of revenue-generating activities on BLM land, including revenue from the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.

BLM Payments to States and Local Governments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Gila County, AZ | 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total BLM Payments (\$) | 7,557 | 66,579,030 |
| Proceeds of Sales | 0 | 9,841,676 |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0 | 53,150 |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 7,557 | 12,684,340 |
| State Payments | 0 | 3,922,509 |
| National Grasslands | 0 | 447,217 |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0 | 39,630,138 |
| Title I | 0 | 33,685,617 |
| Titte II | 0 | 3,343,873 |
| Title III | 0 | 2,600,648 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Proceeds of Sales | 0.0\% | 14.8\% |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 100.0\% | 19.1\% |
| State Payments | 0.0\% | 5.9\% |
| National Grasslands | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0.0\% | 59.5\% |
| Title I | 0.0\% | 50.6\% |
| Titte II | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Titte III | 0.0\% | 3.9\% |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-h

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments Payments are BLM land, including revenue trom the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.
Mineral Leasing Act: These include Oil and Gas Right of Way lease revenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do
not include royaties from mineral leasing on BLM lands, which are distributed by the office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). For ONRR payments see worksheet 10
Taylor Grazing Act: The Taylor Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, established grazing allotments on public land and extended tenure to district
grazers. In 1936 the Grazing Service (BLM) enacted fees to be shared with the county where allotments and leases are located restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predator control, noxious weed programs) in coooperation with BLM or livestock organizations.
 - Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act concems issuing grazing leases on public lands outside the original grazing district established under the
$\frac{\text { National Grasslands: Revenue derived from the management of National Grasslands under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act ( } 7 \text { U.s.C. }}{1012 \text { ), and Executive Order } 10787 \text {, November } 6,1958 \text {. }}$

Oregon and Califormia Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (O\&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road
(CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. Amounts include Titte I Title ll, and Titt payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report tor definitions and information on the Secwre Pura Schools and Community Self-Determination Act).
Why is it important?
The BLM is the nation's largest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adiacent communities. public satety and lax enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in in lieu of
pres property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT).
Methods
BLM data on this page are from BLM FRD 196 and FRD 198 reports. The FRD 196 reports receipts by county and state of origin while the
FRD 1988 reports actual distribution amounts to state and FRD 198 reports actual distribution amounts to state and local governments. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the $\operatorname{FRD} 196$ repo
used. To
usarive at distribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table $3-31$ of BLM Public Land Statistics) was sed. Some erwister in addition, some data are obtained directly from states. Distribution statistics obtained from the state or local state and local govermment in FY 2009.)
Additional Resources
BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics website:
blm.gov/wolsten/res/Direct_Links_to_Publications/ann__pt_and_pls.htmI ${ }^{(6)}$.

Data Source
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available a

## * *

This page describes U.S. Fish and Widllife Service Refuge revenue sharing.

USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes U.S. Fish and Wiidlife
This page describes U.S. Fish and Widlifife Service Refuge revenue sharing.
Twenty-five percent of the net receipts collected from the sale of various products or privileges from Refige lands, or three-quarters of one
percent $(075 \%$ percent $(0.75 \%)$ of the adjusted purchase price of Refuge land, whichever is greater, is shared with the counties in which the Refuge is located.

Why is it important?
National Wildifife Refuges and other lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wiillife Service do not pay property taxes to local governments.
The Refuge revenue sharing program is intended to compensate counties tor non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing rograms, these payments can be important ind to compensate counties for non-taxable Reftuge lands. As with other revenue shatry 1 lt ment to raise sufficient tax revenue to provide basic services. In additition, linking payments to revenue derived from USFWS lands can create incentives for local government officiials to lobby for particular uses of public land.

## Methods

Data Limitations: The USFWS publishes a database of Refige revenue sharing payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007 only, and does not make ata available for other years for the nation. Data on Reftuge revenue sharing may be obtained directly from the receiving county government. County govemments may request county-specific Retuge revenue sharing payment data from U.S. Fish and Wildifite Services, Division nancial Management, Denver Operations.
Significance of Data Limitations: Data limitations are relatively insignificant on the national scale (USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments .

Additional Resources
A detailed description of USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments is available on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Realty website at fws.gov/refiges/realty/rs. htmm ${ }^{(5)}$.

The Refuge Revenue Sharing Database is available at: fws.gov/refuges/reaty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing_Search_2007.ctm.). The database currenty only includes payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007. The agency does not provide data for the nation for additional years
Data Sources
US. Depa in iterior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widdife Service, Washington, D.C.


This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments.
Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: US. Denartment of Interior 2012 Office of Natural Resources Revenue Washington D.C

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for
the region.
Royalties, rents, and bonus payments from mining activitie on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49\% of revenue is returned to
states and $51 \%$ is retained byy the federal government). In additition, revenue trom geothermal production on federal lands and a share of royaltie states and $51 \%$ is retained by the tediral govermment). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on federal lands and a share of royatites
from offshore drilling the Gulf of Mexico (GOMESA) are shared directly with county governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of federal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or economically impacted
by mineral development for planning, construction/maintenance of public facilities, and provision of public services).

Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royalty may be an established Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or percentage increases by steps as the average production on the lease increases. A minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royaty rate increases by steps as the average production on the eease increases. A Geothermal: Geothermal payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. GOMESA: The Gull of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2000 (GOMESA) makes distsibutions of offshore federal mineral royalties to coastal states and communities. The for states and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA leases include Alabama
Louisiana, Mississipi, and Texas.

- $A$ Bonuses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain mineral
represent the cash amount successully bid to win the rights to a lease.
Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royalty, rent, or or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settloment pays Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royalty, rent, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments

Why is it important?
Mineral royaties are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significant
demands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Rovalty revenue helpos meet some of these demands. They are elso demands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Reyalty revenue helps meet some of the
to provide an ongoing public benefit from the depletion of non-renewable resources owned by the public.
Methods
Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal
Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaly distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal
distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalties were generated). For example. Montana distributes 25
percent of the state governments share of federal mineral royaties with the county of origin. Because information about royalties by county
 origin and state govermment distributions tol local governments are not published by ONRR, EPS-HDT users must contact each state directly to
these data. Headwaters Economics includes a list of state distribution policy, links sto data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, Etate, and Local Government Financial Data Methods and Resources document.
http://headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdt.

Additional Resources
Headwaters Economics provides a methods document specific to the EPS-HDT Federal Lands Payments report that includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Governmen financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics. org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS.
HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdff ${ }^{10)}$.
For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available a.
onrr.gov/Stats/pdtdocs/glossary. poff ${ }^{(11)}$.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

8 \＆
The EPS－HDT Government report uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：

## －U．S．Census of Governments

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce
www．census．gov／govs
Tel．800－242－2184
－U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service
Realty Division，U．S．Department of Interior
www．fws．gov
Tel．703－358－1713

## －U．S．Bureau of Land Management

U．S．Department of Interior
www．blm．gov
Tel．202－208－3801

## －U．S．Forest Service

U．S．Department of Agriculture
www．fs．fed．us
Tel．800－832－1355
－U．S．Office of Natural Resources Revenue
U．S．Department of Interior
www．onrr．gov
Tel．303－231－3078

## ＊来的卫粦

EPS－HDT core approaches
EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－county regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## Adjusting dollar figures for inflation

Because a dollar in the past was worth more than a dollar today，data reported in current dollar terms should be adjusted for inflation．The U．S．Department of Commerce reports personal income figures in terms of current dollars．All income data in EPS－HDT are adjusted to real（or constant）dollars using the Consumer Price Index．Figures are adjusted to the latest date for which the annual Consumer Price Index is available．

## 

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
www.census.gov/govs/
www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
www.fs.usda.gov/pts/
www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct Links to Publications/ann rpt and pls.html
www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing Search 2007.cfm
10 headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT Federal Land Payments Documentation 1-30-2011.pdf
www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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Note to Users:
Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV $>40 \%$.

[^4]|  |  | County, Az |  | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (2013*) |  | 3,889,161 |  | 311,536,594 |
| Population (2000) |  | 3,072,149 |  | 281,421,906 |
| Population Change (2000-2013*) |  | 817,012 |  | 30,114,688 |
| Population Percent Change (2000-2013*) |  | 26.6\% |  | 10.7\% |
| *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during $2009-2013$ and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent Change in Population, 2000-2013* |  |  |  |
| - From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the smallest estimated absolute change in population $(817,012)$. | 30\% | 26.6\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20\% |  |  |  |
|  | 15\% |  | 10.7\% |  |
| - From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the largest estimated relative change in population ( $26.6 \%$ ), and the U.S. had the smallest (10.7\%). | 10\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | pa County, A | u.s. |  |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Communits Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.s.
Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.



This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age
Median Age: The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; $i$ ie, half the people are younger than this age and
half are older.

Age \& Gender Distribution, 2013*

|  | Maricopa County, AZ | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 3,889,161 | 311,536,594 |
| Under 5 years | 278,651 | 20,052,112 |
| 5 to 9 years | 284,201 | 20,409,060 |
| 10 to 14 years | 280,183 | 20,672,609 |
| 15 to 19 years | 272,989 | 21,715,074 |
| 20 to 24 years | 275,335 | 22,099,887 |
| 25 to 29 years | 280,898 | 21,243,365 |
| 30 to 34 years | 271,590 | 20,467,912 |
| 35 to 39 years | 259,449 | 19,876,161 |
| 40 to 44 years | 270,898 | 20,998,001 |
| 45 to 49 years | 259,859 | 22,109,946 |
| 50 to 54 years | 250,209 | 22,396,322 |
| 55 to 59 years | 216,550 | 20,165,892 |
| 60 to 64 years | 198,127 | 17,479,211 |
| 65 to 69 years | 155,890 | 13,189,508 |
| 70 to 74 years | 118,572 | 9,767,522 |
| 75 to 79 years | 90,061 | 7,438,750 |
| 80 to 84 years | 66,147 | 5,781,697 |
| 85 years and over | 59,552 | 5,673,565 |
| Total Female | 1,964,913 | 158,289,182 |
| Total Male | 1,924,248 | 153,247,412 |
| Change in Median Age, 2000-2013* |  |  |
| Median Age^ (2013*) | 35.0 | 37.3 |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 33.0 | 35.3 |
| Median Age \% Change | 6.1\% | 5.7\% | - The data in this table are calcula

characteristics during this period.
$\begin{aligned} & \text { - From } 2000 \text { to the } 2009-2013 \text { period, the } \\ & \text { median age estimate increased the most in }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { median age estimate increased the most in } \\ & \text { Maricopa County, } A Z \text { ( } 33.0 \text { to } 35.0 \text {, } \mathrm{a} .1 \%\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { increase) and increased the least in the } \\ & \text { U.S. }(35.3 \text { to } 37.3,2.5 \% \text { increse }\end{aligned}$


- Median Age^ (2000)
- Median Age^ ${ }^{(2013 *)}$

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S

Age \& Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Maricopa County, Az | s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Under 5 years | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 0.7\% | 0.1\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 0.8\% | 0.1\% |
| 25 to 29 years | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 30 to 34 years | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 35 to 39 years | 0.7\% | 0.1\% |
| 40 to 44 years | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 45 to 49 years | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 50 to 54 years | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 0.8\% | 0.1\% |
| 65 to 69 years | 0.8\% | 0.1\% |
| 70 to 74 years | 0.8\% | 0.1\% |
| 75 to 79 years | 1.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 80 to 84 years | 1.2\% | 0.1\% |
| 85 years and over | 1.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Total Female | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Total Male | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age^ $2013^{*}$ ) | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age \% Change | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
$\frac{\text { Median Age: }}{\text { Older. }}$ The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are

Why is it important?
Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of reitrees, the age distribution may be
skewed towards categories 65 years and older. in counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group $18-29$. In


The change in median age is one indicatoo of whether the population has gotten older or younger.
Methods
Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5 -year estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5 -year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, 2009* may be listed as the year, but this is a 5 -year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair reatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej ${ }^{j}$. An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliancelejeresources(policylei_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pdf ${ }^{(1)}$. The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at stateotheusa.org ${ }^{\text {(5) }}$

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: ers.usda.gov/topics/ural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx ${ }^{(6)}$. Wiliam H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools a al
and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at
aoa.gov/aoarootlaging_statisticsindex.aspx ${ }^{\left({ }^{(6)}\right)}$.
The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas. This information is available at: htpp://www.census.gov/popest $t^{(9)}$

For information on county-level heath ranking, see: countyhealthrankings.orgg ${ }^{(10)}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.


| \%* |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups. |  |  |
| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013* |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2013* |
| Total Population | 3,072,149 | 3,889,161 |
| Under 18 | 828,003 | 1,009,240 |
| 18-34 | 801,694 | 934,607 |
| 35-44 | 475,907 | 530,347 |
| 45-64 | 607,566 | 924,745 |
| 65 and over | 358,979 | 490,222 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Under 18 | 27.0\% | 26.0\% |
| 18-34 | 26.1\% | 24.0\% |
| 35-44 | 15.5\% | 13.6\% |
| 45-64 | 19.8\% | 23.8\% |
| 65 and over | 11.7\% | 12.6\% | 7 The data in this ta

during this period.


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into
Why is it important?
For public land managers, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups has a large retired population, or soon-to-be-retired population, for example, the needs and ind atitudes of different age groups. If a geography on public land managesers than a geoography with a large number of minors or or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation (those born between 1946 and 1964). As this generation enters retirement age, their mobility, spending patterms, and consumer demands (for health care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develop economicall. An aging population can also affect changing emands on land use (e.g., recreation).

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout erort, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
Additional Resources
The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:
.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx ${ }^{(11)}$
For a discussion on the implications or rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave will
.
The Census maintains a useful web site with data, aricicles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: census.govipoppulation/age/ ${ }^{\text {(II }}$
The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census. goviprod/2010pubs/p25 1138.pdf ${ }^{[133}$

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and Its Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29. Washington, DC. ers.usda.govipublications/err-economic-research-reportler79. aspx ${ }^{(\text {121) }}$.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regiona Demographics in the '00 Decade: The Role of Seniors, Boomers and New Minorities. The Brookings Instiution, Washington, D.C.

Frey, W. H. 2007. Mapping the Growth of older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21 st Century. Brookings Census 2000 Series.
Washington, D.C.: Brookings institution Meroopolitan Poolicy Program. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program.

Jacobsen, L. A., and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." Population Bulletin 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C.. ,
U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesexhtm| ${ }^{(15)}$. Retrieved September $1,2010$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Divivion, Washington, D.C.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of
Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems support Division, Washington, D.C.

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Under 18 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 18-34 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 35-44 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 45-64 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 65 and over | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2009* |
| Under 18 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 18-34 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 35-44 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 45-64 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 65 and over | 0\% | 0\% |




|  | Maiticopa County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or Atrican American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Other Pacific Is. alone | 4\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 2\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 2\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Maicopa County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or Aftican American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific Is. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 2\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 2\% | 0\% |



Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term
"Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers }}{\text { race and }}$ Eace and Hispanic origin to be wo separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the speciif }}{\text { Hispanic }}$ Hispanic cr Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they
are "other are other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." "rigin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of
any race. any race.

## Why is it important?

Hispanics are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the
U.S. seff-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the poph
2050. Between 2000 and 2010 , Hispanics accounted for over one-half of the nation's population grownh.

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of the
Hispanic community in an area can be an important consideration for public land managers working to meet the needs of the public or evaluating potentially adverse impacts on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e
promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and envirommental riskss" and promoting equal employment opporumniess assessing racial disparities in heald and environmental isks)" and "Data on ethnic groups are
important tor putting into effecta number of federal stautes (ie enforcing biingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act monitoring and important tor putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e., enforcing bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act; monitoring and
enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civili Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local goverments to run programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identifying segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under then Public Health Act evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act)."

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geogranhic

## Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity (1997), see: whitehouse.gov/omb/fedree_1997standards ${ }^{\text {(12) }}$.

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-1.pdf ${ }^{(17)}$.
Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/js/pages/index.xhtm| ${ }^{1818)}$.
Additional information on the U.S. Hispanic population from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at:
census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.ppff ${ }^{20}$.
For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land mana
subject, see: icbemp.gov/sciencelhansistichard 10pg. pf ${ }^{(21)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

## Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Maricopa Counly, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 4\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 10\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 3\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 0\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 3\% | 0\% |



| American Indian \& Alaska Native Population, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | u.s. |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Native American | 2\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes | 2\% | 0\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes | 29\% | 1\% |
| Non-Specified Tribes | 14\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.s. |
| Total Native American | 0\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes | 0\% | 0\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes | 0\% | 0\% |
| Non-Specified Tribes | 0\% | 0\% |


| Region |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races. |  |  |
| American Indian \& Alaska Native Population, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population | 3,889,161 | 311,536,594 |
| Total Native American | 72.913 | 2,540,309 |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 64,905 | 1,997,487 |
| Apache | 2,745 | 69,740 |
| Blackeet | 225 | 26,474 |
| Cherokee | 1,991 | 273,192 |
| Cheyenne | 42 | 11,774 |
| Chickasaw | 257 | 22,917 |
| Chippewa | 722 | 115,253 |
| Choctaw | 727 | 90,189 |
| Colville | 40 | 8,182 |
| Comanche | 216 | 12,228 |
| Cree | 30 | 2,191 |
| Creek | 119 | 41.521 |
| Crow | 0 | 11,424 |
| Delaware | 48 | 7,471 |
| Houma | 0 | 9,488 |
| Iroquois | 409 | 45,639 |
| Kiowa | 110 | 8,691 |
| Lumbee | 14 | 68,171 |
| Menominee | 22 | 8,259 |
| Navaio | 26,377 | 305,552 |
| Osage | 0 | 8,332 |
| Ottawa | 76 | 7,026 |
| Paiute | 78 | 10,545 |
| Pima | 10,216 | 24,212 |
| Potawatomi | 361 | 19,337 |
| Pueblo | 3,102 | 71,029 |
| Puget Sound Salish | 58 | 13,971 |
| Seminole | 78 | 13,987 |
| Shoshone | 45 | 9,470 |
| Sioux | 1,048 | 124,383 |
| Tohono O'Odham | 2.439 | 20,343 |
| Ute | 169 | 8,629 |
| Yakama | 88 | 8,614 |
| Yaqui | ${ }^{4.405}$ | 19,942 |
| Yuman | -1,577 | 7,944 |
| All other tribes | 7,071 | 491,367 |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 1.774 | 60,370 |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 444 | 108,836 |
| Alaska Athabaskan | 84 | 15,882 |
| Aleut | 64 | 11,709 |
| Eskimo | 164 | 60,926 |
| Tlingit-Haida | 123 | 15,622 |
| All other tribes | 9 | 4,697 |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | 71 | 10,616 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; |  |  |
| *The data in this table are calculated by ACS | ucted during 2009-20 | $\overline{\text { average }}$ |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { The data in this table are calculatat } \\
& \text { characteristics during this period. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identity as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination
with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes
 or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackfeet, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Chocktaw, Coville, Comanche, Cree,
Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, roquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navaio, Osage, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Pugget


Alaska Native: This category shows selfi-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska Native race and ethnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: }}{\text { Census questionnaire or crategory includes respondents whe generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native, " or tribal entries not elsewhere classified. }}$
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and
historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helptut to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation <12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 ,
and $40 \%$; and
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accurachy throughout and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dols) indicales a coefficient of variation >

Additional Resources
The U.S. Forest Service Office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-tribal


## Data Sources

S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Maricepa County az |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% |  |
| Total Native American | 2\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 2\% | 0\% |
| Apache | 16\% | 2\% |
| Blackeet | 38\% | 3\% |
| Cherokee | 16\% | 1\% |
| Cheyenne | 75\% | 6\% |
| Chickasaw | 31\% | 3\% |
| Chippewa | 25\% | 1\% |
| Choctaw | 29\% | 1\% |
| Colville | 49\% | 5\% |
| Comanche | 53\% | 6\% |
| Cree | 103\% | 11\% |
| Creek | 49\% | 2\% |
| Crow | na | 5\% |
| Delaware | 63\% | 7\% |
| Houma | na | 6\% |
| Iroquois | 37\% | 2\% |
| Kiowa | 38\% | 7\% |
| Lumbee | 100\% | 1\% |
| Menominee | 99\% | 4\% |
| Navaio | 5\% | 1\% |
| Osage | na | 6\% |
| Otawa | 75\% | 7\% |
| Paiute | 44\% | 4\% |
| Pima | 7\% | 4\% |
| Potawatomi | 41\% | 3\% |
| Pueblo | 13\% | 2\% |
| Puget Sound Salish | 99\% | 4\% |
| Seminole | 58\% | 4\% |
| Shoshone | 59\% | 5\% |
| Sioux | 24\% | 1\% |
| Tohono O'Odham | 15\% | 5\% |
| Ute | 45\% | 6\% |
| Yakama | 56\% | 5\% |
| Yaqui | 12\% | 5\% |
| Yuman | 13\% | 6\% |
| All other tribes | 10\% | 1\% |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 22\% | 3\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 29\% | 1\% |
| Alaska Athabaskan | 70\% | 4\% |
| Aleut | 59\% | 5\% |
| Eskimo | 50\% | 1\% |
| Tlingit-Haida | 49\% | 4\% |
| All other tribes | 101\% | 6\% |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | 80\% | 6\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; $\mathrm{N}^{\prime}$ | 14\% | 1\% |

## Page 7

＋$\square$ ○ $\bigcirc$ 米雷

## 

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work（occupation）and where they work（by industry）．
Employment by Occupation， 2013

| Civilian employed population $>16$ years |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{\text {1，}}^{1,3434,641}$ | 141，84，69 |
| Menice | （384，518 | ${ }^{511,34,266}$ |
| Sales and office | 476．093 | 34，957，520 |
| Farming，fisting，and foresty | 4.488 | 1.030. |
| Construction，extraction，mant． \＆repair | 139,2 | ${ }_{11,832}^{118}$ |
| Production，transporataion，\＆maeralal movin | 162，25 | 17，057，570 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Manaement，protessional，\＆erelated |  | 约3．2\％\％ |
| Sence Sane and ofice | （18．39\％ |  |
| Faming，Isting，and foresty | 0．3\％ | 0．7\％ |
| Consturction，extaction，mant，\＆Repair | 8．0\％ | ${ }^{8.3 \%}$ |
| Producioio，trassootation， Q materia mo | 9．4\％ | 2．0\％ |



Employment by Industry，2013＊

| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | Conny Az | U． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{\text {1，734，641 }}^{\text {10746 }}$ | （14．1．64．697 |
|  | 107746 |  |
| Constuction |  |  |
| Wholesale trade | ${ }_{4}^{47,134}$ | ${ }_{3,937,876}^{14,0,4,48}$ |
| Retail tade | 211，807 | 16，415，217 |
| Transorataion，warehousing，and unilites | ${ }^{88,309}$ | ${ }^{7,01010.637}$ |
| Intimation $\begin{aligned} & \text { Inance and insurance，and reale estaie }\end{aligned}$ | （16．154 |  |
| Finarce and insurance，and real estate | ${ }^{1655175}{ }_{222,834}$ | 9，4．49，756 |
| Education healt care，esocial ssisisane | ${ }^{367,711}$ |  |
| Arts eneerain，rec，accomotiation \＆tood | ${ }^{170.924}$ | 13，262，892 |
| Others sevices，extept pubicic administration | ${ }_{\substack{83,247 \\ 76,527}}$ | （7，043，0．003 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Agiculuref foresty，frsting \＆hunting，minin }}$ | 0．6\％\％ | 1．9\％ |
| Constuction |  | ¢，${ }_{\text {c．2\％}}^{\text {1．5\％}}$ |
| Whotesale trade | ${ }_{2}$ | 2．8\％ |
|  |  |  |
| Transporation，warehousing，and unitites Intumation | ${ }_{2.0 \%}^{5.19 \%}$ | ${ }_{2}^{4.2 \%}$ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 9．5\％ | 6．7\％ |
| Prot，scientific，mgmt，admin．\＆w waste mgr | 12．8\％ | 10．8\％ |
| Education，health care，$X$ social assistance | ${ }^{21.2 \%}$ | 23．2\％ |
| Ats，eneetain，rec，accomodation， Otood | ¢ $9.98 \%$ |  |
| Public administration | ${ }_{4.4 \%}$ | 5．0\％ |

Data Surres．U．S．Departmen t ot commerece．2013．Census Bureau，Ameicican Community Surey ofitice，Wastington，D．C．
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## 

What do we measure on this page？
This page describes what people do tor
Employment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification（SOC）system，where workers are classified into occupations
with similar job duties，skills，education，and／or training，regardless of indusustry
Employment by industry：Refers to the employment by industry，listed according to the North American Industry Classification System
（NAICS）．
Why is it Important？
Employment statistics are usually reported by industry（as with other reports in EPS．HDT）．This is a useful way to show the relative diversity of people do tor a living and the type of work they do，regardiess of the industry．For example，management and protessional occupations are
geneat people do for a alwing and the type of work they do，regardisss of the industry．For example，manaaementan and professional occupations are
generally of higher wage and require tormal education，and these occupations could exist in any number of industries for example，managers generaly of higher wage and require tormal education，anc these occupations could exst in any number of industries（tor example，managers
could be working to a sostware firm，a mine，ora construction company）．occupation intormation describes what peopile do，while employmen
by industry describes where people work．

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation＜ $12 \%$ ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between
12 and $40 \%$ and PED 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD（preceded with two dots）indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$ ．If data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report，we suggest running another demographics repoft at a arger geographic s cale．

Additional Resources
The Census Bureau provides a definition of socs：census．govihhes／wwwiliondex（overiew．htm｜${ }^{\text {P55 }}$
Occupations are also defined by U．S．Bureau of Labor Statistics：bls．govisocl ${ }^{(22)}$
The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs including traing and ef in neede
earnings，working conditions，and what workers do on the job：bls．gov／ocol／（27）

## Data Sources

U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Oftice，Washington，D．C．

| Marcopa County，Az U．S． |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Management，protessiona，\＆related | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Serice | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and fifice | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Farming，fisting，and torestry | 9\％ | 1\％ |
| Construction，extraction，maint，\＆repair | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movins | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Serice | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and fifice | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Faming，fisting，and torestry | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Construction，extraction，maint，\＆repair | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Employment by Industry，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Agiculure，torestry，ffsting \＆hunting，minin | 5\％ | \％\％ |
| Construction | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 1\％ | \％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utitities | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Intormation | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Prot．，scienific，mgmt．admin．，\＆waste mgr | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，heath care，\＆social asistance | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Ars，entertain．，rec．，accomodation，\＆food | ${ }^{1 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Other senices，except public administration | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Pubic administraion | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Agriculurue，torestr，fishing \＆hunting，minin }}$ | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Construction | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utitities | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Intormation | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Prof．，scientific，mgmt．admin．，\＆waste mgr | 1\％ | \％\％ |
| Education，heath care，\＆social assistance | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Arts，entertain，rec，accomotation， 8 food | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Other senices．except public administration Pubic administaion | 1\％ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Public administraion | 1\％ | 0\％ |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> 

## What do we measure on this page?

rer wer
Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irrespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual
worked 10 or 40 hours per week, it they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year".

Why is it important?
Otten, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human
canial translating tol capital, translating to lower real incomes and a lower standard of fiving. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have consistently been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the US Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Part-time jobs (those that average less
than 35 hoursweek) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to
remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to
telecommute and work shorter and more fiexible hours. And, in some cases, young aduilts seek out seasonal, tourism, or recreation related
 hours/week).

To understand the degree to which the data on this page are related to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, To understand the degree to which the data on this page arr
data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count full time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large
percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain falling wages or rates of employment that outpace percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain allling wages or rates of employment that outpac
population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$ II dita have consistently low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$.

Additional Resources
Maynard, D. C. \& Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G $06-12$ (501). Available at:
ceo.usc.edu/pdif/ G0612501.pdf ${ }^{\text {(23) }}$.
For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-ime employment, see: bls.gov/opub/is/patifopbilis71.pdf ${ }^{(29)}$.
For information on unemployment, run the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

## Data Sources

u.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.


|  |
| :---: |
| This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to |

Commuting Characteristics, 2013*


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## * * What do we measure on this page? <br> What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers who do not work

Place of Work: The values reported under "place of work" describe the number of workers that live in the selected geographic area who worked
either in or outside the county they live in. If the selected geography is not a county, the workers may or may not work within the selected
 residents that worked in Maricopa County (but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix).

## Why is it important?

-High rates of out-commuting are more common in non-metro areas, and in parts of the U.S. where communities are closer together.
Economic development ts sometimes affected by commuting in unanticipated ways: strategies aimed at increasing iobs in a community will not
necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for ressidents does not always require bringing iobs into that necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing jobs into that
community.
High out-commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for services, complicating fiscal planning for local governments.
"Bedroom communities," those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggle to provide social services, housing, and water and sewer


Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation <12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (precededed with two dotss) indicates a cooefficient tof variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report a a a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Aldrich, L... Beale, B. and $K$. Kasse. 1997 . Commuting and the EConomic Function
Perspecives 12 (3) ers. usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.puf ${ }^{\text {(30) }}$.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.c.

| ariation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U.S. |
| Workers 16 years and over | 0\% | 0\% |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 0\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 2\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 2\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 2\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 2\% | 0\% |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 0\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 3\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 2\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 2\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 1\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 2\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 2\% | 0\% |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |

[^5]| Maricopa County, Az |  | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Per-Capita Income | 0\% | 0\% |
| Median Household Income^ ${ }^{\text {^2013) }}$ \$ | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Households | 0\% | 0\% |
| Less than \$10,000 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 2\% | 0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 2\% | 0\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 2\% | 0\% |
| Gini Coefficient | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 1\% | 0\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 1\% | 0\% |

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line．
$\frac{\text { Poverty：Following the Office of Management and Budget＇s Directive } 14 \text { ，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by }}{\text { tamily size and composition to detect who is poor If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty }}$ family size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a amily or an unrelated in
threshold，then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Poverty，2013＊

|  | Maricopa County，Az | U．S． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 3，839，007 | 303，692，076 |
| Families | 930，395 | 76，744，358 |
| People Below Poverty | 639，233 | 46，663，433 |
| Families below poverry | 113，890 | 8，666，630 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| People Below Poverty | 16．7\％ | 15．4\％ |
| Families below povery | 12．2\％ | 11．3\％ | The data in this table are calcula）．

characteristics during this period．

－Percent below poverty level by age and family type is calculated by dividing the number of people by demographic in poverty by the
total pooulation of that demographic． total population of that demographic．

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．
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## 

```
What do we measure on this page？
This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line．
Family：A group of two or more people who reside together and who are related by birth，marriage，or adoption．
Poverty：Following the office of Management and Budgets Directive 14 ，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor．It he total income for a amily or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold
then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Why is it important？
Poveryy is an important indicator of economic well－being．For public land managers，understanding the extent of poverty is important for several reasons．First，people with limited income may have different needs，values，and attitudes as they relate to public lands．Second，proposed activies on pubicic ands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience
orty rates are often repold
Poverty rates are often reported in aggregate，which can hide important differences．The bottom table shows poverty for various types of
individuals and famiies．This is important because aggregat information（for example，the poverty rate for single mothers with children）．
```


## Methods

```
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation \(<12 \%\) ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and 40\％；and RED BOLD（preceded with two dots）indicates a coefficient of variation \(>40 \%\) ．If data have consistently low accuracey through \(a \quad\) report，we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale．
Additional Resources
For more information on rural poverty，see U．S．Department of Agriculture，Economic Research Service，Briefing Room，＂Rural Income，Poverty． and Welfare：High Poverty Counties＂available at：ers．usda．govtropics／rural－economy－population／fural－poverty－well－being．aspx \({ }^{\text {（33）}}\)
The University of Michigan＇s National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States．See： mww．npc．umich．edu／poverty \({ }^{(36)}\)
The U．S．Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as＂the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of al people
regardless of race，color，national origin，or income with respect to the development，implementation，and entorcement of environmental law regulations，and policies．＂Environmental Protection Agency environmental iustice resources are available at epa．gov／compliancelej \({ }^{(4) \text { ．}}\)
```


## Data Sources

```
US．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C
```


## Poverty，Coefficients of Variation

|  | Maricopa County，Az | u．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family Type，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Maricopa Countr，Az | U．S． |
| People | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Under 18 years | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| 65 years and older | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Families with related children＜ 18 years | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Married couple families | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 3\％ | 1\％ |
| Female householder，no husband present | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| with children $<18$ years | 3\％ | 0\％ |


| 5*D米 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty. |  |  |
| Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. |  |  |
| Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity^, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population (all races) in Poverty | 639,233 | 46,663,433 |
| White alone | 466,893 | 28,254,647 |
| Black or African American alone | 48,898 | 10,165,935 |
| American Indian alone | 19,685 | 701,439 |
| Asian alone | 17,506 | 1,872,394 |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | ${ }^{1} .525$ | 99,943 |
| Some other race | 65,061 | 3,872,191 |
| Two or more races | 19,665 | 1,696,884 |
| All Ethnicities in Poverty |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 332,253 | 12,507,866 |
| Not Hispanic or Lation (of any race) | 306,980 | 34,155,567 |
| Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) |  |  |
| White alone | 73.0\% | 60.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 7.6\% | 21.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 3.1\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 2.7\% | 4.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Some other race | 10.2\% | 8.3\% |
| Two or more races | 3.1\% | 3.6\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 52.0\% | ${ }^{26.8 \%}$ |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 4.0\% | 73.2\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or ethnic category by the total population. <br> *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |
| Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty-, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, AZ | U.s. |
| White alone | 15.1\% | 12.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 25.1\% | 27.1\% |
| American Indian alone | 27.8\% | 28.6\% |
| Asian alone | 12.8\% | 12.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 20.0\% | 19.6\% |
| Some other race alone | 29.6\% | 26.8\% |
| Two or more races alone | 17.9\% | 20.1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 29.1\% | 24.7\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 9.6\% |  |
| ~Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that race. |  |  |



Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population (all races) | 1\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 4\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 6\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 6\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 20\% | 2\% |
| Some other race | 3\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 5\% | 0\% |
| All Ethnicities |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 1\% | \% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 2\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 4\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 6\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 7\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 25\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 4\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 6\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 2\% | 0\% |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 4\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 6\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 6\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 59\% | 18\% |
| Some other race alone | 4\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races alone | 6\% | 1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 1\% | 1\% |


|  |  | ＊口米 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊DTE |  |  |
| This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household eamings by source． |  |  |
| Number of Households Receiving Earnings，by Source，2013＊ |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County，Az | U．S． |
| Total households： | 1，411，727 | 115，610，216 |
| Labor earnings | 1，117，939 | 90，436，935 |
| Social Security（SS） | 377，942 | 33，386，448 |
| Retirement income | 235，934 | 20，504，523 |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 45，281 | 5，716，592 |
| Cash public assistance income | 32，142 | 3，255，213 |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 164，541 | 14，339，330 |
| Percent of Total＾ |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 79．2\％ | 78．2\％ |
| Social Security（SS） | 26．8\％ | 28．9\％ |
| Retirement income | 16．7\％ | 17．7\％ |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 3．2\％ | 4．9\％ |
| Cash public assistance income | 2．3\％ | 2．8\％ |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 11．7\％ | 12．4\％ |




Educational Attainment, 2013*


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

$\qquad$

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

* tovoz*

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes levels of educater attanment
Educational Attainment: This refers to the evel of education completed by people 25 years and over in terms of the highest degree or the
highest level of schooling completed
School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private
school or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interview. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business school such as post secondary vocational, trade, hospital school, and on job training were not reported as enrolled in school.

Why is it important?
Sudies show that geograshies with a higher than average educated worktorce growew faster, have have higher incoumes, and sutfer less during Sudies show that geographies with a higher than average educated worktorce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during

For public land managers, understanding the dififerences in education levels can highilight whether certain people in geographic areas migh
experience disproportionalety high and adverse effects of pan.
Shool enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age, access to education and potential for future growth. Some government agencies also use this intormation for funding allocations.

Methods
Dala accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation <12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low curacy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-found employment, and unemployment rates, see:
The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.goviemplep_chart_001.htm (41),
U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available
at: census.goviprod/2002pubs/(p23-210.pdf ( 42 ).

Card, David (1999). "The Causal Effect of Education on Earnings" in Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, eds., Handbook of Labor Economics, wol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

## Data Source

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


Study Guide and Supplemental Information
**
What do we measure on this page?
This page measures the primary language people speak at home.
Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English
language which is sed in addition to English or in place of English.
Why is it important?
For pubbic land managers who are trying to communicate with citizens of communities adiacent to public lands, it is important to know whether
a significant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation a signifcant portion of that population has trouble
may need to be conducted in multipiel languages.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates betwe
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dotst) indicates a coefficient of variation > $40 \%$. It datat have consistenty low accuracy
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United
States. This tool is available at
Data Sources
Uata Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
anguage Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Maitopa County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 5 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak only English | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 1\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 0\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 5\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 2\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 5\% | 1\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 1\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Speak only English | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 0\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 1\% | 0\% |
| Other IndoEuropean languages | 5\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 3\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 5\% | 0\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 1\% | 0\% |

大 1 人

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year buill.
Housing Characteristics, 2013*

|  |  | copa Count, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units |  | 1,648,392 | 132,057,804 |
| Occupied |  | 1,411,727 | 115,610,216 |
| Vacant |  | 236,665 | 16,447,588 |
| For rent |  | 62,970 | 3,230,123 |
| Rented, not occupied |  | 9,740 | 599,884 |
| For sale only |  | 30,103 | 1,682,020 |
| Sold, not occupied |  | 11,479 | 608,590 |
| For seasonal, recreational, occasional us |  | 73,195 | 5,122,778 |
| For migrant workers |  | 149 | 34,233 |
| Other vacant |  | 49,029 | 5,169,960 |
| Year Built |  |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later |  | 8,313 | 771,765 |
| Built 2000 to 2004 |  | 415,565 | 19,385,497 |
| Built 1990 to 1999 |  | 353,876 | 18,390,124 |
| Built 1980 to 1989 |  | 318,002 | 18,345,244 |
| Built 1970 to 1979 |  | 293,441 | 21,042,566 |
| Built 1960 to 1969 |  | 121,341 | 14,634,125 |
| Built 1959 or earier |  | 137,854 | 39,488,483 |
| Median year structure built^ |  | 1989 | 1976 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| Occupancy |  |  |  |
| Occupied |  | 85.6\% | 87.5\% |
| Vacant |  | 14.4\% | 12.5\% |
| For rent |  | 3.8\% | 2.4\% |
| Rented, not occupied |  | 0.6\% | 0.5\% |
| For sale only |  | 1.8\% | 1.3\% |
| Sold, not occupied |  | 0.7\% | 0.5\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional |  | 4.4\% | 3.9\% |
| For migrant workers |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Other vacant |  | 3.0\% | 3.9\% |
| Year Built |  |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later |  | 0.5\% | 0.6\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 |  | 25.2\% | 14.7\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 |  | 21.5\% | 13.9\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 |  | 19.3\% | 13.9\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 |  | 17.8\% | 15.9\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 |  | 7.4\% | 11.1\% |
| Built 1959 or earier |  | 8.4\% | 29.9\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Median year structure built is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations. <br> * The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. <br> Housing Occupancy, Maricopa County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, $A Z$ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing ( $14.4 \%$ ), and the U.S. had the lowest $(12.5 \%)$. |  | $\ldots \%$ | m\%\% |
|  | 60\% |  |  |
|  | 40\% |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 20 \% \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Maricopa County, Az | u.s. |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and
$\frac{\text { Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied }}{\text { vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview. }}$
$\frac{\text { For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other }}{\text { occasional use throughout the year. }}$
For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

Why is it important?
Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data is used to assess the demand for housing, to identify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing arket over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic
levels.
Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirability of a place for recreation and tourism. This could aso be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990 and early 2000 were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when
housing grew ata a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the erlative growth rates of housing is housing grew ata a ast rate (the alete 1970 , tor example, in some parts or the country. Understanding the realive gromin rates or housing is
relevant for public lands managers in the context of the willdand-urban interface, and as an indicator of overall economic growth. The year the home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast tuture demand of sevices, such as energy consumption and fire protection.
Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
*]
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
$\frac{\text { owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid }}{\text { for. }}$
Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.
Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
$\frac{\text { Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, }}{\text { and condominium fees. }}$
Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) if these are paid for by the renter (or paid for the renter by someone else).

Why is it important?
An important indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share
devoted to housing that is below 15 percent is a good proxy for highly affordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

## Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 pe
excessive ( or unaffordable) housing costs that exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey has additional information on housing and housing affordability. See:

For housing prices, for-profit online real-estate senvices may have the most recent price information. See, for example, zillow.com ${ }^{(45)}$.
For current calculations on housing affordabiility, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordabiily Index, available at:
realtor.org/research/research/housinginx ${ }^{(46)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C

- In the $2009-2013$ period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs
for owner-occupied homes (\$1,540), and Maricopa County, AZ had the lowest
(\$1.528).
- In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County.
AZ had the highest estimated monthly AZ had the highest estimated monthly gross rent for renter-occupied homes
( $\$ 943$ ), and the U.S. had the lowest ( $\$ 904$ ).

- Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income dian Monthly Mortgage Costs and Gross Rent, 2013

-Median monthly mortgage cost^ $\quad$ Median gross rent ${ }^{\wedge}$

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation

|  | maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied housing units with a | 0.5\% | 0.3\% |
| morgage Monthy cost $<15 \%$ of household income | 1.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 0.9\% | 0.1\% |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 0.5\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 2.0\% | 0.3\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 0.9\% | 0.1\% |
| Median monthly mortgage cost^ | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Median gross rent^ | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 1.0\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 0.8\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 1.8\% | 0.6\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 0.9\% | 0.1\% |



This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States
The term "benchmark" in this report should not be construed as having the same meaning as in the National Forest Management Act.
Race: Race is a selfidentitication data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. The
Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal govemment collects and presents data on race and
ethnicity
ethnicity.
Poveryy: Following the Otfice of Management and Budgets Directive 14 , the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by tamily
size and composition to detect who is poor. If the total income tor a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold, size and composition to detect who is poor. the totat income for a tamily or an untelaed individual tails below he eelevant poverty hreshold,
then the tamily or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the povery level."

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been borm between 1946 -1964. The reported percent of population that are "tabay

Social Security Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and surivor benefits, permanent disability
Insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It insuranace payments made by the Social
does not include Medicare reimbursement.
Retirement Income: Consists of tamilies that receive income trom: (1) retirement pensions and sunvivor benefits trom a tormer employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. militany; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local.
government: and the U.S.S. military. (3) periodic receipts from annuities and insurance; and (4) regular income from IRA and Keogh plans. It
does not include social Security income.
is it important?
This page shows a quick comparison of a number of indicators covered in this report to hightight where the region is different trom the U.S.
It also offers an at-a-glance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a
can help pubbic land managers identity groups of people and aspects of hardship that can aid with outreach and consideration of whether the
ppacts of land management actions could have disproportionater igh and adverse imper on disadiviaed people or places.

Methods
The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure trom the region by the figure trom the U.S.
Data accuracy is indiciated as tollows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates betwee 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy

Nedian Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography reeions due to data availability
re calculated by ACS usin al 20013 and haracteristics during this period.
 Indian or Alaska Native (2013*) and Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

| Indicators |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Region | S |
| Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age (2009*) | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population White Alone (2009*) | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Population "Baby | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Mediaa Family Income (2009*) | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Per Capita Income (2009*) | 0.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Individuals Below Povert (2009*) | 0.7\% | 0.4\% |
| Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*) | 1.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Households with Retirement and Social | 0.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income | 0.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High | 0.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population That Speak English Less Than | 1.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*) | 1.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30\% of | 0.8\% | 0.2\% |
| Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 0.9\% | 0.1\% |

EPS－HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：
－ 2000 Decennial U．S．Census
Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750

## －American Community Survey

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750
The on－line ACS data retrieval tool is available at：
http：／／www．census．gov／acs／www／

## ＊柬縕紫 <br> EPS－HDT core approaches

EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－Regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## About the American Community Survey（ACS）

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1－3，all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey（ACS）of the Census Bureau．

The ACS is a nation－wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic，social，economic，and housing information about communities every year－information that until recently was only available once a decade．The ACS is not the same as the decennial census，which is conducted every ten years（the ACS has replaced the detailed，Census 2000 long－form questionnaire）．

Data used in this report are 5 －year ACS estimates．Moreso than the 1 or 3 －year estimates，the 5 －year estimates are consistently available for small geographies，such as towns．We show 5 －year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross－geography comparisons．The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period，only what the average value is over the full period．

Because ACS is based on a survey，it is subject to error．The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error（MOE）for every data point．In this report，we alert the user to the data accuracy using color－coded text in the tables：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation（CV）＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD （preceded with two dots）indicates a CV $>40 \%$ ．

The CV is a measure of relative error in the estimate，and is calculated directly from the MOE as the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself．To get the standard error，the MOE is divided by 1.645 （for a 90 percent confidence interval）．The CV is expressed as a percentage．For example，if you have an estimate of $60+/-20$ ，the CV for the estimate is 20.3 percent．This estimate should be used with caution，since the sampling error represents more than 20 percent of the estimate．

## 成米日

## 

headwaterseconomics．org／eps－hdt

## 

Throughout this report，references to on－line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses．These resources are provided as hyperlinks here．

```
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej guidance nepa ceq1297.pdf
www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology main/
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej
www.stateoftheusa.org
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
www.frey-demographer.org
www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging statistics/index.aspx
www.census.gov/popest/
www.countyhealthrankings.org/
www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
uww.census.gov/population/age/
www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg 1997standards
www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22 cspan hispanics.pdf
www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard 10pg.pdf
www.bia.gov/index.htm
uww.indians.org/index.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
www.bls.gov/soc/
www.bls.gov/ocol
www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
uww.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009 ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
www.bls.gov/emp/ep chart 001.htm
www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
www.mla.org/map single
www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
www.zillow.com
www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.
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headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Land Ownership

What is the breakdown of land ownership? 1
What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 2
What are the different types of federal lands? 3
Land Cover
What is the breakdown of forest, grassland, and other land cover types?
4

Residential Development

What are the trends in residential land-use conversion? ..... 5-6
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 7
Links to Additional Resources ..... 8

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

$=$
$=$
$=2$
$=$


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations. |  |  |
| U.S. Forest Service Land Types (Acres), 2009 |  |  |
|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Area | 5,903,622 | 2,286,279,509 |
| Forest Service Lands | 657,723 | 192,750,310 |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 485,818 | 146,630,207 |
| National Wilderness | 171,905 | 36,155,579 |
| National Monument | 0 | 3,661,327 |
| National Recreation Area | 0 | 2,950,660 |
| National Game Refuge | 0 | 1,198,099 |
| National Wild River | 0 | 568,059 |
| National Recreation River | 0 | 398,207 |
| National Scenic River | 0 | 289,617 |
| National Scenic Area | 0 | 230,459 |
| Primitive Area | 0 | 173,762 |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0 | 167,427 |
| Special Management Area | 0 | 164,707 |
| Protection Area | 0 | 45,051 |
| Recreation Management Area | 0 | 43,900 |
| National Scenic and Wildlife Area | 0 | 39,171 |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0 | 12,645 |
| National Botanical Area | 0 | 8,256 |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0 | 6,637 |
| National Historic Area | 0 | 6,540 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Forest Service Lands | 11.1\% | 8.4\% |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 8.2\% | 6.4\% |
| National Wilderness | 2.9\% | 1.6\% |
| National Monument | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| National Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Game Refuge | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Wild River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Recreation River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Primitive Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Special Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Protection Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Recreation Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Wildlife Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Botanical Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Historic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| County Specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Refiges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, |  |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations. Note: All acreages on this page were reported by the U.S. Forest Services' Land Areas Report 2009. The total acreage of Forest Service land
on this page may differ from that reported on previous page due to differences in values reported by the data sources.

Why is it important?
Forest Service lands have special designations scat of may affect Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forent Service lands have special designations

Methods
County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Retuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia
Additional Resources
A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available
at:ts. fed. . us/land/stafflar/2009/larogindex.html ${ }^{(4)}$.

Data Sources
SDA, FS - Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database





8 \&
The EPS-HDT Land-Use report uses national data sources to represent land cover and residential development. In an effort to report more accurate statistics for land ownership, a compilation of state level data was used. All the data in this report were the result of calculations made in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- TIGER/Line County Boundaries 2012

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html

- Developed Areas 2000 and 2010

Theobald, DM. 2013. Land use classes for ICLUS/SERGoM v2013. Unpublished report, Colorado State University.

- Protected Areas Database v 1.32012
U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006

National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm

- USDA, Forest Service

Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html

## 

EPS-HDT core approaches
EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-county regions, to accommodate a flexible range of userdefined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
www.nhd.usgs.gov
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.htm|
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions of terms.htm
headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php
```
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Produced by
Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit

## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

www.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Note to Users:

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.

Components of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Asthington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of titerior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes al federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
ederal land payments: These are tederal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals).
$\frac{\text { Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is }}{\text { based on a maximum per-acre payment reduced by the sum on all }}$
 Payments include the $25 \%$ Fund, Secure Rural Schools \& Community Self-Determination Act, and Bankhead-Jones Forest Grasslands.

BLM Revenue Sharing: The BLM shares a portion of receipts generated on public lands with state and local governments, including grazing fee Hough the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California ( $O \& C$ ) grant lands.
USFWS Refuge: These payments share a portion of receipts from National Wildlife Refuges and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located.
$\frac{\text { Federal Mineral Royalies: These payments are distributed to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may }}{\text { Share at their discretion: }}$ Federal Fiscal Year: FY refers to the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1 and ends September 30

Why is it important?
State and local govermment cannot tax federally owned lands the way they would if the land were privately owned. A number of federal programs exist to compensate county governments for the erresence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significiant portion of
local goverment revenue in rural counties with large federal land holdings.

Before 1976, all federal payments were linked directly to receipts generated on public lands. Congress funded PILT with appropriations begining in 1977 in recognition of the volatility and Inadequacy of ederara revenue sharing programs. PILT was intended to stabilize and crease federal land payments to county govermments. More recently, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of
2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several maior concern around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment level, and the incentives provided to counties by linking federal land payments directly to extractive uses of public lands.
PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Despite the increased appropiations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget concern are creating uncertainty for the future of both.
Methods
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported du
Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively insignificant at the federal level (data gaps on local distributions of
USFWS Refuge revenue sharing is less than one percent of total federal land payments in FFY 2009) but may be important to specific loca governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royalties represent a more significant omission in states that share a portion governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineal royaties represent a more significant omission in states thas
royalties with local governments. Federal mineral royalties made up $68 \%$ of federal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.
Gorte, Ross W., M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importat
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socieeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports a headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdti ${ }^{(1)}$
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2007. U. Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## - *



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widllife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources
tww.headwaterseconomics.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page lecce

Why is it important?
A variety of state and local governments receive federal land payments, and the way these payments are distributed explains who benefits. For example. PLLT is directed to county government only while USFS payments are shared between county government and schools. II USSS
payments decine, payments decine, the PILT tormula ensures that county govermment payments will increase, but school distsicts will not share in the increased
PITT payments. While PILT and SRS have decoupled Iocal government payments fom commercial activities on public lands, all the federal
land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenul shaing payments) are still liked directly to how land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenue sharing payments) are still inked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legistators and govemors have a different set of expectations and incentives to lobby for particular outcomes on public lands than do county commissioners or school officials.

## Methods

State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) federal mineral royaties and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent istributions to local government according to state and federal statute (see note about data limitations). county Government Distributions: Consist of (1) PILT; (2) portions of Forest Serice payments including Secure Rural Schools and
Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Titte l and Title III, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands ; (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discretionary state government distributions of federal mineral royatities where these data are available. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Titte I, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distributions: Consist of SRS Titte II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on pub
land projects on the national forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and
 interests and areas of expertise, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national forest personnel.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Crazing District Distributions: Consist t f BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR. and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). -

Additionauiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT

Gorte, Ross W., M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanenty Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of (jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at

Data Sources
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Sevice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S.


This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distributed to the state
school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Government by Permitted Use, FY 2013 ( 2013 \$s)


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
to county governments (federal land payment distributed to the state, school districts. grazing districts, and RACs are excludeded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Why is it important?
County goverments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For ay for law enforcement mandtain county roads used by logging truck and recreational traftic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must the Forest Senvice, are specifically tarcyeted to help pay for these costs.

Methods
$\frac{\text { Unrestricted: Consist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Widlifife Service Reftuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral }}{\text { royalties from the state government. }}$
Restricted-County Roads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Title I, (2) Forest Service $25 \%$
Fund, (3) Forest Service Owl payments (between 1993 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law) mandates payments be insd for county roads and public schools. Each state determines how to split tunds between the two services.
Restricted--Special County Projects: Consist of $(1)$ SRS Titte Ill funds that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, suct astion plans.
protect

Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royalies and some BLM payments, and these data may not be vailable

Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee,
Washing Washington, D.C. by Research Un
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. ish and Widalie Service, washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic


## TTis page comporases fededal land payments as a propoprion of otatal general county government revenues, based on local government financial data e neereded direetly into the table by the user.

$\frac{\text { Instructions: Use the Interactive Table below to input data (enter data only in the shaded cells). Data entered will automatically }}{\text { update the table and figures below. See the instuctions in the Sudy }}$ ( Guide for help on where to to find count data.


## Study Guide and Supplemental Information 

## What do we measure on this page?

anotion of total general counny government revenues, based on local government financial
is it important?
 Instructions
 Financial Statemente
figures on this page
 these to the state. Audited anvual financial statements are the best source for Iocal financial data because they report st
general county goverment
 are not standardized across local goverments and some work may be required to understand the accounting basis tor these reports.
 worksheet. To unhide worksheets, I IGhtictick on on any yorksheet tab and click unhide.
Update Text in Tables, Figures, and Bulles: Table and figure headings and bullets that describe the reporing period and geographies covered must te updated to teflect the year of data enterecd, and the geographies covered.

Additional Resources
Honade H1 y you have que
570.5626 .

## Data Sources






－

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes（PILT）． |  |  |  |
| PILT Eligible Acres by Agency，FY 2013 |  |  |  |
|  |  | County，Az | U．S． |
| Total Eligible Acres |  | 2，441，551 | 605，353，942 |
| BLM |  | 1，749，122 | 241，711，116 |
| Forest Service |  | 657，723 | 189，274，098 |
| Bureau of Reclamation |  | 32，217 | 4，030，856 |
| National Park Service |  | 11 | 76，781，845 |
| Military |  | 0 | 328，157 |
| Army Corps of Engineers |  | 2，478 | 7，969，080 |
| U．S．Fish and Wildilife Serice |  | 0 | 85，235，272 |
| Other Eligible Acres |  | 0 | 23，518 |
| PLLT Payment（2013 \＄s） |  | 2，781，842 | 397，256，089 |
| Avg．Per－Acre Payment（2013 Ss） |  | 1.14 | 0.66 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| BLM |  | 71．6\％ | 39．9\％ |
| Forest Service |  | 26．9\％ | 31．3\％ |
| Bureau of Reclamation |  | 1．3\％ | 0．7\％ |
| National Park Service |  | 0．0\％ | 12．7\％ |
| Military |  | 0．0\％ | 0．1\％ |
| Army Corps of Engineers |  | 0．1\％ | 1．3\％ |
| U．S．Fish and Wildilife Service |  | 0．0\％ | 14．1\％ |
| Other Eligible Acres |  | 0．0\％ | 0．0\％ |
| －From FY 1986 to FY 2013，PILT payments grew from $\$ 1,886,634$ to $\$ 2,781,842$ ，increased of 47 percent． | Payments in Lieu of Taxes（PILT）per FY，Maricopa County Az |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 3.5 \\ & \$ 3.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | \＄2．5 |  |  |
|  | \＄2．0 |  |  |
|  | \＄1．5 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1.0 \\ & \$ 0.5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 斎鲄 | 嵓 亳 તี |
| －In FY 2013，Maricopa County，AZ had the highest average per－acre PILT payment（\＄1．14），and the U．S． had the lowest（\＄0．66）． | Avg．Per－Acre Payment（2013 \＄s） \＄1．14 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \＄1．00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathscr{H}^{\$ 0.80}$ |  | \＄0．66 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | \＄0．20 |  |  |
|  | \＄0．00 |  |  |
|  |  | Maricopa County，Az | U．S |
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What do we measure on this page？
This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes（PILT）
Congress authorized PILT in 1976 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing payment programs to compens sharing payments by paying counties based ther borders（Public Law 94－565）．PILT increases and stabilizes county government revenue and is subject to a population cap．
A ow average per－acre PILT payment may indicate significant revenue sharing payments from the previous year or that the county＇s population
As below the population cap that limits the base per acre payment．
PILT is permanently authorized，but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis．PILT was typically not fully funded until FY 2008
when counties received a guarantee of five years at tull payment amounts（FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments）．

Why is it important？
As county payments became more important to local government atter wwil（largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post－wa
housing and economic growth），volatility became an issue．PllT increased and stablized payments by housing and economic growin），Volatitity became an issue．PILT increased and stabilized payments by tunding counties from congressional local government services，but can be used at the discretion of county commissioners to fund any local government needs．

Additional Resources
．Departnent o the Interior maintains an online searchable database of PILT payments and eligible PILT acres by county and state total．Data are available back to FY 1999 at：doi．gov／nbc／index．cfm ${ }^{(4)}$

Schuster，Envin G．1995．PILT－Its Purpose and Performance．Journal of Forestry．93（8）：31－35
Corn，M．Lynne．2008．PILT（Payments in Lieu of Taxes）：Somewhat Simplified．Congressional Research Service Report RL31392．

Data Sources
．

## *****


This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell Determination Act (SRS), 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Forest Service Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


[^6]
## Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act
URS. Forest Service 25 Percent Fund: The $25 \%$ Fund, established in 1908 , shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on publict land with the ecounty where the activities take place. Twenty-five percent of the value of public land receipts are distributed directly to counties and must be used to fund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local sevices.
The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS), or Public Law 106-393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to $\frac{\text { The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of } 2000 \text { ( (SRS), or Public Law } 106 \text {--393: SRS was enacted in FY } 2001 \text { to }}{\text { provide } 5 \text { years of transitional assistance to rural counties affected by the decline in revenue from timber havests on federal lands. SRS was }}$ reauthorized for a single year in 2007 , and again in 2008 for a period of four years. The SRS Act has three titles that allocate payments for specific purposes.
-Title I- these payments to counties make up 80 to 85 percent of the total SRS payments and must be dedicated to funding roads and

-Titte II - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal

- Titte III - these payments may be used to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program, to reimburse the county for search
and rescue and other emergency services, and to develop community wildfire protection plans.
$\frac{\text { What is the Relationship Between the } 25 \% \text { Fund and SRS? Counties elect to receive Secure Rural Schools Payments, or to continue with } 25 \%}{\text { Fund payments. Most counties have elected to receive Secure Rural Schools payments. Some counties, particularly in the East, continue to }}$ prefer $25 \%$ Fund payments to Secure Rural Schools. .
Forest Grasslands: Forest Grasslands are lands acquired by the Forest Service through the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (P.L. 75 . 210). The Act authorized acquisition of damaged lands to rehabilitate and use them for various purposes. Receipts from activities on Forest
Grasslands are shared directly with county governments. Grasslands are shared directly with county governments

Special Acts: These include Payments to Minnesota (Act of June 22, 1948,16 U.S.C. 577 g), payments associated with the Quinault Specia
Management Area in Washington (P.L. $100-638,102$ Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quartz from the Ouachita National Forest in Management Area in Washington (P.L. 100-638, 102 Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quartz trom the Ouachita National Forest in
Arkansas (\$423, Interior Appropiations Act tor FY1989; P.L. 100-446, 102 Stat. 1774). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment 75\% of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receipts from the Quinault Special Management Area with both the Quinault Indian Tribe and with the State of
Washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quartz from the Ouachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (rat han being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkansas counties with Ouachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

Why is it important?
USFS revenue sharing is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royaties are distributed to
states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important atter wwill when tiates). For some countiest provides a significant portion titat local government reverue. Paymenis became

As the timber economy shitted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it
Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owl" transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owl" transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of
transition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS act. SRS changed USFS revenue shaing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decou ransition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS act. SRS changed USFS revenue sharing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decoupled
county payments from National Forest receipts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewardship through Titte ll funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment equity concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Titte I formula is adjusted using each county's per capita personal income).

SRS transition payments are only authorized through FY 2011, at which point Congress must decide to extend and/or reform SRS, or allow it exxire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the $25 \%$ Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on
public land.
Additional Resources
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act payments available at: fs. usdagoov/pts/s ${ }^{(5)}$
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties, Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.
Data Sources
. .S. Departent of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at
U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Fo
www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

## ****

*     * 

This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived from a variety of revenue-generating activities on BLM land, including revenue from the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.

BLM Payments to States and Local Governments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Maricopa County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total BLM Payments (\$) | 216,567 | 66,579,030 |
| Proceeds of Sales | 175,051 | 9,841,676 |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0 | 53,150 |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 41,515 | 12,684,340 |
| State Payments | 0 | 3,922,509 |
| National Grasslands | 0 | 447,217 |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0 | 39,630,138 |
| Titte I | 0 | 33,685,617 |
| Titte II | 0 | 3,343,873 |
| Title III | 0 | 2,600,648 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Proceeds of Sales | 80.8\% | 14.8\% |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 19.2\% | 19.1\% |
| State Payments | 0.0\% | 5.9\% |
| National Grasslands | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0.0\% | 59.5\% |
| Titte I | 0.0\% | 50.6\% |
| Titte II | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Titte III | 0.0\% | 3.9\% |



Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived tor and anding activities on BLM land, including revenue trom the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.
Mineral Leasing Act: These include Oil and Gas Rase of land and materials.
not includeasing Act: These include Oil and Gas Right of Way lease revenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do
not payments see worksheet 10 .
$\frac{\text { Taylor Grazing Act : The Taylor Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, established grazing allotments on public land and extended tenure to district }}{\text { grazers. In } 1936 \text { the Grazing Service (BL) }}$ restricted to use for range improvements (e.g enacted fees to be shared with the county where allotments and leases are located. Funds are Setion 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concems greazaing control, noxious weed programs) in cooperation with BLM or livestock organizations. - Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns issuing grazing leases on public lands outside the original grazing district established under the
$\frac{\text { National Grasslands: Revenue derived from the management of National Grasslands under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act ( } 7 \text { U.s.C. }}{\text { 1012), and Executive Order } 10787 \text {, November } 6,1958 \text {. }}$

Oregon and Califormia Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (O\&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road
(CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. Amounts include Titte I Title ll, and Titt payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report tor definitions and information on the Secwre Pura schools and $\tau$ Community Self-Determination Act).
Why is it important?
The BLM is the nation's largest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adiacent communities. Simiarly, the non-taxable status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide sevices to county residents, and provide
public satety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in lieu of property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT).
Methods
BLM data on this page are from BLM FRD 196 and FRD 198 reports. The FRD 196 reports receipts by county and state of origin while the
FRD 198 reports actual distribution amounts to state and local governments. used. To rarive at iststribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table 3 -31 of of BLM Public Land Stataistics) was sed. Some error is ikely. In addition, some data are obtained directly from states. Distribution statistics obtained from the state or local government are realed to the previous FY
state and local govermment in FY 2009.)
Additional Resources
BLM Public Land Staticics are available at the Annual Reports and Puic Land Statistics website:
blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct_Links_to_Publications/ann_rpt_and_pls.htmil ${ }^{(6)}$.

Data Source
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available a

## O\&C and CBWR land grants <br> - Taylor Grazing Act <br> ENational Grassland <br> - Mineral Leasing Act

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of La
methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. orgleps-hdt

## * *

This page describes U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge revenue sharing.

USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  |  |  | Maicopa County, AZ |  | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USFWS Reftuge Revenue Share |  |  | 0 |  | ,936,122 |
|  |  | USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing per FY, Maricopa County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\left.\begin{array}{l} \$ 0.0 \\ \$ 0.0 \end{array}\right]$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | สี |
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## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes U.S. Fish and Widlilife Service Refuge revenue sharing.
Twenty-five percent of the net receipts collected from the sale of various products or privileges from Refuge lands, or three-quarters of one percent $(0.75 \%)$ of the adjusted purchase price of Refuge land, whichever is greater, is shared with the counties in which the Refige is located.

Why is it important?
National Wildifife Refuges and other lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wiillife Service do not pay property taxes to local governments.
The Refuge revenue sharing program is intended to compensate counties tor non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing programs, these payments can be importanted to compensate counties for non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing 1
 create incentives for local government officials to lobby for particular uses of public land.

## Methods

Data Limitations: The USFWS publishes a database of Refige revenue sharing payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007 only, and does not make ata available for other years for the nation. Data on Refuge revenue sharing may be obtained directly from the receiving county government. County govemments may request county-specific Retuge revenue sharing payment data from U.S. Fish and Wildilife Services, Division .

Significance of Data Limitations: Data limitations are relatively insignificant on the national scale (USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments别

Additional Resources
A detailed description of USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments is available on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Realty website at fws.gov/refigess/realty/ris.htm ${ }^{(6)}$.

The Refuge Revenue Sharing Database is avaiabble at: fws.gov/refugessreaty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing_Search_2007.cfm. The database currenty only includes payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007. The agency does not provide data for the nation for additional years.
Data Sources
S. Depar of iterior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widdife Service, Washington, D.C.

## 

## 

This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments.
Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Sources US. Deparment of interior 2012 Office of Natural Resources Revenue Washington D.C

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geograaphies, and trends tor
This page
the region.
Royalties, rents, and bonus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49\%\% of revenue is returned to from offshore drilling the Gulf of Mexico (GOMESA) are shared directly with county governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of federal mineral royaties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or economically impacte by mineral development tor planning construction/maintenance of publicictacilities, and provision of public senvices)

Royalties: Royalty payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royaty may be an established Rovaties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or poyaly rate increases by steps as the average production on the lease increases. A sliding-scale royalty rate is based on on average prop-suctien and applies to all production from the elease. A royaty is due when production begins. Seothermal: Geothermal payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. OMESA: The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (GOMESA) makes distributions of offshore federal mineral royalties to coastal states and communities. The tour s.
Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Rents: A rent schedule is established at the time a lease is issued. Rents are annual payments, normally a fixed dollar amount per acre required to preserve the right to a lease.
Bonuses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Bonuses represent the cash amount successsully bid to win the rights to a lease.
Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royalty, rent, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalies, settlement payments.
Why is it important?
Mineral royaties are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significant demands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royalty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designe

Methods
Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaly distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal
 origin and state govemment distributions to local governments are not published by ONRR, EPS-HDT users must contact each stated directly hese data. Headwaters Economics includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in http://headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content uploads/EPS-HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdif

Additional Resources
Headwaters Economics provides a methods document specific to the EPS-HDT Federal Lands Payments report that includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Governmen Resources document headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS
HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdff ${ }^{10)}$
For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available a
onrr.gov/Stats/pdtfocs/glossary.pdfili).
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

8 \＆
The EPS－HDT Government report uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：

## －U．S．Census of Governments

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce
www．census．gov／govs
Tel．800－242－2184
－U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service
Realty Division，U．S．Department of Interior
www．fws．gov
Tel．703－358－1713

## －U．S．Bureau of Land Management

U．S．Department of Interior
www．blm．gov
Tel．202－208－3801

## －U．S．Forest Service

U．S．Department of Agriculture
www．fs．fed．us
Tel．800－832－1355
－U．S．Office of Natural Resources Revenue
U．S．Department of Interior
www．onrr．gov
Tel．303－231－3078

## ＊来的卫粦

EPS－HDT core approaches
EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－county regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## Adjusting dollar figures for inflation

Because a dollar in the past was worth more than a dollar today，data reported in current dollar terms should be adjusted for inflation．The U．S．Department of Commerce reports personal income figures in terms of current dollars．All income data in EPS－HDT are adjusted to real（or constant）dollars using the Consumer Price Index．Figures are adjusted to the latest date for which the annual Consumer Price Index is available．

## 

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
www.census.gov/govs/
www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
www.fs.usda.gov/pts/
www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct Links to Publications/ann rpt and pls.html
www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing Search 2007.cfm
10 headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT Federal Land Payments Documentation 1-30-2011.pdf
www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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Note to Users:
Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV $>40 \%$.

[^7]

| Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| Population (2013*) | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
| Population (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Population Change (2000-2013*) | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
| Population Percent Change (2000-2013*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |




This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age
Median Age: The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e, half the people are younger than this age and
half are older.

Age \& Gender Distribution, 2013*

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 379,128 | 311,536,594 |
| Under 5 years | 27,993 | 20,052,112 |
| 5 to 9 years | 28,978 | 20,409,060 |
| 10 to 14 years | 26,506 | 20,672,609 |
| 15 to 19 years | 24,000 | 21,715,074 |
| 20 to 24 years | 21,531 | 22,099,887 |
| 25 to 29 years | 25,251 | 21,243,365 |
| 30 to 34 years | 28,217 | 20,467,912 |
| 35 to 39 years | 26,543 | 19,876,161 |
| 40 to 44 years | 24,542 | 20,998,001 |
| 45 to 49 years | 22,307 | 22,109,946 |
| 50 to 54 years | 22,145 | 22,396,322 |
| 55 to 59 years | 21,740 | 20,165,892 |
| 60 to 64 years | 22,103 | 17,479,211 |
| 65 to 69 years | 20,637 | 13,189,508 |
| 70 to 74 years | 16,006 | 9,767,522 |
| 75 to 79 years | 9,912 | 7,438,750 |
| 80 to 84 years | 6,074 | 5,781,697 |
| 85 years and over | 4,643 | 5,673,565 |
| Total Female | 180,898 | 158,289,182 |
| Total Male | 198,230 | 153,247,412 |
| Change in Median Age, 2000-2013* |  |  |
| Median Age^ ( $2013^{*}$ ) | 36.1 | 37.3 |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 37.1 | 35.3 |
| Median Age \% Change | $\therefore 2.7 \%$ | 5.7\% | -The data in this table are calculat.

$\begin{aligned} & \text { - From } 2000 \text { to the } 2009-2013 \text { period, the } \\ & \text { median age estimate increased the tost in }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { median age estimate increased the most in } \\ & \text { the U.S. (35.3 to } 37.3, \mathrm{a} .77 \% \text { increase) }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { and decreased the most in Pinal county, } \\ & \text { AZ ( } 37.1 \text { to 36.1. a } \\ & \text { 27\% decrease) }\end{aligned}$


- Median Age^ (2000)
- Median Age^ (2013*)

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S

Age \& Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Under 5 years | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 2.0\% | 0.19 |
| 10 to 14 years | 2.2\% | 0.19 |
| 15 to 19 years | 1.5\% | 0.0\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 3.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 25 to 29 years | 0.9\% | 0.0 |
| 30 to 34 years | 0.6\% | 0.0\% |
| 35 to 39 years | 2.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 40 to 44 years | 2.5\% | 0.19 |
| 45 to 49 years | 0.6\% | . 0 \% |
| 50 to 54 years | 0.9\% | 0.0\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 2.5\% | .1\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 2.7\% |  |
| 65 to 69 years | 2.7\% | 0.1\% |
| 70 to 74 years | 2.9\% | 0.1 |
| 75 to 79 years | 3.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 80 to 84 years | 5.1\% |  |
| 85 years and over | 6.7\% |  |
| Total Female | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Total Male | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age^ (2013*) | 0.3\% |  |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 0.0\% |  |
| Median Age \% Change | 12.2\% |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
and the change in median age.
$\frac{\text { Median Age: }}{\text { older. }}$ The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are

Why is it important?
Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of reitrees, the age distribution may be
skewed towards categories 65 years and older. in counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group $18-29$. In skewed towards categories 65 years and older. In counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group 18-29. in many counties, the largest segment of the population is in the Baby Boomer generation (people born between 1946 and 1964 )
The change in median age is one indicatoo of whether the population has gotten older or younger.
Methods
Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5 -vear estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5 -year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, $2009^{*}$ may be listed as the year, but this is a 5 -year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of all people
regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and entorcement of environmental laws, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej

An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliancelejeresources(policylei_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pdf ${ }^{(1)}$. The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at stateotheusa.org ${ }^{\text {(5) }}$

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: ers.usda.gov/topics/ural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx ${ }^{(6)}$. William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools a al
and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org (2)
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Sen
aoa.gov/aoarootlaging_statisticsindex.aspx ${ }^{(\theta)}$
The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas This information is available at: htp://www.census.gov/popest ${ }^{(9)}$.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: countyhealthrankings.org/ ${ }^{(0)]}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

-     * 

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups. |  |  |
| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013* |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2013* |
| Total Population | 179,727 | 379,128 |
| Under 18 | 45,081 | 97,938 |
| 18-34 | 39,312 | 84,538 |
| 35-44 | 25,384 | 51,085 |
| 45-64 | 40,779 | 88,295 |
| 65 and over | 29,171 | 57,272 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Under 18 | 25.1\% | 25.8\% |
| 18-34 | 21.9\% | 22.3\% |
| 35-44 | 14.1\% | 13.5\% |
| 45-64 | 22.7\% | 23.3\% |
| 65 and over | 16.2\% | 15.1\% | The data in this ta

during this period.


Sata Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of
Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems support Division, Washington, D.C.

| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 2000 | $2009+$ |
| Under 18 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $18-34$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | $00 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| 65 and over | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Under 18 | 2000 | $2009+$ |
| $18-34$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 3544 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $00 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 65 and over | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into
Why is it important?
For public land managers, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups has a large retired population, or soon-to -be-retired population, for example, the needs and interests of the public may place different demands on public land managers than a geoography with a large number of minors or or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation (those born between 1946 and 1964). As this generation enters retirement age, their mobility, spending patterms, and consumer demands (for health care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develop economically. An aging population can also affect changing emands on land use (e.g., recreation).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceeded with (wo dols) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helptul wideo on population pyramids at:
m.org/JournaisistWebcasts/2009/distilleddemographics 1.aspx ${ }^{(11)}$

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will
C
The Census maintains a useful web site with data, aricicles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: census.gov/population/age/ ${ }^{[22]}$.
The Next Four Decades: Oider Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25 1138.pdf ${ }^{[12]}$

Cromarie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and Its Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29. Washington, DC. ers.usda.gov/publications/er-economic-research-reportler79.aspx ${ }^{\left({ }^{(2)}\right)}$

Frey, W.H. 2006. Americas Regiona Demographics in the '00 Decade: The Role of Seniors, Boomers and New Minorities. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Frey, W. H. 2007. Mapping the Growth of OIder America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21 st Century. Brookings Census 2000 Series.
Washington.D. Brookings instiution Merropolitan Poolicy Program Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program
Jacobsen, L. A. a, and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." Population Buletin 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C.. , Lerce
S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030."
census.gov/poppulation/www/projections/projectionsagesexhtml ${ }^{(25)}$. Retrieved September 1, 2010.

## Data Sources

4.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce

2000 . Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washingtion, D.C.



|  | Pinal County, AZ | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or Atrican American alone | 2\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Other Pacific Is. alone | 7\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 5\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 8\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or Atrican American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 4\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific Is. alone | 14\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 6\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 8\% | 0\% |
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term
"Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers }}{\text { race and }}$ Etthnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not tispanic or Latino. The
race and Hispanic origin to be mo segarate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latios may be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the speciif }}{\text { Hispanic }}$ Hispanic cr Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they
are "other are other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." "rigin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of
any race. any race.
Why is it important?
Hispanics are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the
U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the poph
2050. Between 2000 and 2010 , Hispanics accounted for over one-half of the nation's population grownh.

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of the
Hispanic community in an area can be an important consideration for public land managers working to meet the needs of the public or evaluating potentially adverse impacts on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e
promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and envirommental riskss" and "Data on ethnic grous al promoting equal employment opporumities; assessing racial disparities in heald and environmental isks)" and "Data on ethnic groups are
important tor putting into effecta number of federal stautes (ie enforcing biingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act monitoring and important for putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e., enforring bilingual eleccion rules under the Voting Rights $A$ Act, monitoring and
enforcing equal employment opportunities under Lhe Civil Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local goverments to run programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identitifing segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Heath Act evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Communit Reinvestment Acl)."

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geogranhic

## Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classiication of Federal data on race and ethnicity
(1997) see (1997), see: whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards ${ }^{(10)}$

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at. census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-1.pdff ${ }^{(17)}$.
Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factinder2.census.gov/faces/navisis/pages/index.xhtm| ${ }^{\text {(1B) }}$
Additional information on the U.S. Hispanic population from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at:
census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.ppff ${ }^{20}$ ).
For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land mana
subject, see: icbemp.gov/sciencelhansistichard 10pg. pf ${ }^{(21)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

## Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 6\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 51\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 9\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 1\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 4\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 49\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 8\% | 0\% |





Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
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What do we measure on this page?
That do we measure on this page?
This page describes in genear terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination
with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribe
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behali of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes
or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackreet. Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Choctaw, Colvill , Comanche cree,
 Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Siouxx, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

Alaska Native: This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska
Native race and ettnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: }}{\text { Census questionnaire or crategory includes respondents whe generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native, " or tribal entries not elsewhere classified. }}$
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and
historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helptut to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Forest Service office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-ribal relations. See: fs.fed.us/spfftribalrelations $/$ index.shtmi ${ }^{24}$
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.s. |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Native American | 2\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 2\% | 0\% |
| Apache | 33\% | 2\% |
| Blackeet | na | 3\% |
| Cherokee | 59\% | 1\% |
| Cheyenne | na | 6\% |
| Chickasaw | 93\% | 3\% |
| Chippewa | 53\% | 1\% |
| Choctaw | 70\% | 1\% |
| Colville | 103\% | 5\% |
| Comanche | 70\% | 6\% |
| Cree | na | 11\% |
| Creek | 71\% | 2\% |
| Crow | na | 5\% |
| Delaware | na | 7\% |
| Houma | na | 6\% |
| Iroquois | 85\% | 2\% |
| Kiowa | na | 7\% |
| Lumbee | na | 1\% |
| Menominee | 95\% | 4\% |
| Navaio | 21\% | 1\% |
| Osage | 59\% | 6\% |
| Otawa | na | 7\% |
| Paiute | 81\% | 4\% |
| Pima | 8\% | 4\% |
| Potawatomi | na | 3\% |
| Pueblo | 33\% | 2\% |
| Puget Sound Salish | na | 4\% |
| Seminole | na | 4\% |
| Shoshone | na | 5\% |
| Sioux | 63\% | 1\% |
| Tohono O'Odham | 20\% | 5\% |
| Ute | 137\% | 6\% |
| Yakama | na | 5\% |
| Yaqui | 39\% | 5\% |
| Yuman | 56\% | 6\% |
| All other tribes | 20\% | 1\% |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 58\% | 3\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 43\% | 1\% |
| Alaska Athabaskan | na | 4\% |
| Aleut | na | 5\% |
| Eskimo | 40\% | 1\% |
| Tlingit-Haida | 122\% | 4\% |
| All other tribes | na | 6\% |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | na | 6\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; $\mathrm{Ns}^{\text {c }}$ | 19\% | 1\% |

## Page 7

＋$\square$ ○米雷

## 

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work（occupation）and where they work（by industry）．
Employment by Occupation，2013＊＊

|  | Suny，$A 2$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 133，164 | ${ }^{141,864,697}$ |
|  | 41，269 | ${ }^{51,341,226}$ |
| Serice | 27，458 | 25，45，065 |
| Sales and ofice | 33.429 | ${ }^{34,957,520}$ |
| Framing，fsing，and foresty |  |  |
|  | 152,14 15.14 | － $17.057,570$ |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Management，protessional，\＆erelaed | 31．0\％ | 36．2\％ |
| Senice | 20．6\％ | ${ }^{18.1 \%}$ |
| Samming，fsting，and toresty | ${ }^{51.7 \% \%}$ | 0．7\％ |
| tion，extrac | 10．2\％ | \％ |
| Production，trassorataio，\＆mateial movin | 11．3\％ | 12．0\％ |

 characteisists during tis peitiod．
Employment by Industry， $2013^{*}$

| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | Unny，Az | U． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | （14．864．697 |
|  | c．i．051 |  |
| Constuction | （8．994 | \％8，864，481 <br> $14.867,423$ |
| Wholesale trade | 2，616 | ${ }_{3,937,876}$ |
| Realit trate | 16，216 | 16，415，217 |
| Transporation，waerousing，and utities | ${ }_{6}^{6,286}$ | ${ }^{7,010,0,637}$ |
| Intomation Fnance and insurance，and real estate | 2,787 8.861 2， |  |
| Prot，scientific，mgmt，admin．．\＆waste mgr | ${ }_{111,55}$ | （15．409，7568 |
| Education，heath care，\＆social assistance | 27，077 | 32.871 .216 |
| Ars，eneerain，rec，accamodation， Rood |  | （13，262，892 <br> 7 704302 |
| Other sevices，extept pubicic administration | ¢，${ }_{\text {5，469 }}^{11,95}$ | （7，043，0003 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Agiculure，foesty，fssing \＆hunting，minin | ${ }^{3.8 \%}$ | 1．9\％ |
| Constuction |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{\text {P200\％}}$ | （ex |
| Retail trade | 12．2\％ | 11．6\％ |
| Transporation，waerenosisg，and utilites | 4．7\％ | \％ |
| Intomation | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{2.196}$ | 2\％\％ |
| Erinace and insurance，and realestae | ${ }^{6.79 \%}$ | （e．78\％ |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {ckin }}^{\text {10．8\％}}$ |
| Atrs，eneeratan，ree，accomodation，\＆tood | 9．7\％ | ${ }^{9.3 \% \%}$ |
| Othe senvies．exexept publicicadministraion |  | 年50\％ |

Data Surres．U．S．Departmen t ot commerec．2013．Census Bureau，Ameicican Community Surey ofitice，Wastington，D．C．
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## 

What do we measure on this page？
This page describes what people do tor
Employment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification（SOC）system，where workers are classified into occupations
$\frac{\text { Emplosment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard } O \text { Occupational Classification }}{\text { with similiar job duties，skils，education，andiot training，regardeses of industry．}}$
Employment by industry：Refers to the employment by industry，listed according to the North American Industry Classification System
（NAICS）．
Why is it Important？
Employment statistics are usually reported by industy（as with other reports in EPS．HDT）．This is a usetul way to show the relative diversity of
the economy and the degree of dependence on certan sectors．Employment by occupation offers additional intormation that describes what people do for a living and the type of work they do，regardless of the industry．For example，，tmanagememtiont and in protessional occuluations are



Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between
12 and $40 \%$ and 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD（preceded with wo dots）indicates a coefficient of varaition $>40 \%$ ．If data have consistently low accuracy
dditional Resources
The Census Bureau provides a definition of socs：census．govihhes／wwwifiondex／overiew．htmI ${ }^{1255}$
Occupations are also defined by U．S．Bureau of Labor Statistics：bls．gows $\mathbf{g o c}{ }^{(20)}$ ．
The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs，including training and edication neede
earnings，working conditions，and what workers do on the job：bls．gov／ocol／（27）
Data Sources
U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．

| A Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Management，protessiona，\＆related | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Serice | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and dffice | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Farming，fishing，and forestry | 15\％ | 1\％ |
| Construction，extraction，maint，\＆repait | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movin！ | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Management，protessional，\＆related | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Serice | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and office | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Farming，Ifsing，and torestry | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| Constuction，extraction，maint．\＆repair | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movin！ | $4 \%$ | 0\％ |
| Employment by Industry，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 19， 19 | 0\％ |
| Agriculture，frestsy，ffshing \＆hunting，minin | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Constuction | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utilities | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Intormation | 12\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | ${ }^{6 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| Prot，scientific，mgmt，admin．，\＆waste mgr | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，healh care，\＆social assistance | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Ars，entertain．，rec，accomodation，\＆food | ${ }^{5 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| Other senices，except public administration | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Pubic administation | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Agriculture，foresty，fisting \＆hunting，minin | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Construction | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utitities | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Intormation | 12\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Prof．，scientific，mgmt，admin．，\＆waste mgr | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，heath care，\＆socia assistance | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Ats，entertain，rec．，accomodation，\＆food | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Other serices，except public administraion | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Public administration | 4\％ | 0\％ |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> 

What do we measure on this page?
.
Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irrespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual
worked 10 or 40 hours per week, if they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year".

## Why is it important?

Often, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, translating to ower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture
employment have consistenty been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the U.S. Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Part-time jobs (those that average less
than 35 hoursweek) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to
remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a tull schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to
telecommute and work shorter and more fiexible hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal tourism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960 s. during periods of economic stability, the vast majoity of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, orly about one in seven part-ime workers were involuntary (individuals wanting full-time jobs but working less than 35 hours (week).

To understand the degree to which the data on this page are related to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, To understand the degree to which the dala on this page ar
data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count full time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain falling wages or rates of employment that outpace
population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOL and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40$ report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
a

Additional Resources
Maynard, D. C. \& Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G $06-12$ (501). Available at:
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs
ceo.usc.edu/pdf/(G0612501.pdf ${ }^{(22)}$.

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-ime employment, see: bls.gov/opub/is/pati/opbis 571 .pdf ${ }^{(29)}$.
For information on unemployment, run the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.

Labor Participation Characteristics, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 16 to 64 | 0\% | \% |
| WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: |  |  |
| Worked 50 to 52 weeks | 1\% | 0\% |
| Worked 27 to 49 weeks | 4\% | \% |
| Worked 1 to 26 weeks | 4\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 2\% | 0\% |
| HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: |  |  |
| Worked 35 or more hours per week | 1\% | 0\% |
| Worked 15 to 34 hours per week | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 14 hours per week | 6\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 2\% | 0\% |
| Mean usual hours worked for workers | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: |  |  |
| Worked 50 to 52 weeks | 1\% | 0\% |
| Worked 27 to 49 weeks | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 26 weeks | 4\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 1\% | 0\% |
| HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: |  |  |
| Worked 35 or more hours per week | 1\% | 0\% |
| Worked 15 to 34 hours per week | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 14 hours per week | 6\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 1\% | 0\% |



Commuting Characteristics, 2013*

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over | 130,542 | 139,786,639 |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 64,496 | 101,321,530 |
| Worked outside county of residence | 66,046 | 38,465,109 |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 14,817 | 18,023,639 |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 12,484 | 19,150,654 |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 11,083 | 20,753,054 |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 12,502 | 19,796,414 |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 6,493 | 8,189,640 |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 17,894 | 18,220,851 |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 5,252 | 3,673,571 |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 8.190 | 4,920,004 |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 20,159 | 10,154,523 |
| 60 or more minutes | 14,173 | 10,857,904 |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 31 | 26 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 49.4\% | 72.5\% |
| Worked outside countv of residence | 50.6\% | 27.5\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 11.4\% | 12.9\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 9.6\% | 13.7\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 8.5\% | 14.8\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 9.6\% | 14.2\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 5.0\% | 5.9\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 13.7\% | 13.0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 4.0\% | 2.6\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 6.3\% | 3.5\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 15.4\% | 7.3\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 10.9\% | 7.8\% |
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## * * What do we measure on this page? <br> What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers who do not work

Place of Work: The values reported under "place of work" describe the number of workers that tive in the selected geographic area who worked
either in or outside the county they live in. If the selected geography is not a county, the workers may or may not work within the selected either in or outside the country they live in. If the selected geography is nota county, the workers may or may not wortwinin
geography. For example, for the city of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worked in county of residence" describes the number of city of Phoenix residents that worked in Maricopa County (but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix).

## Why is it important?

High rates of out-commuting are more common in non-metro areas, and in parts of the U.S. where communities are closer together.
Economic development is sometimes affected by commuting in unanticicipated ways: strategies aimed at increasing jobs in a community will not
necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not alwayss require bringing jobs into that
community. community.
High out-commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for sevices, complicating fiscal planning for local governments.
"Bedroom communities," those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggele to provide sccial senvicies housing and water and sewer
Bacilities without an adequate source of revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This
can result trom unaffordable housing
can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient tof variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variaition $>40 \%$. If data have consistentyly low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (precededed with two dotss) indicates a cooefficient tof variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report a a a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development


## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

| of Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U.S. |
| Workers 16 years and over | 1\% | 0\% |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 2\% | \%\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 2\% | \% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 2\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 2\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 2\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 5\% | \% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 5\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 9\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 6\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 4\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 4\% | 0\% |



[^8]

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the povery line．
Poverty：Following the Office of Management and Budget＇s Directive 14，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by
family size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty lamily size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a family or an unrelated in
threshold，then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Poverty，2013＊

|  | Pinal County，Az | U．S． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 353，747 | 303，692，076 |
| Families | 89，831 | 76，744，358 |
| People Below Poverty | 55，245 | 46，663，433 |
| Families below poverry | 9，757 | 8，666，630 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| People Below Poverty | 15．6\％ | 15．4\％ |
| Families below povery | 10．9\％ | 11．3\％ | Theracterisitics during this period．


－Percent below poverty level by age and family type is calculated by dividing the number of people by demographic in poverty by the
total population of that demographic． total population of that demographic

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．
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## 

```
What do we measure on this page？
This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line．
Family：A group of two or more people who reside together and who are related by birth，marriage，or adoption．
Poverty：Following the office of Management and Budgets Directive 14 ，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor．It he total income for a amily or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold，
then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Why is it important？
Poveryy is an important indicator of economic well－being．For public land managers，understanding the extent of poverty is important for several reasons．First，people with limited income may have different needs，values，and attitudes as they relate to public lands．Second，proposed activies on pubiliands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvanaged could experience ．
Poverty rates are often reported in aggregate，which can hide important differences．The bottom table shows poverty for various types of
individuals and families．This is is indormation（for example，the poverty rate for singe aggregate poverty rates（for example，families below poverty）may hide some important
```


## Methods

```
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation \(<12 \%\) ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and \(40 \%\) ；and RED BOLD（preceded with wo dots）indicates a coefficient of variation \(>40 \%\) ．If data have consistently low accuracey through a report，we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale．
Additional Resources
For more information on rural poverty，see U．S．Department of Agriculture，Economic Research Service，Briefing Room，＂Rural Income，Poverty． and Welfare：High Poverty Counties＂available at：ers．usda．govtropics／rural－economy－population／fural－poverty－well－being．aspx \({ }^{\text {（33）}}\)
The University of Michigan＇s National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States．See： wow．npc．umich．edu／poverty \({ }^{(360}\)
The U．S．Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental Justice as＂the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of al people
regardless of race，color，national origin，or income with respect to the development，implementation，and entorcement of environmental laws， regulations，and policies．＂Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at．epa．gov／compliance／ej \({ }^{\text {（4）．}}\) ．
```


## Data Sources

```
U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey office，Washington，D．C．
```

Poverty，Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County，Az | U．S． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family Type，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal Countr，Az | U．S． |
| People | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| Under 18 years | 4\％ | 0\％ |
| 65 years and older | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Families with related children＜ 18 years | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Married couple families | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 13\％ | 1\％ |
| Female householder，no husband present | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 8\％ | 0\％ |


|  |  | 口䄻 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * * Wwaraw |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty. |  |  |
| Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. |  |  |
| Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity^, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population (all races) in Poverty | 55,245 | 46,663,433 |
| White alone | 38,331 | 28,254,647 |
| Black or African American alone | 2.804 | 10,165,935 |
| American Indian alone | 8,608 | 701,439 |
| Asian alone | '624 | 1,872,394 |
| Native Hawaian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 199 | 99,943 |
| Some other race | 3,218 | 3,872,191 |
| Two or more races | 1.461 | 1,696,884 |
| All Ethnicities in Poverty |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 20,714 | 12,507,866 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 34,531 | 34,155,567 |
| Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) |  |  |
| White alone | 69.4\% | 60.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 5.1\% | 21.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 15.6\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 1.1\% | 4.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Some other race | 5.8\% | 8.3\% |
| Two or more races | 2.6\% | 3.6\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 37.5\% | 26.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 62.5\% | 73.2\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or ethnic category by the total population. <br> *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |
| Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty-, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 13.6\% | 12.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 18.5\% | 27.1\% |
| American Indian alone | 46.2\% | 28.6\% |
| Asian alone | 11.4\% | 12.5\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Oceanic alone | 19.5\% | 19.6\% |
| Some other race alone | 15.3\% | 26.8\% |
| Two or more races alone | 14.8\% | 20.1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 21.4\% | 24.7\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 10.3\% | 10.6\% |
| -Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is c race. | ber of people by rac | ation of that |
| Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.s. |
| Total Population (all races) | 4\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 22\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 10\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 34\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is.alone | 72\% | 2\% |
| Some other race | 18\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 17\% | 0\% |
| All Ethnicities |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 6\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 7\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| White alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 22\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 10\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 32\% | \%\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 68\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 18\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 16\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 4\% | 0\% |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 22\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 10\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 40\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 131\% | 18\% |
| Some other race alone | 19\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races alone | 19\% | 1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 7\% | 0\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 6\% | 1\% |


| ＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊DTE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household eamings by source． |  |  |
| Number of Households Receiving Earnings，by Source，2013＊ |  |  |
|  | Pinal County，Az | U．s． |
| Total households： | 123，733 | 115，610，216 |
| Labor earnings | 88,971 | 90，436，935 |
| Social Security（SS） | 43，604 | 33，386，448 |
| Retirement income | 29，362 | 20，504，523 |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 5，045 | 5，716，592 |
| Cash public assistance income | 3，280 | 3，255，213 |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 15，285 | 14，339，330 |
| Percent of Total＾ |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 71．9\％ | 78．2\％ |
| Social Security（SS） | 35．2\％ | 28．9\％ |
| Retirement income | 23．7\％ | 17．7\％ |
| Supplemental Security Income（SSI） | 4．1\％ | 4．9\％ |
| Cash public assistance income | 2．7\％ | 2．8\％ |
| Food Stamp／SNAP | 12．4\％ | 12．4\％ |





Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population 25 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| No high school degree | 2\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 1\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 4\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| No high school degree | 2\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 1\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 4\% | 0\% |
| School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.s. |
| Total Population over 3 years old: | 0\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in school: | 1\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 7\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | 6\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 5\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 11\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Enrolle in school: | 1\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 9\% | 0\% |
| Enroled in kindergarten | 8\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 4\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 8\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 0\% | 0\% |

$\qquad$
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* tovoz*

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes levels of educat antanment
Educational Attainment: This refers to the level of education completed by people 25 years and over in terms of the highest degree or the
highest level of schooling completed
School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private
school or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interview. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business


Why is it important?
Sudies show that geograshies with a higher than average educated worktorce growew faster, have have higher incoumes, and sutfer less during tudies show that geographies with a higher than average educated worktorce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during
conomic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the dififerences in education levels can highilight whether certain people in geographic areas migh
and outreach efforts could be tailored to differentent audiences.
Shool enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age, access to education. and potential for future growh. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

Methods
Data accuracy ys indicated as follows: : LACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates eetween 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-found employment, and unemployment rates, see:
The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.goviemplep_chart_001.htm (41).
U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available
at: census.goviprod/2002pubs/(p23-210.pdf ( 42 ).

Card, David (1999). The Causal Effect of Educ
vol. 3A. New York: Flseverer. po. $1801-63$.
vol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| This page measures the primay language people speak at home. |  |  |  |
| Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a nonEnglish language which is used in addition to English or in place of English. |  |  |  |
| Language Spoken at Home, 2013* |  |  |  |
|  |  | couny, Az |  |
| Population 5 yrs orolder |  | ${ }^{351.135}$ | ${ }_{\text {291,484,482 }}^{231122.908}$ |
| Speak ony Engish Speak a lanuuage other than English |  | $\underset{\substack{274,245 \\ 76.880}}{ }$ |  |
| Speak language onerithan Engish |  |  | 60.3615 .54 <br> $37,45.624$ |
| Oiner Indo.European languages |  | 4.225 | 10,737,607 |
| Asian and Pacticic siand languages |  | ${ }_{4}^{4.187}$ | 9,539,099 |
| Other laguages |  | ¢. 5.017 | 2.262.244 <br> 25148.900 |
| Speak Engisht less than very well |  | 21.756 | 25,148.900 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| Speak ony English |  | ${ }^{78.19 \%}$ | ${ }^{79.3 \%}$ |
| Speak a language other than Engish |  | ${ }^{21.996}$ | ${ }^{20.77 \%}$ |
|  |  | ${ }^{18.12 \%}$ | (12.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Asian and Pacific siand languages |  | ${ }_{1}^{1.4 \% \%}$ |  |
| Speak Enolisth less than ver well' |  | 6.2\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent tof Population that Speaks Engilsh Less Than very well., |  |  |
| - In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that and Pinal County, AZ had the lowest (6.2\%). |  |  | 6\% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{6.2 \%}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & \left.\begin{array}{c} 3 \% \\ 1 \% \\ 1 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array} \right\rvert\, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | ninal Count, Az | u.s. |
|  |  |  |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information **
What do we measure on this page?
This page measures the primary language people speak at home.
Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English
language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.
Why is it important?
For public land managers who are tring to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent to public clands, it its important to know whether
a significant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation a sigiticant portion of that population has trouble s.
may need to be conducted in multipiel languages.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dott) indicates betwe
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If datat have consistenty low accuracy
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots indicates a coefticient of variation $>40 \%$. It data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United
States. This tool is available at or
Data Sources
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County, Az | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 5 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak only English | 1\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 2\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 2\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 33\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 9\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 12\% | 1\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 4\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Speak only English | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 2\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 2\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 35\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 10\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 13\% | 0\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 4\% | 0\% |

大 1 人

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built
Housing Characteristics, 2013*

|  |  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units |  | 160,903 | 132,057,804 |
| Occupied |  | 123,733 | 115,610,216 |
| Vacant |  | 37,170 | 16,447,588 |
| For rent |  | 4,339 | 3,230,123 |
| Rented, not occupied |  | 709 | 599,884 |
| For sale only |  | 5,699 | 1,682,020 |
| Sold, not occupied |  | 11,211 | 608,590 |
| For seasonal, recreational, occasional us |  | 16,870 | 5,122,778 |
| For migrant workers |  | "132 | 34,233 |
| Other vacant |  | 8,210 | 5,169,960 |
| Year Built |  |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later |  | 1,968 | 771,765 |
| Built 2000 to 2004 |  | 86,004 | 19,385,497 |
| Built 1990 to 1999 |  | 25,494 | 18,390,124 |
| Built 1980 to 1989 |  | 17,579 | 18,345,244 |
| Built 1970 to 1979 |  | 13,886 | 21,042,566 |
| Built 1960 to 1969 |  | 6,698 | 14,634,125 |
| Built 1959 or earier |  | 9,274 | 39,488,483 |
| Median year structure built^ |  | 2001 | 1976 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| Occupancy |  |  |  |
| Occupied |  | 76.9\% | 87.5\% |
| Vacant |  | 23.1\% | 12.5\% |
| For rent |  | 2.7\% | 2.4\% |
| Rented, not occupied |  | 0.4\% | 0.5\% |
| For sale only |  | 3.5\% | 1.3\% |
| Sold, not occupied |  | 0.8\% | 0.5\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional |  | 10.5\% | 3.9\% |
| For migrant workers |  | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Other vacant |  | 5.1\% | 3.9\% |
| Year Built |  |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later |  | 1.2\% | 0.6\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 |  | 53.5\% | 14.7\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 |  | 15.8\% | 13.9\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 |  | 10.9\% | 13.9\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 |  | 8.6\% | 15.9\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 |  | 4.2\% | 11.1\% |
| Built 1959 or earier |  | 5.8\% | 29.9\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Median year structure built is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations. <br> * The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. Housing Occupancy, Pinal County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - In the 2009-2013 period, Pinal County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing (23.1\%), and the U.S. had the lowest $(12.5 \%)$. | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ 80 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\%$ | mon |
|  | 60\% |  |  |
|  | 40\% |  |  |
|  | 20\% |  |  |
|  | 0\% | Pinal County, AZ |  |
|  |  |  | u.s. |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
Rent: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and
$\frac{\text { Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied }}{\text { vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview. }}$
$\frac{\text { For Seasonal. Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other }}{\text { Oche }}$
For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

Why is it important?
Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data is used to assess the demand for housing, to identify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing arket over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic
levels.
Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirability of a place for recreation and tourism. This could aso be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990 and early 2000 were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when
housing grew ata a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the erlative growth rates of housing is housing grew ata a ast rate (the alear 1970 , tor example, in some parts or the country. Understanding the realive grownt rates or housing is
relevant for public lands managers in the context of the willdand-urban interface, and as an indicator of overall economic growth. The year the home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast future demand of services, such as energy consumption and fire protection
Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Pinal County, Az | US. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units | 0\% | 0\% |
| Occupied | 1\% | 0\% |
| Vacant | 2\% | 1\% |
| For rent | 8\% | 1\% |
| Rented, not occupied | 23\% | 1\% |
| For sale only | 7\% | 1\% |
| Sold, not occupied | 15\% | 1\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional | 4\% | 0\% |
| For migrant workers | 51\% | 2\% |
| Other vacant | 7\% | 1\% |
| Year Built |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later | 10\% | 0\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 | 1\% | 0\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Built 1959 or earier | 4\% | 0\% |
| Median year structure built | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Occupancy |  |  |
| Occupied | 1\% | 0\% |
| Vacant | 2\% | 1\% |
| For rent | 9\% | 0\% |
| Rented, not occupied | 28\% | 0\% |
| For sale only | 7\% | 0\% |
| Sold, not occupied | 16\% | 0\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional | 5\% | 0\% |
| For migrant workers | 74\% | 0\% |
| Other vacant | 7\% | 2\% |
| Year Built |  |  |
| Buill 2005 or later | 10\% | 0\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 | 1\% | 0\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Built 1959 or earlier | 4\% | 0\% |

*]
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
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## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
$\frac{\text { owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid }}{\text { for. }}$
Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.
Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
$\frac{\text { Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, }}{\text { and condominium fees. }}$

- $x$

Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels

Why is it important?
An inportant indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share
devoted to housing that is below 15 percent is a good proxy for highly affordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

## Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 pe
excessive (or unaffordable) housing costs that exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >40\%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey has additional information on housing and housing affordability. See:

For housing prices, for-profit online real-estate senvices may have the most recent price information. See, for example, zillow.com ${ }^{(45)}$.
For current calculations on housing affordabiility, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordabiity Index, available at:
realtor.org/research/research/housinginx ${ }^{(46)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

- In the $2009-2013$ period, the U.S. had the
highest estimated monthy mortage costs highest estimated monthly mortgage costs
for owner-cocupied homes (\$1,540), and Pinal County, AZ had the lowest ( $\$ 1,332$ ).

In the 2009-2013 period, Pinal County, AZ
had the highest estimated monthly had the highest estimated monthly gross
rent for renter-ocupied homes ( $\$ 966$ ) and rent for renter- occupied homes (\$
the U.S. had the lowest ( $\$ 9044)$.


- Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income edian Monthly Mortgage Costs and Gross Rent, 2013


Median monthy mortgage cost
EMedian gross rent^

## Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage |  |  |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 4.9\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 3.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 2.7\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 9.8\% | 0.3\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 4.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Median monthly mortgage cost^ | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median gross rent^ | 1.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 5.0\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 3.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 9.8\% | 0.6\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 4.5\% | 0.1\% |



This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States.
The term "benchmark" in this report should not be construed as having the same meaning as in the National Forest Management Act.
Race: Race is a selfidentification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. The
Office ot Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the eederal goverment collects and presents data of race and
etthnicity.
Poveryy: Following the Otfice of Management and Budgets Directive 14 , the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by tamily
size and composition to detect who is poor. If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold. size and composition to detect who is poor. 1t the totat income for a tamily or an untelaed individual tals below he eelevant poverty hreshold,
then the tamily or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the povery level."


Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Sec
does not indude Medicare reimbursement.
Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor

y is it important?
This page shows a q it
This page shows acqick comparison of a number of indicators covered in this report to highight where the region is different trom the U.S.
It also offers an at-a-glance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a
geography has an older population, relatively unaftordable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indica
can help public land managers identity groups of people and aspects of hardship that can aid with outreach and consideration of whether the
mpacts of land management actions could have disproportiona ith and adverse imp disalied people or places.

Methods
The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure trom the region by the figure trom the U.S.
Data accuracy is indicated as tolowss: BLACK indicates a coeficicent of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceeded with one dot) indicates between
2 and $40 \%$ : and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variaion $>40 \%$. If data 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy

Nedian Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability

The data in this table are calculated by ACS using ane sers conducted during $2009-2013$ and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- The Pinal County AZ is most dififerent from the U.S. in Population Gromt (\% change, 2000-2013 $)$, Percent Population American Indian of
Alaska Native ( $2013^{*}$ ), and Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Communily Survey office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Region | us |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age (2009*) | 0.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population White Alone (2009*) | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (209*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native | 2.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Population "Baby | 0.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Family Income (2009*) | 1.2\% | 0.1\% |
| Per Capita Income (2009*) | 1.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*) | 3.9\% | 0.4\% |
| Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*) | 5.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Households with Retirement and Social | 1.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income | 3.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High | 2.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's | 2.0\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population That Speak English Less Than | 3.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*) | 4.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 3.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 4.5\% | 0.1\% |

EPS－HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：
－ 2000 Decennial U．S．Census
Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750

## －American Community Survey

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750
The on－line ACS data retrieval tool is available at：
http：／／www．census．gov／acs／www／

## ＊柬縕紫 <br> EPS－HDT core approaches

EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－Regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## About the American Community Survey（ACS）

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1－3，all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey（ACS）of the Census Bureau．

The ACS is a nation－wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic，social，economic，and housing information about communities every year－information that until recently was only available once a decade．The ACS is not the same as the decennial census，which is conducted every ten years（the ACS has replaced the detailed，Census 2000 long－form questionnaire）．

Data used in this report are 5 －year ACS estimates．Moreso than the 1 or 3 －year estimates，the 5 －year estimates are consistently available for small geographies，such as towns．We show 5 －year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross－geography comparisons．The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period，only what the average value is over the full period．

Because ACS is based on a survey，it is subject to error．The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error（MOE）for every data point．In this report，we alert the user to the data accuracy using color－coded text in the tables：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation（CV）＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD （preceded with two dots）indicates a CV $>40 \%$ ．

The CV is a measure of relative error in the estimate，and is calculated directly from the MOE as the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself．To get the standard error，the MOE is divided by 1.645 （for a 90 percent confidence interval）．The CV is expressed as a percentage．For example，if you have an estimate of $60+/-20$ ，the CV for the estimate is 20.3 percent．This estimate should be used with caution，since the sampling error represents more than 20 percent of the estimate．

## 成米日

## 

headwaterseconomics．org／eps－hdt

## 

Throughout this report，references to on－line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses．These resources are provided as hyperlinks here．

```
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej guidance nepa ceq1297.pdf
www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology main/
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej
www.stateoftheusa.org
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
www.frey-demographer.org
www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging statistics/index.aspx
www.census.gov/popest/
www.countyhealthrankings.org/
www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
uww.census.gov/population/age/
www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg 1997standards
www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22 cspan hispanics.pdf
www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard 10pg.pdf
www.bia.gov/index.htm
uww.indians.org/index.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
www.bls.gov/soc/
www.bls.gov/ocol
www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
uww.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009 ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
www.bls.gov/emp/ep chart 001.htm
www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
www.mla.org/map single
www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
www.zillow.com
www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx
```
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Produced by
Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit

## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Land Ownership

What is the breakdown of land ownership? 1
What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 2
What are the different types of federal lands? 3
Land Cover
What is the breakdown of forest, grassland, and other land cover types?
4

Residential Development

What are the trends in residential land-use conversion? ..... 5-6
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 7
Links to Additional Resources ..... 8

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

$=$
$=2$
$=$

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations. |  |  |
| U.S. Forest Service Land Types (Acres), 2009 |  |  |
|  | Pinal County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Area | 3,439,308 | 2,286,279,509 |
| Forest Service Lands | 222,889 | 192,750,310 |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 154,996 | 146,630,207 |
| National Wilderness | 67,893 | 36,155,579 |
| National Monument | 0 | 3,661,327 |
| National Recreation Area | 0 | 2,950,660 |
| National Game Refuge | 0 | 1,198,099 |
| National Wild River | 0 | 568,059 |
| National Recreation River | 0 | 398,207 |
| National Scenic River | 0 | 289,617 |
| National Scenic Area | 0 | 230,459 |
| Primitive Area | 0 | 173,762 |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0 | 167,427 |
| Special Management Area | 0 | 164,707 |
| Protection Area | 0 | 45,051 |
| Recreation Management Area | 0 | 43,900 |
| National Scenic and Widllife Area | 0 | 39,171 |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0 | 12,645 |
| National Botanical Area | 0 | 8,256 |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0 | 6,637 |
| National Historic Area | 0 | 6,540 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Forest Service Lands | 6.5\% | 8.4\% |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 4.5\% | 6.4\% |
| National Widerness | 2.0\% | 1.6\% |
| National Monument | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| National Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Game Refuge | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Wild River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Recreation River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Primitive Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Special Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Protection Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Recreation Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Widldife Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Botanical Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Historic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Reftuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida,Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. |  |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations. Note: All acreages on this page were reported by the U.S. Forest Services' Land Areas Report 2009. The total acreage of Forest Service land
on this page may differ from that reported on previous page due to differences in values reported by the data sources.

Why is it important?
orest Service lands have special designations scat may maffect service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forent Service lands have special designations

Methods
County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Retuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia
Additional Resources
A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available
at:ts. fed. . us/land/stafflar/2009/larogindex.html ${ }^{(4)}$.
Test Senice Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at. fs fed Us/land/statiflar/definitions of terms $\mathrm{htm}{ }^{(5)}$.
Data Sources
USDA. FS - Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database





8 \&
The EPS-HDT Land-Use report uses national data sources to represent land cover and residential development. In an effort to report more accurate statistics for land ownership, a compilation of state level data was used. All the data in this report were the result of calculations made in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- TIGER/Line County Boundaries 2012

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html

- Developed Areas 2000 and 2010

Theobald, DM. 2013. Land use classes for ICLUS/SERGoM v2013. Unpublished report, Colorado State University.

- Protected Areas Database v 1.32012
U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006

National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm

- USDA, Forest Service

Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html

## 

EPS-HDT core approaches
EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-county regions, to accommodate a flexible range of userdefined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
www.nhd.usgs.gov
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.htm|
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions of terms.htm
headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php
```


## 



Produced by
Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit

## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

www.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Note to Users:

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.

Components of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.;. U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Asthington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of titerior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes all federal land payme
This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
ederal land payments: These are tederal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals).
Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is Sed on a maximum per-acre payment reduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. Forest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools.

BLM Revenue Sharing: The BLM shares a portion of receipts generated on public lands with state and local governments, including grazing fee Hough the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California ( $O \& C$ ) grant lands.
USFWS Refuge: These payments share a portion of receipts from National Wildlife Refuges and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located.
$\frac{\text { Federal Mineral Royalies: These payments are distributed to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may }}{\text { Share at their discretion: }}$ Federal Fiscal Year: FY' refers to the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1 and ends September 30 .

Why is it important?
State and local govermment cannot tax federally owned lands the way they would if the land were privately owned. A number of federal programs exist to compensate county governments for the erresence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significiant portion of
local goverment revenue in rural counties with large federal land holdings.

Before 1976, all federal payments were linked directly to receipts generated on public lands. Congress funded PILT with appropriations egining in 197 in recognition of the volatility and Inadequacy of ederara revenue sharing programs. PLT was intended to stabilize and increase federal land payments to county govermments. Morer recently, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of
2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several maior concerns around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment level, and the incentives provided to counties by linking federal land payments directly to extractive uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget concerns are creating uncertainty for the future of both.
Methods
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, Data Limitations: Local government distributions of tederall and payments may be underreported du
Signiticance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively insigniticant at the federal level (data gaps on local distributions of
USFWS Refige revenue sharing is less than one percent of total federal land payments in FFY 2009) but may be important to specific local overnments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royalties represent a more significant omission in states that share a portion governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineal royaties represent a more significant omission in states thas
royalties with local governments. Federal mineral royalties made up $68 \%$ of federal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M
Gorte, Ross W., M. Lymne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Senvice Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic import
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdtt ${ }^{(1)}$
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U. Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## ****
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What do we measure on this page?
This page lecinea

Why is it important?
A variety of state and local governments receive federal land payments, and the way these payments are distributed explains who benefits. For example. PILT is directed to county government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schools. If USFS
payments decline, the PILT formula ensures that county govemment payments will icrease, but school districts will hot share in the increased payments decine, the PILT formula ensures that county govermment payments will increase, but school districts will not share in the increased
PILT payments. While PILT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activties on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenue sharing payments) are still inked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and govemors have a different set of expectations and incentives to lobby for particular outcomes on public lands than do county commissioners or school officials.

Methods
State Govermment Distributions: Consist of: (1) federal mineral royalties and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and federal statute (see note about data limitations). County Government Distributions: Consist ot (1) PILT; ( 2 ) portions of Forest Service payments including Secure Rural Schools and
Community Selt-Determination Act (SRS) Titte I and Title III, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands ; (4) LLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discretionary state government distributions of federal mineral royatities where these data are available. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Titte I, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distributions: Consist of SRS Title II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on pub
land projects on the nationa forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and land projects on the national forest or BLM Tand where the payment oiginated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and
recommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of special projects on federal lands as authorized under the
Seccure Rural interests and areas of expertise, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national forest personnel.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist tof BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). -
Addition Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.

Gorte, Ross W.,. M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Congressional Research Service Report RL30335. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of jobs and income) of these activites, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service,
 Fish and Widlilife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic
Additional sources and methods available at www headwaterseconomics

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liet of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.C. U.S. Department on IIterior. .2009. Bureau of Land. Management,
Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wiidlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart
interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. orgleps-hdt

This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distributed to the state
school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Government by Permitted Use, FY 2013 ( 2013 \$s)
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What do we measure on this page?
to county governments (federal land payment distributed to the state, school districts. grazing districts, and RACs are excludeded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Why is it important?
County goverments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For ay for law enforcement mandtain county roads used by logging truck and recreational traftic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with publi
the Forest Senvice, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

Methods
$\frac{\text { Unrestricted: Consist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Widlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral }}{\text { royaties from the state government. }}$
Resticted-County Roads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Title I, (2) Forest Serice $25 \%$
Fund, (3) Forest Service Owl payments (between 1993 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law mandates payments be used for county roads and public schools. Each state determines how to split tunds between the two services.
Restricted--Special County Projects: Consist of (1) SRS Titte Ill funds that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, suct as frenews
protection plans.

Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royalities and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
availible).

Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee,
Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Washington, D.C. by Research Un
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2007. U. ish and widile Service, washington, D.C.,. U.s. Department of interior. 2012. Offic
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Federal Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Agriculuture. 2009. Forest Sevice Washington, D.C.;. U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.C. U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. OOtifice of Natural Resources
Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. orgleps-hdt
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state government general revenue.
Reporting Period: State and local financial data is from the U.S. Census of Governments, conducted every five years. The latest was for Fiscal
Year (FY) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local govermment during FY 2007. Interactive Table: Census of Govemment county financial statistics are based on a anational survey and may not match local government financial reports. The interactive table on the next page allows the user to input data gathered from primary sources to avoid these data limitations and update data tor the latest year.
$\frac{\text { Taxes: }}{\text { Ill taxes collected by state and local govermments, including property, sales, and income tax. }}$ Intergovernmental Revenue: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including
Intergovernmental Revenue: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including federal education, health care, and Total Charges: Charges imposed for providing current services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges Total Charces: Charges imposed tor providing current services, including social sevices,
All Other (Miscellaneous): All other general government revenue from their own sources.
Why is it important?
County payments are an important component of local government fiscal health for a handful of rural counties with a large share of land in
federal ownership. For counties with fewer public lands and larger economies, federal land payments are a small piece of a much broader federal ownership. For counties with fewer public lands and larger economies, federal land payments are a small piece of a much broader
revenue stream. Counties most dependent on federal land payments are affected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For the counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difificult.
Methods
Reporting Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July 1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the
 during the following FY. For example, Forest Sevice payyments authorized and appropriated for FY 2007 are delivered to counties in January of
20008 , during the Census of Government FY 2000 . To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2006 are compared to local govemment revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations
from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these from USFWS, ONRR, and

Census of Governments Data Limitations: (1) county financial statistics may not match local government financial reports for three main reasons: (a) The Census of Government defines the general country government as the aggregation of the parcent (counts) government and all
agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and quasi-governmental entities). This may differ from the way local
 reporting period used by local governments (for example, some counties use a calendar year for reporting purposes); and (c) survey methods
introduce error; (2) the last published edition of the Census of Governments was FY 2007, before the recent increase in payments from SRS and
and PILT: and ( () f) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other sources
of
Additional Resources
U.S. Census Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census.gov/govs/estimatel $l^{(2)}$.

For a detailed description of Census of Governments survey methods, survey year (fiscal year), and deffinitions, see: 2006 Government Finance and Employment Classification Manual at census.gov/govs ${ }^{(3)}$ )
Schuster Enin $G$. and Krista M Genet 2001 Property Tax
Schuster, Enin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May
2001 pp 30-35. Ingles, Bett. 2004. Changing the Funding Structure: An Analysis of the Secure Rural School and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 on National Forest Lands. Environmental Science and Public Policy Research Institute, Boise State University.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Govemments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau. of Land Management. Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Willilife Service, Washington
D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at
and www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt
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## TTis page comporases fededal land payments as a propoprion of otatal general county government revenues, based on local government financial data e neereded direetly into the table by the user.

$\frac{\text { Instructions: Use the Interactive Table below to input data (enter data only in the shaded cells). Data entered will automatically }}{\text { update the table and figures below. See the instuctions in the Sudy }}$ ( Guide for help on where to to find count data.
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## What do we measure on this page?

Proportion of total general county government revenues, based on local government financial
y is it important?
 Instructions
 Financial Statemente
figures on this page
Audied Financial Satements: Most states require county governments 10 complete annual audits of government financial reports and tor report these to the state. Audited anvual financial statements are the best source for Iocal financial data because they report st
general county goverment
 are nos standardizized across local govermments and some work may be required to understand the accounting basis tor these reports. 2. Enter Federal Land Payments Data: Fill in the shaded dells in the interactive Table with federal land payments datat or the year immediately
prior to the year for which you entered goverment t inancial data These datac can be found on page 2 of this report, or in the tidden "calcs" prior to the year tor which you enered government finacial datat These data can b
worksheet. To unhide worksheets. fight cicick on any worksheet tab and dick unhide.
3 Update Tex in Tables, Figures, and Bulles: Table and figure headings and bullets that describe the reporing period and geographies covered must te updated to toffect the year of datai enterecd, and the geographies sovered.

Additional Resources
Honade If y you have que
570.5626 .

## Data Sources




Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014 . Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department
of miterior 2009. Payment




This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)
Congress authorized PILT in 1976 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing payment programs to compens
counties for non-taxable federal lands within their borders (Public Law $94-565$ ). PILT increases and stabilizes county government revenue sharing payments by paying counties based on a per-acre average "base payment" that is red and stabilizes county government revenue and is subject to a population cap.

A low average per--acre PILT payment may indicate significant revenue sharing payments from the previous year or that the county's population
is below the
As below the population cap that limits the base per acre payment.
PILT is permanently authorized, but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis. PILT was typically not fully funded until FY 2008
when counties received a guarantee of five years at tull payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Why is it important?
As county payments became more important to local goverrmment atter wwil (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-wa
housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PIIT increased and stablized payments by appropriations rather than directly trom commodity receipts. PILT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local govermment services, but can be used at the discretion of county commissioners to fund any local government needs.

Additional Resources
he U.S. Department of the Interior maintains an online searchable database of PILT payments and eligible PILT acres by county and state total. Data are available back to FY 1999 at: doi. gov/nbcc/index.ctm ${ }^{(4)}$

Schuster, Evin G. 1995. PILT - Its Purpose and Performance. Journal of Forestry. 93(8):31-35.
Corn, M. Lynne. 2008. PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes): Somewhat Simplified. Congressional Research Service Report RL31392.

Data Sources
S. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PLTT), Washington D.C.

## *****


This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell Determination Act (SRS), 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Forest Service Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture
at www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt
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*     *         * 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act
U.S. Forest Service 25 Percent Fund: The $25 \%$ Fund, established in 1908 , shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on publict and with the country where the activities take place. TTenty-five percent of the value of public land receipts are distributed directly to counties and must be used to fund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local sevices.
The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS), or Public Law 106-393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to $\frac{\text { The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of } 2000 \text { ( (SRS), or Public Law } 106 \text {--393: SRS was enacted in FY } 2001 \text { to }}{\text { provide } 5 \text { years of transitional assistance to rural counties affected by the decline in revenue from timber havests on federal lands. SRS was }}$ reauthorized for a single year in 2007, and again in 2008 for a period of four years. The SRS Act has three titles that allocate payments for specific purposes.

Title I - these payments to counties make up 80 to 85 percent of the total SRS payments and must be dedicated to funding roads and

Titte II - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal latel
(RACs) at the community level help make spending determinations and monitor project progress.

- Title III - these payments may be used to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program, to reimburse the county for search
and rescue and other emergency services, and to develop community wildfire protection plans.
$\frac{\text { What is the Relationship Between the } 25 \% \text { Fund and SRS? Counties elect to receive Secure Rural Schools Payments, or to continue with } 25 \%}{\text { Fund payments. Most counties have elected to receive Secure Rural Schools payments. Some counties, particularly in the East, continue to }}$ prefer $25 \%$ Fund payments to Secure Rural Schols.
Forest Grasslands: Forest Grasslands are lands acquired by the Forest Service through the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (P.L. 75 210). The Act authorized acquisition of damaged lands to rehabilitate and use them for various purposes. Receipts from activities on Forest
Grasslands are shared directly with county governments.

Special Acts: These include Payments to Minnesota (Act of June 22, 1948, 16 U.S.C. 5779 ), payments associated with the Quinault Special
Management Area in Washington (P.L. $100-638,102$ Stat. 3327 ), and receits from the sale of quartz from the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas (\$423, Interior Appropriations Act tor FY1989; P.L. 100-446, 102 Stat. 17744 ). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment ( $75 \%$ of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receiptst from the Quinault Special Management Area with both the Quinault Indian Tribe and with the State of Whan being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkansas counties with Ouachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

Why is it important?
USFS revenue sharing is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royaties are distributed to
states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when ates). For some counties it provides a signicean porion of total local goveris ment reverue. Payments became imber harvests on the National Forests increased sharply in response to post-war housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shitted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "Ow" "transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of
transition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS
county payments sRS changed USFS Revenue sharing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decoupled frough Title II funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment equity concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Titte I formula is adjusted using each county's per capita personal income).

SRS transition payments are only authorized through FY 2011, at which point Congress must decide to extend and/or reform SRS, or allow it expire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the $25 \%$ Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on
public land.
Additional Resources
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act payments available at: fs.usda gov/pts/( ${ }^{(5)}$
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties. Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.
Data Sources
.S. Deparment of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at
U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Fo
ww. headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

## *****


This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived from a variety of revenue-generating activities on BLM land, including revenue from the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.

BLM Payments to States and Local Governments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Pinal Count, Az | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total BLM Payments (\$) | 92,210 | 66,579,030 |
| Proceeds of Sales | 64,478 | 9,841,676 |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0 | 53,150 |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 27,731 | 12,684,340 |
| State Payments | 0 | 3,922,509 |
| National Grasslands | 0 | 447,217 |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0 | 39,630,138 |
| Titte I | 0 | 33,685,617 |
| Titte II | 0 | 3,343,873 |
| Titte III | 0 | 2,600,648 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Proceeds of Sales | 69.9\% | 14.8\% |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 30.1\% | 19.1\% |
| State Payments | 0.0\% | 5.9\% |
| National Grasslands | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0.0\% | 59.5\% |
| Titte I | 0.0\% | 50.6\% |
| Titte II | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Titte III | 0.0\% | 3.9\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes BLM payments to states and local government. Payments are BLM lagd, including revenue trom the sale of land and moterials, grazing, and minerals leasing.
Mineeral Leasing Act: These include Oill and Gas Sile of land and materials. The
$\frac{\text { ner }}{\text { not }}$. payments see worksheet 10 .
Taylor Grazing Act The Taylor Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, established grazing allotments on public land and extended tenure to district restricted to use for range improvements ( ) enacted fees to be shared with the county where allotments and leases are located. Funds are - Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns grazing pentrits nox issued on public lands within grazing districts established under the Act. - Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns issuing grazing leases on public lands outside the original grazing district established under the
$\frac{\text { National Grasslands: Revenue derived from the management of National Grasslands under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act ( } 7 \text { U.S.C. }}{\text { 1012), and Executive Order 10787, November } 6,1958 \text {. }}$

Oregon and Califormia Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (O\&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road
(CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. Amounts include Titte I Title ll, and Titt payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report tor definitions and information on the Secwre Pur schools and $\tau$ Community Self-Determination Act).
Why is it important?
The BLM is the nation's largest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adiacent communities. public satety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in lieu of property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT).
Methods
BLM data on this page are from BLM FRD 196 and FRD 198 reports. The FRD 196 reports receipts by county and state of origin while the
FRD 198 reports actual distribution amounts to state and Ised. To arrive at distribution amounts trom receite and local governments. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 repor used. Some error is is ikely. In addition, some recipts are the Legained Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table e $3-31$ of BLM Public Land Statistics) was govermment are related to the previous FY's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2008 are received and reported by state and local govermment in FY 2009.)
Additional Resources
BLM Public Land Statics and Statistics website:
blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct_Links_to_Publications/ann_rpt_and_pls.htm( ${ }^{(6)}$

Data Source
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau or Management, Washington, D.C.; Additiona sorices and methods avaliable
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau

```
O\&C and CBWR land grants - Taylor Grazing Act
ENational Grassland
- Mineral Leasing Act
```

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of La
methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## * *

This page describes U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge revenue sharing.

USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  |  |  | Pinal Count, Az |  | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USFWS Retuge Revenue Share |  |  | 0 |  | ,122 |
|  |  | USFWS Reftuge Revenue Sharing per FY, Pinal County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 0.0 \\ & \$ 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0- |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes U.S. Fish and Wiidlife
This page describes U.S. Fish and Widlilife Service Refuge revenue sharing.
Twenty-five percent of the net receipts collected from the sale of various products or privileges from Refuge lands, or three-quarters of one percent $(0.75 \%)$ of the adjusted purchase price of Refuge land, whichever is greater, is shared with the counties in which the Refige is located.

Why is it important?
National Wildifife Refuges and other lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wiillife Service do not pay property taxes to local governments.
The Refuge revenue sharing program is intended to compensate counties tor non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing programs, these payments can be important it to compensate counties for non-taxable Reftuge lands. As with other revenue shating 1
 create incentives for local government officials to lobby for particular uses of public land.

## Methods

Data Limitations: The USFWS publishes a database of Refigge revenue sharing payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007 only, and does not make ata available for other years for the nation. Data on Refuge revenue sharing may be obtained directly from the receiving county government. County govemments may request countr-specific Refige revenue sharing payment data from U.S. Fish and Widdifíe Services, Division nancial Management, Denver Operations.
Signififance of Data Limitations: Data limitations are relatively insignificant on the national scale (USFWS Refige revenue sharing payments别

Additional Resources
A detailed description of USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments is available on the U.S. Fish and wildife Service Reaty website at tws.gov/refigess/realty/ris.htm( ${ }^{(0)}$

The Refuge Revenue Sharing Database is available at: fws._govirefuges/reaty/RRS/2007/Revenuesharing_Search_2007.ctm?. The database currenty only includes payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007. The agency does not provide data tor the nation for additional years

Data Sources
S. D. of iterior. 2007 U. . F. Fish and Widdife Service, Washington, D. . .


This page describes components of federal mineral royaty distributions to state and local governments.
Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: US. Denartment of Interior 2012 Office of Natural Resources Revenue Washington D.C

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for
the region.
Royalties, rents, and bonus payments from mining activitie on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49\% of revenue is returned to
states and $51 \%$ is retained byy the federal government). In additition, revenue trom geothermal production on federal lands and a share of royaltie states and $51 \%$ is retained by the tediral govermment). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on federal lands and a share of royatites
from offshore drilling the Gulf of Mexico (GOMESA) are shared directly with county governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of federal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or economically impacted
by mineral development for planning, construction/maintenance of public facilities, and provision of public services).

Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royalty may be an established Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or percentage increases by steps as the average production on the lease increases. A minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royaty rate increases by steps as the average production on the eease increases. A Geothermal: Geothermal payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. GOMESA: The Gull of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (GOMESA) makes distributions of offshore federal mineral royalities to coastal states and communities. The for states and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA leases include Alabama
Louisiana, Mississipi, and Texas.

- A Bonuses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain mineral
represent the cash amount successully bid to win the rights to a lease.
Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royalty, rent, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement pays. Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royalty, rent, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments

Why is it important?
Mineral royaties are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significant demands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royalty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed owned by the public.
Methods
Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local govermment of origin (the location where the royaties were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25
percent of the state government's share of federal mineral royalties with the county of origin. Because information about royalties by county of
 these data Headwaters Economics includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in hitp://headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdf.

Additional Resources
Headwaters Economics provides a methods document speciic to the EPS.-HDT Federal Lands Payments report that includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Governmen inancial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS.
HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdff ${ }^{101)}$.
For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available a
onrr.gov/Stats/pdtdocs/glossary. poff ${ }^{(11)}$.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

8 \＆
The EPS－HDT Government report uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：

## －U．S．Census of Governments

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce
www．census．gov／govs
Tel．800－242－2184
－U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service
Realty Division，U．S．Department of Interior
www．fws．gov
Tel．703－358－1713

## －U．S．Bureau of Land Management

U．S．Department of Interior
www．blm．gov
Tel．202－208－3801

## －U．S．Forest Service

U．S．Department of Agriculture
www．fs．fed．us
Tel．800－832－1355
－U．S．Office of Natural Resources Revenue
U．S．Department of Interior
www．onrr．gov
Tel．303－231－3078

## ＊来的卫粦

EPS－HDT core approaches
EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－county regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## Adjusting dollar figures for inflation

Because a dollar in the past was worth more than a dollar today，data reported in current dollar terms should be adjusted for inflation．The U．S．Department of Commerce reports personal income figures in terms of current dollars．All income data in EPS－HDT are adjusted to real（or constant）dollars using the Consumer Price Index．Figures are adjusted to the latest date for which the annual Consumer Price Index is available．

## 

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
www.census.gov/govs/
www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
www.fs.usda.gov/pts/
www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct Links to Publications/ann rpt and pls.html
www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing Search 2007.cfm
10 headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT Federal Land Payments Documentation 1-30-2011.pdf
www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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Note to Users:
Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV $>40 \%$.

[^9]
Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Communits Survey office, Washington, D.C.; U.s.
Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.



This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age
Median Age: The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e, half the people are younger than this age and
half are older.

Age \& Gender Distribution, 2013*

|  | Santa Cruz Counly, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 47,122 | 311,536,594 |
| Under 5 years | 3,614 | 20,052,112 |
| 5 to 9 years | 3,872 | 20,409,060 |
| 10 to 14 years | 4,037 | 20,672,609 |
| 15 to 19 years | 4,081 | 21,715,074 |
| 20 to 24 years | 2,789 | 22,099,887 |
| 25 to 29 years | 2,359 | 21,243,365 |
| 30 to 34 years | 2,471 | 20,467,912 |
| 35 to 39 years | 2,404 | 19,876,161 |
| 40 to 44 years | 3,219 | 20,998,001 |
| 45 to 49 years | 2,945 | 22,109,946 |
| 50 to 54 years | 3,135 | 22,396,322 |
| 55 to 59 years | 2,874 | 20,165,892 |
| 60 to 64 years | 2,771 | 17,479,211 |
| 65 to 69 years | 2,225 | 13,189,508 |
| 70 to 74 years | 1,672 | 9,767,522 |
| 75 to 79 years | 1,260 | 7,438,750 |
| 80 to 84 years | '895 | 5,781,697 |
| 85 years and over | '499 | 5,673,565 |
| Total Female | 24,497 | 158,289,182 |
| Total Male | 22,625 | 153,247,412 |
| Change in Median Age, 2000-2013* |  |  |
| Median Age^ ( $2013^{*}$ ) | 35.7 | 37.3 |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 31.8 | 35.3 |
| Median Age \% Change | 12.3\% | 5.7\% | *The data in this table are calcula

$\begin{aligned} & \text { - From } 2000 \text { to the } 2009-2013 \text { period, the } \\ & \text { median age estimate increased the tost in }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { median age estimate increased the most in } \\ & \text { Santa Cruz County, AZ (31.8 to 35.7, a }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \% \text { increase) and increased the least in } \\ & \text { the U.S. ( } 35.3 \text { to } 37.3, \mathrm{a} .7 \% \text { increase). }\end{aligned}$

$=$ Median Age^ (2000)

- Median Agen $\left(2013^{*}\right)$

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S

Age \& Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Under 5 years | 1.5\% | .0\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 5.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 1.2\% | 0.0\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 7.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 25 to 29 years | 2.3\% | 0.0\% |
| 30 to 34 years | 1.2\% | 0.0 |
| 35 to 39 years | 7.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 40 to 44 years | 5.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 45 to 49 years | 1.9\% | 0.0\% |
| 50 to 54 years | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 6.4\% | 0.1\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 7.5\% | .1\% |
| 65 to 69 years | 8.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 70 to 74 years | 8.7\% | 0.1\% |
| 75 to 79 years | 9.2\% | 0.1\% |
| 80 to 84 years | 12.2\% | 0.1 |
| 85 years and over | 15.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Total Female | 0.26 | 0.0\% |
| total Male | 0.2\% | 0.0 |
| Median Age^ (2013*) | 0.5\% | 0.2\% |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age \% Change | 4.7\% | 3.0\% |
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What do we measure on this page?
and the change in median age.
$\frac{\text { Median Age: }}{\text { older. }}$ The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are

Why is it important?
Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of reitrees, the age distribution may be
skewed towards categories 65 years and older. in counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group $18-29$. In skewed towards categories 65 years and older. In counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group 18-29. In many counties, the largest segment of the population is in the Baby Boomer generation (people born between 1946 and 1964).
The change in median age is one indicatoo of whether the population has gotten older or younger.
Methods
Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5 -vear estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5 -year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, 2009* may be listed as the year, but this is a 5 -year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of all people
regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and entorcement of environmental laws, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej ${ }^{\text {an }}$.
An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliancelejeresources(policylei_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pdf ${ }^{(1)}$. The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at: stateotheusa.org ${ }^{(5)}$.

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: ers.usda.gov/topics/ural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx ${ }^{(6)}$ Wiliam H. Frey's website provides links to pubications, issues, media stories, data tools and
and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.f.frey-demographer.org ${ }^{(1)}$.
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Sen
aoa.gov/aoarootaging_statisticsindex.aspx ${ }^{(\theta)}$
The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas. This information is available at: htp://www.census.gov/popest ${ }^{(9)}$.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: countyhealthrankings.org/ ${ }^{\text {(10) }}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.
\% *

during this period.


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of
Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

|  | 2000 | $2009+$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Under 18 | 0\% | 2\% |
| 18-34 | 0\% | 3\% |
| 35-44 | 0\% | 5\% |
| 45-64 | 0\% | 2\% |
| 65 and over | 0\% | 4\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2009* |
| Under 18 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 18-34 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 35-44 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 45-64 | 0\% | 0\% |
| 65 and over | 0\% | 0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into
Why is it important?
For public land managers, understanding the age distribution can help highligh whether management actions might affect some age groups
 on public land managers than a geographey with a large number of minorors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation (hrose born between 1944 and 1964). As this generation enters retirement age, their mobility, spending patterns, and consumer demands (for health care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develo economically. An aging population can also affect changing demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout epon, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
Additional Resources
The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:
..orgIJournailstsWebcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx ${ }^{(11)}$
For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave will
.
The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: census.gov/population/age/ ${ }^{122}$.
The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25 1138. pdf ${ }^{[23]}$

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and IIs Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29. Washington, DC. ers.usda.gov/publications/er-economi--research-reportler79.aspx ${ }^{(21)}$.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Reyial Demographics in the '00 Decade: The Role of Seniors, Boomers and New Minorities. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Frey, W. H. 2007. Mapping the Growth of OIder America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21 st Century. Brookings Census 2000 Series.
Washington.D. Brookings instiution Merropolitan Poolicy Program. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program.

Jacobsen, L. A., and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." Population Bulletin 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C.: ,
U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesexhtm| ${ }^{(15)}$. Retrieved September $1,2010$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.
-

This page describes the number of people who selfidentity as belonging to a particular race.
Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity.
The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 tor how the Federal government collects and presents data on The ofice ormanal.
race and ethnicity.

Population by Race, 2013*


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.


|  | nv, Az | U.s, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Toat Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 3\% | \% |
| Blackor Afician Amenican alone | ${ }^{33 \%}$ | \%\% |
| American Indian alone | 34\% | \% |
| Asian aone | 22\% | \%\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific 15 s.ane | ${ }_{9}^{61 \%}$ | ${ }^{1 \%}$ |
| Some other race | ${ }_{\text {cke }}$ | - |
| $\frac{}{\text { Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation }}$ |  |  |
| White alone | , 3 \% | Us, |
| Black or Afican Ameician alone | 33\% | 0\% |
| American Indian aone | ${ }^{30 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| Asian alone | 26\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific 15. alone | ${ }^{99 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Some other race | 9\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 22\% | 0\% |





Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | \% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 32\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 46\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 22\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 61\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 91\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 50\% | \% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Sana Cruz Count, Az | U.S. |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 41\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 65\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 26\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 99\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 130\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 59\% | 0\% |





Not Specified
$\begin{aligned} & \text { The data in this table eareaculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representaitive of average } \\ & \text { characterisics during this period. }\end{aligned}$ 363,0

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
What do we measure on this page?
This page describes.in general terms, the number of people who self-identity as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination
with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes

 Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Siouxx, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

Alaska Native: This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska
Native race and etthic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the }}{\text { Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" o " "Alaska Native, ' or tribal entries not elsewhere classified. }}$
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where theses populations reside and have a
historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helptut to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 .
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dols) indicales a coefficient of variation >

Additional Resources
The U.S. Forest Service Office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-tribal

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

| Santa Cruz County, Az U.S. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Native American | 34\% | 0\% |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 38\% | 0\% |
| Apache | 122\% | 2\% |
| Blackeet | na | 3\% |
| Cherokee | 81\% | 1\% |
| Cheyenne | na | 6\% |
| Chickasaw | na | 3\% |
| Chippewa | na | 1\% |
| Choctaw | na | 1\% |
| Colville | na | 5\% |
| Comanche | na | 6\% |
| Cree | na | 11\% |
| Creek | na | 2\% |
| Crow | na | 5\% |
| Delaware | na | 7\% |
| Houma | na | 6\% |
| Iroquois | na | 2\% |
| Kiowa | na | 7\% |
| Lumbee | na | 1\% |
| Menominee | na | 4\% |
| Navaio | 91\% | 1\% |
| Osage | na | 6\% |
| Otawa | na | 7\% |
| Paiute | na | 4\% |
| Pima | na | 4\% |
| Potawatomi | na | 3\% |
| Pueblo | na | 2\% |
| Puget Sound Salish | na | 4\% |
| Seminole | na | 4\% |
| Shoshone | na | 5\% |
| Sioux | na | 1\% |
| Tohono O'Odham | 182\% | 5\% |
| Ute | na | 6\% |
| Yakama | na | 5\% |
| Yaqui | 61\% | 5\% |
| Yuman | na | 6\% |
| All other tribes | 55\% | 1\% |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 182\% | 3\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | na | 1\% |
| Alaska Athabaskan | na | 4\% |
| Aleut | na | 5\% |
| Eskimo | na | 1\% |
| Tlingit-Haida | na | 4\% |
| All other tribes | na | 6\% |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | na | 6\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; N | 76\% | 1\% |

## Page 7

＋$\square$ ○ $\bigcirc$ 米雷

## 

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work（occupation）and where they work（by industry）．
Employment by Occupation，2013＊＊

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 17，334 | 141．864，697 |
| Management，protessional，\＆related | 4.692 | 51，34，2，26 |
| Senice | 3．023 | 25，64，065 |
| Sales and office | 5．800 | 34，97，520 |
| Farming，fsting，and foresty |  | ${ }^{1.030,8881}$ |
| Constuction，extaction，mant．，\＆repar | （1，493 |  |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Manage | ${ }^{27.196}$ | ， |
| Senice | 17．46\％ | 1\％ |
| Saes and oftre | 边 |  |
| Constuction，extraction，mant． | 8．6\％ | ${ }_{8.3 \%}$ |
| Production，transorataion，\＆material | 12．6\％ | 12．0\％ |

 characterisisis during this period．
Employment by Industry， 2013

|  | 1732 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | ${ }^{17.334}$ | $14,864.697$ <br> 2731.302 |
|  | ${ }_{717} 47$ |  |
| Manutacuring | 912 | 1， $1,867,4,43$ |
| Wholesale trade | ．943 | 3．937，876 |
| Reatal tade | ${ }^{3.348}$ | 16，415，217 |
| Transporataion，warehousing，and utirities |  |  |
| Intomation Finance and insurace，and feal state | － |  |
| Prot．scientut，mgmt，admin．\＆waste mgr | 1.384 | 15，30，528 |
| Education，health care，\＆social assistance | 3，302 | ${ }_{\text {32，}}^{3271.216}$ |
|  |  | （13，26，892 |
| Onder | ${ }_{1}^{1.576}$ |  |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Agiciulure，foresty，fssing \＆hunting，minin | 2．4\％ | 1．9\％ |
|  | 4．1\％ |  |
| Manuacuruing | 5．3\％ | 10．5\％ |
| Wholesale Hat | 9，936 | ${ }_{\substack{2.88 \% \\ 11.60 \%}}$ |
| TTassooration，warehousing and utitice | $7.5 \%$ | \％ |
| Intomation | 10\％ | 20\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 29\％ | \％\％ |
| Prof．ts scientit．mgmt．admin．\＆waste mgr |  | 10．8\％ |
| Education，healt，care，\＆socila asistance | 19．0\％ | 2\％ |
| Ats，enteratin，ree，accomodation，\＆food |  | ${ }^{9.3 \%}$ |
| Other | （10\％ | （ |

Data Surres．U．S．Departmen t ot commerce．2013．Census Bureau，Ameicican Community Surey ofitice，Wastington，D．C．

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## ＊＊中

What do we measure on this page？
This page describes what people do tor
Employment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification（SOC）system，where workers are classified into occupations
$\frac{\text { Emplosment by Occupation：Refers to the Standard } O \text { Occupational Classification }}{\text { with similiar job duties，skils，education，andiot training，regardeses of industry．}}$
$\frac{\text { Employment by Industry：Reters to the employment by industry，listed according to the North American Industry Classification System }}{\text {（NAICS）．}}$
Why is it Important？
Employment statistics are usually reported by industry（as with other reports in EPS．HDT）．This is a useful way to show the relative diversity of
the economy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors．Employment by occupation offers additional information that describes what
 could be working tor a sottware firm，a mine，or a construction company）．Occupation intormation describes what people do，while employmer by industry describes where people work

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation＜ $12 \%$ ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between
12 and $40 \%$ and RED 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD（preceded with wo dots）indicates a coetficient of variation $>40 \%$ ．If data have consistently low accuracy
dditional Resources
The Census Bureau provides a definition of Socs：census．gov／hhes／wwwfioindex／overiew．htmI ${ }^{(25)}$
Occupations are also defined by U．S．Bureau of Labor Statistics： bl ．gov／soci（ ${ }^{26)}$ ．
The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for difterent types of jobs including tring and ediation neede earnings，working conditions，and what workers do on the job：bls．gov／ocol／（27）

## Data Sources

U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．

| 俍loyment by Occupation，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ty，Az | U．s． |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Management，protessional，\＆related | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Senice | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and flice | 6\％ | \％ |
| Farming，fisting，and toresty | 38\％ | 1\％ |
| Construction，extraction，maint，\＆repair | 13\％ | \％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movin！ | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Management，protessional，\＆related | 6\％ | \％ |
| Senice | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Sales and office | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| Farming，fisting，and torestry | 37\％ | 0\％ |
| Construction，extraction，mant．\＆repair | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| Production，transporation，\＆material movins | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Employment by Industry，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Agricultur，foresty，fishing \＆hunting，minin | 22\％ | 0\％ |
| Constuction | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Manulacturing | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 12\％ | \％ |
| Retail trade | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Transporation，warehousing，and utilities | 15\％ | \％ |
| Intormation | 30\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Prof．，scientific，mgmt，admin．，\＆waste mgr | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，health care，\＆social assistance | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| Ars，entertain．，rec，accomodation，\＆food | ${ }^{13 \%}$ | \％\％ |
| Other senices，exxept public administration | 17\％ | 0\％ |
| Pubic administation | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Agriculure，forestr，fishing \＆hunting，minin | 23\％ | \％\％ |
| Construction | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Manutacturing | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| Wholesale trade | 12\％ | 0\％ |
| Retail trade | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Transportation，warehousing，and utilities | 15\％ | \％\％ |
| Intormation | 33\％ | 0\％ |
| Finance and insurance，and real estate | 19\％ | 0\％ |
| Prof，scientific，mgmt．admin．，\＆waste mgr | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| Education，healt care，\＆social assistance | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Ars，entertain，．，rec，accomodation，\＆food | ${ }^{13 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| Other senices，except public administration | 17\％ | 0\％ |
| Public administation | 14\％ | 0\％ |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> 

What do we measure on this page?
.
Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual
worked 10 or 40 hours per week, it they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year".

Why is it important?
Otten, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human
capital translating to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living For example labor incomes in capital, translating to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have consistenty been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the US Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Part-ime jobs (those that average less
than 35 hoursweek) are often ideal tor students people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents and the eldery who wish to than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to
remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a tull schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to
telecommute and work shorter and more fiexible hours. And, in some cases, young adutts seek out seasonal tourism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960 s. during periods of economic stability, the vast majority of parastime workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, orly about one in seven part-ime workers were involuntary (individuals wanting full-time jobs but working less than 35 hours/week).

Tounderstand the degree to which the data on this page are related to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, To understand the degree to which the dala on this page ar
data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count full time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain falling wages or rates of employment that outpace
population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation>
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Maynard, D. C. \& Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G $06-12$ (501). Available at:
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs
ceo.usc.edulpdffico612501.pdf ${ }^{(23)}$.

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-ime employment, see: bls.gov/opub/is/pati/opbis 571 .pdf ${ }^{(29)}$.
For information on unemployment, run the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

## Data Sources

u.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


|  |
| :---: |
| This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work. |

Commuting Characteristics, 2013*


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## What do we measure on this page? <br> What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers who do not wo

Place of Work: The values reported under "place of work" describe the number of workers that tive in the selected geographic area who worked
either in or outside the county they live in. If the selected geography is not a county, the workers may or may not work within the selected geography. For example, for the city of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worked in county of residence" describes the number of city of Phoenix residents that worked in Maricopa County (but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix).

## Why is it important?

High rates of out-commuting are more common in non-metro areas, and in parts of the U.S. where communities are closer together.
Economic development is sometimes affected by commuting in unantitipated ways: strategies aimed at increasing jobs in a community will not
necessarily mean iobs for residents. Conversely creating job opportunities for residents does not allways require bringing iobs into that necessanly mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing jobs into that
community.
High out-commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for services, complicating fiscal planning for local governments.
"Bedroom communities," those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggle to provide social serices, housing, and water and sewer
"Bearoom communites," those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggle to provide social services, housing, and water and sewer
facilities wwithout an adequate source of evevue. Higher levels and longed distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This
can result from unafordable housing prices or other residentia constraits.

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; And RED BOLD (preceded with Wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (precededed with two dotss) indicates a cooefficient tof variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report a a a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Aldrich, L... Beale, B. and $K$. Kasse. 1997 . Commuting and the EConomic Function
Perspectives 12 (3) ers. usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.puf ${ }^{\text {(30) }}$.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.c.

| Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | y, Az | J.S. |
| Workers 16 years and over | \% | 0\% |
| PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 11\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 7\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 7\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 14\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 21\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 13\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 37\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 31\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 19\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 15\% | 0\% |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 5\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation PLACE OF WORK: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked outside county of residence | 10\% | 0\% |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK: |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 7\% | 0\% |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 8\% | 0\% |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 14\% | 0\% |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 21\% | 0\% |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 13\% | 0\% |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 32\% | 0\% |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 28\% | 0\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 20\% | 0\% |
| 60 or more minutes | 15\% | 0\% |



[^10]


## Poverty，Coefficients of Variation

|  | Santa Cruz County，Az | u．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 2\％ | 0\％ |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family Type，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz County，Az | U．s． |
| People | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Under 18 years | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| 65 years and older | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Families with related children＜ 18 years | 11\％ | 0\％ |
| Married couple families | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 18\％ | 1\％ |
| Female householder，no husband present | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 16\％ | 0\％ |


|  |  | * D 柬 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty. |  |  |
| Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. |  |  |
| Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity^, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz Count, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population (all races) in Poverty | 12,285 | 46,663,433 |
| White alone | 8,256 | 28,254,647 |
| Black or African American alone | 23 | 10,165,935 |
| American Indian alone | 20 | 701,439 |
| Asian alone | 31 | 1,872,394 |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 0 | 99,943 |
| Some other race | ${ }^{3} .730$ | 3,872,191 |
| Two or more races | 225 | 1,696,884 |
| All Ethnicities in Poverty |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 10,987 | 12,507,866 |
| Not Hispanic or Lation (of any race) | -1,298 | 34,155,567 |
| Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) |  |  |
| White alone | 67.2\% | 60.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | -0.2\% | 21.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 0.2\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 0.3\% | 4.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| Some other race | 30.4\% | 8.3\% |
| Two or more races | 1.8\% | 3.6\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 89.4\% | 26.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 10.6\% | 73.2\% |
| ${ }^{\wedge}$ Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or ethnic category by the total population. <br> *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |
| Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty-, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.s. |
| White alone | 23.6\% | 12.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 9.7\% | 27.1\% |
| American Indian alone | 25.0\% | 28.6\% |
| Asian alone | 9.5\% | 12.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | -0.0\% | '19.6\% |
| Some other race alone | 36.2\% | 26.8\% |
| Two or more races alone | 25.2\% | 20.1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 28.4\% | 24.7\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 15.6\% | 10.6\% |
| $\sim$ Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that race. |  |  |



Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population (all races) | 7\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 77\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 100\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 102\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | na | 2\% |
| Some other race | 15\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 35\% | 0\% |
| All Ethnicities |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 8\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 94\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| White alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 65\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 112\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 96\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacific Is. alone | na | 0\% |
| Some other race | 15\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 37\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 66\% | 0\% |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz Count, Az | U.s. |
| White alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 84\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 107\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 160\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | na | 18\% |
| Some other race alone | 18\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races alone | 42\% | 1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 8\% | 0\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 13\% | 1\% |


|  |  | *口米 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * **** W**- |  |  |
| This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source. |  |  |
| Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Sanla Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| Total households: | 15,078 | 115,610,216 |
| Labor earnings | 11,768 | 90,436,935 |
| Social Security (SS) | 4,678 | 33,386,448 |
| Retirement income | 2,146 | 20,504,523 |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 611 | 5,716,592 |
| Cash public assistance income | '544 | 3,255,213 |
| Food Stamp/SNAP | 3.367 | 14,339,330 |
| Percent of Total^ |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 78.0\% | 78.2\% |
| Social Security (SS) | 31.0\% | 28.9\% |
| Retirement income | 14.2\% | 17.7\% |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 4.1\% | 4.9\% |
| Cash public assistance income | 3.6\% | 2.8\% |
| Food Stamp/SNAP | 22.3\% | 12.4\% |

T Total may add to more than $100 \%$ due to households receiving more than 1 source of income.
The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during $2009-2013$ and are representative of average
characteristics during this period.
Fercent of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013+

- In the 2009-2013 period, the highest the Santa Cruz County AZ was in the form the Santa Cuz County AZ was in the form
of Social Security (SS) (31.0\%), and the lowest was in the form of Cash public assistance income (3.6\%).

Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean earnings | \$51,740 | \$75,017 |
| Mean Social Security income | \$15,330 | \$17,189 |
| Mean retirement income | \$23,353 | \$23,589 |
| Mean Supplemental Security Income Mean cash pubic assistance income | 58,247 | ${ }_{\$ 9,1}$ |

Mean cash public assistance income

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


Number of Households Receiving Earnings, By Source, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total households: | 1\% | 0\% |
| Labor earnings | 2\% | 0\% |
| Social Security (SS) | 3\% | 0\% |
| Retirement income | 7\% | 0\% |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 17\% | 0\% |
| Cash public assistance income | 18\% | 0\% |
| Food Stamp/SNAP | 7\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 2\% | 0\% |
| Social Security (SS) | 3\% | 0\% |
| Reirement income | 7\% | 0\% |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 18\% | 0\% |
| Cash public assistance income | 19\% | 0\% |
| Food Stamp/SNAP | 7\% | 0\% |
| Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | u.s. |
| Mean earnings | 3\% | 0\% |
| Mean Social Security income | 5\% | 0\% |
| Mean retirement income | 14\% | 0\% |
| Mean Supplemental Security Income | 26\% | 0\% |
| Mean cash public assistance income | 30\% | 0\% |

##  <br> Educational Attainment, 2013*

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population 25 yrs or older | 28,729 | 206,587,852 |
| No high school degree | 7,912 | 28,887,721 |
| High school graduate | 20,817 | 177,700,131 |
| Associates degree | 1,914 | 16,135,795 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 5,678 | 59,583,138 |
| Bachelor's degree | 3,847 | 37,286,246 |
| Graduate or professional | 1,831 | 22,296,892 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| No high school degree | 27.5\% | 14.0\% |
| High school graduate | 72.5\% | 86.0\% |
| Associates degree | 6.7\% | 7.8\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 19.8\% | 28.8\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 13.4\% | 18.0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 6.4\% | 10.8\% |
| *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period |  |  |
| - In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the | Educational Atta |  |
| highest estimated percent of people over | ${ }_{30 \%}^{35 \%}$. $27.5 \%$ |  |
| the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree or |  |  |
| higher (28.8\%), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (19.8\%). | 20\% ${ }^{25 \%}$ |  |
| AZ had the lowest | 15\%. |  |
|  |  |  |
| In the 2009-2013 period, Santa Cruz Corce, AZ had he highest estimated no high school degree (27.5\%), and the U.S. had the lowest ( $14.0 \%$ ). | ${ }^{5 \%}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Cruz County, Az |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | -No high school degree | *Bachelor's degree or higher |
| School Enrollment, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz Counly, Az | u.s. |
| Total Population over 3 years old: | 45,098 | 299,795,523 |
| Enrolled in school: | 13,482 | 82,624,806 |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 582 | 5,011,192 |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | '863 | 4,208,394 |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 2,763 | 16,286,543 |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 3,433 | 16,510,313 |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 3,626 | 17,153,559 |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 1,971 | 19,333,036 |
| Graduate or professional school | 244 | 4,121,769 |
| Not enrolled in school | 31,616 | 217,170,717 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Enrolled in school: | 29.9\% | 27.6\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 1.3\% | 1.7\% |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | 1.9\% | 1.4\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 6.1\% | 5.4\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 7.6\% | 5.5\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 8.0\% | 5.7\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 4.4\% | 6.4\% |
| Graduate or protessional school | 0.5\% | 1.4\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 70.1\% | 72.4\% |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Sanla Cruz County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population 25 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| No high school degree | 5\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 3\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 11\% | 0\% |
| Bachelors degree or higher | 6\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 7\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 9\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| No high school degree | 5\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 3\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 11\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 6\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 7\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 9\% | 0\% |
| School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Santa Cruz Counly, Az | U.s. |
| Total Population over 3 years old: | 0\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in school: | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 18\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | 14\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 12\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 32\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 1\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Enrolle in school: | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 19\% | 0\% |
| Enroled in kindergarten | 13\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 6\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 11\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 34\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 1\% | 0\% |

$\qquad$

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes levels of educational attainment
Educational Attainment: This refers to the level of educaion completed by people 25 years and overin terms of the highest degree or the
highest level of schooling completed
School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private
School or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interiew. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business school such as post secondary vocational, trade, hospital school, and on job training were not reported as enrolled in school.

Why is it important?
Sudies show that geograshies with a higher than average educated worktorce growew faster, have have higher incoumes, and sutfer less during tudies show that geographies with a higher than average educated worktorce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during
conomic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geographic areas migh
and outreach efforts could be tailored to dodiferent audiences.
Shool enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age access to education and potential for future growh. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

Methods
ala accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation <12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates eetween 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-found employment, and unemployment rates, see:
The Bureau of Labor Statisicics' web resource: bls.goviemp/ep_chart_001.htm (41)
U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Symthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available
at. census.goviprod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf ( 42 ).

Card, David (1999). "The Causal Effect of Educ
vol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.


Study Guide and Supplemental Information **
What do we measure on this page?
This page measures the primary language people speak at home.
Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English
language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.
Why is it important?
For pubbic land managers who are trying to communicate with citizens of communites adiacent to public lands. it is important to know whether
a siginicant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation a sigiticant portion of that population has trouble s.
may need to be conducted in multipiel languages.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates betwe
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. It data have consistenty low accuracy
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots indicates a coefticient of variation $>40 \%$. It data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United
States. This tool is available ate
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 5 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| Speak only Engish | 5\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 1\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 1\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 305\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 49\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 178\% | 1\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 3\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Speak only English | 5\% | 0\% |
| Speak a language other than English | 1\% | 0\% |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole | 1\% | 0\% |
| Other Indo-European languages | 298\% | 0\% |
| Asian and Pacific Island languages | 52\% | 0\% |
| Other languages | 189\% | 0\% |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 3\% | 0\% |

大 1 人

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year buill.
Housing Characteristics, 2013*


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and
$\frac{\text { Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied }}{\text { vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview. }}$
$\frac{\text { For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other }}{\text { occasional use throughout the year. }}$
For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

Why is it important?
Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data
is used to assess the demand for housing, to oidentify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing is used to assess the demand for housing, to identify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing arket over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic
levels.
Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirability of a place for recreation and tourism. This could aso be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990 and early 2000 were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when
housing grew ata a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the erlative growth rates of housing is nousing grew at a fast rate (hhe late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country.) Understanding the relative grownt rates of housing is home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast future demand of services, such as energy consumplion and fire protection.
Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variaition < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$ and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coeficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracay throughout and $40 \%$; and RED ROLL (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$
ar report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.
*]
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
$\frac{\text { owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid }}{\text { for. }}$
Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.
Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
$\frac{\text { Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, }}{\text { and condominium fees. }}$

- $x$

Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels

## Why is it important?

An important indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

## Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 perc
excessive (or unaffordable) housing costs that exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > $40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey has additional information on housing and housing affordability. See.
census.gov/hhes/(www/housing/ahs/lahs.htm( ${ }^{(44)}$
For housing prices, for-profit online real-estate senvices may have the most recent price information. See, for example, zillow.com ${ }^{(45)}$.
For current calculations on housing affordabiility, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at:
realtor.org/research/research/housinginx ${ }^{(46)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Santa Cruz County Az Ve U.S. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied housing units with a |  |  |
| mortgage | 3.5\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost < $15 \%$ of household income | 14.0\% | 0.36 |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 8.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 4.9\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 16.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Gross rent >30\% of household income | 10.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Median monthly mortgage cost^${ }^{\wedge}$ | 3.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Median gross rent^ | 2.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Monthly cost <15\% of household income | 14.1\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 7.9\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent < $15 \%$ of household income | 16.1\% | 0.6\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 10.2\% | .19 |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States. |  |  |  |  |
| Indi | cators | Santa Cruz County AZ | u.s. | Santa Cruz County AZ vs. U.S. |
|  | Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2013*) | 22.8\% | 10.7\% |  |
|  | Median Age (2013*) | 35.7 | 37.3 |  |
|  | Percent Population White Alone (2013*) | 74.6\% | 74.0\% |  |
|  | Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*) | 82.7\% | 16.6\% |  |
|  | Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013*) | 0.2\% | 0.8\% |  |
|  | Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*) | 29.6\% | 30.6\% |  |
| \% | Median Household Income (2013*) | \$37,745 | \$53,046 | 1 |
|  | Per Capita Income (2013*) | \$17,664 | \$28,155 |  |
|  | Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*) | 26.3\% | 15.4\% |  |
|  | Percent Fanilies Below Poverry (2013*) | 21.3\% | 11.3\% |  |
|  | Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*) | 45.3\% | 46.6\% |  |
|  | Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income (2013*) | 30.0\% | 20.2\% |  |
|  | Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*) | 27.5\% | 14.0\% | 1 |
|  | Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*) | 19.8\% | 28.8\% |  |
|  | Percent Population That Speak English Less Than 'Very Well' (2013*) | 31.8\% | 8.6\% |  |
|  | Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*) | 7.6\% | 3.9\% | 1 |
|  | Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30\% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*) | 40.6\% | 35.4\% |  |
|  | Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30\% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*) | 43.3\% | 48.3\% |  |

This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States
The term "benchmark" in this report should not be construed as having the same meaning as in the National Forest Management Act.
Race: Race is a selfidentitication data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. The
Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal govemment collects and presents data on race and
ethnicity
ethnicity.
Poverty: Following the office of Management and Budgets Directive 14 , the Census Bureau uses a set of income thesholds that vary by tamily
size and composition to detectet who is poor. It the total income tor a tamily or an unrelated individidual falls below the eelevant poverty threshold. size and composition to detect who is poor. It the total income tor a tamily or an untealed individual lalis below he televant povery tireshold,

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been borm between 1946 -1964. The reported percent of population that are "tabay

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Social Security Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and surivor benefits, permanent disability } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { insurance payments made by the Social Se } \\
\text { does not include Medicacre reimbursement. }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a tormer employer, labor }
\end{aligned}
$$



Why is it important?
This page shows a quick comparison of a number of indicators covered in this report to hightight where the region is different trom the U.S.
It also offers an at-a-glance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show what a
can help public land managers identily groups of people and aspects of hardship that can aid with outreach and consideration of whether the
pacts of tand management actions could have disproportionatel high and adverse imper disadir)

Methods
The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure trom the region by the figure trom the U.S.

ata have consistently low accuracy troughout a report, we suggest tunning another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
Iedian Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability

The dutain Characteristics during this period.

The Santa Cruz County AZ is most ditferent trom the U.S. in Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013³), Percent Population That Speak Engish Less Than Very Well ( $2013^{*}$ ), and Population Growt ( $\%$ change, 2000-2013 ${ }^{*}$ ).

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Indicators

|  | Region | us |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age (2009*) | 0.5\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population White Alone (2009*) | 2.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (209*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native | 29.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Population "Baby | 2.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Family Income (2009*) | 4.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Per Capita Income (2009*) | 3.1\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*) | 7.2\% | 0.4\% |
| Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*) | 8.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Households with Retirement and Social | 3.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income | 6.3\% | 0.3\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High | 5.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's | 5.5\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population That Speak English Less Than | 3.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*) | 10.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 7.9\% | 0.2\% |
| Renter.Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 10.2\% | 0.1\% |

EPS－HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：
－ 2000 Decennial U．S．Census
Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750

## －American Community Survey

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750
The on－line ACS data retrieval tool is available at：
http：／／www．census．gov／acs／www／

## ＊柬縕紫 <br> EPS－HDT core approaches

EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－Regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## About the American Community Survey（ACS）

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1－3，all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey（ACS）of the Census Bureau．

The ACS is a nation－wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic，social，economic，and housing information about communities every year－information that until recently was only available once a decade．The ACS is not the same as the decennial census，which is conducted every ten years（the ACS has replaced the detailed，Census 2000 long－form questionnaire）．

Data used in this report are 5 －year ACS estimates．Moreso than the 1 or 3 －year estimates，the 5 －year estimates are consistently available for small geographies，such as towns．We show 5 －year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross－geography comparisons．The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period，only what the average value is over the full period．

Because ACS is based on a survey，it is subject to error．The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error（MOE）for every data point．In this report，we alert the user to the data accuracy using color－coded text in the tables：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation（CV）＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD （preceded with two dots）indicates a CV $>40 \%$ ．

The CV is a measure of relative error in the estimate，and is calculated directly from the MOE as the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself．To get the standard error，the MOE is divided by 1.645 （for a 90 percent confidence interval）．The CV is expressed as a percentage．For example，if you have an estimate of $60+/-20$ ，the CV for the estimate is 20.3 percent．This estimate should be used with caution，since the sampling error represents more than 20 percent of the estimate．

## 成米日

## 

headwaterseconomics．org／eps－hdt

## 

Throughout this report，references to on－line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses．These resources are provided as hyperlinks here．

```
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej guidance nepa ceq1297.pdf
www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology main/
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej
www.stateoftheusa.org
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
www.frey-demographer.org
www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging statistics/index.aspx
www.census.gov/popest/
www.countyhealthrankings.org/
www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
uww.census.gov/population/age/
www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg 1997standards
www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22 cspan hispanics.pdf
www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard 10pg.pdf
www.bia.gov/index.htm
uww.indians.org/index.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
www.bls.gov/soc/
www.bls.gov/ocol
www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
uww.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009 ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
www.bls.gov/emp/ep chart 001.htm
www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
www.mla.org/map single
www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
www.zillow.com
www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Land Ownership

What is the breakdown of land ownership? 1
What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 2
What are the different types of federal lands? 3
Land Cover
What is the breakdown of forest, grassland, and other land cover types?
4

Residential Development

What are the trends in residential land-use conversion? ..... 5-6
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 7
Links to Additional Resources ..... 8

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt


[^11]

## 

This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
U.S. Forest Service Land Types (Acres), 2009

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Area | 776,260 | 2,286,279,509 |
| Forest Service Lands | 418,907 | 192,750,310 |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 391,354 | 146,630,207 |
| National Wilderness | 27,553 | 36,155,579 |
| National Monument | 0 | 3,661,327 |
| National Recreation Area | 0 | 2,950,660 |
| National Game Refuge | 0 | 1,198,099 |
| National Wild River | 0 | 568,059 |
| National Recreation River | 0 | 398,207 |
| National Scenic River | 0 | 289,617 |
| National Scenic Area | 0 | 230,459 |
| Primitive Area | 0 | 173,762 |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0 | 167,427 |
| Special Management Area | 0 | 164,707 |
| Protection Area | 0 | 45,051 |
| Recreation Management Area | 0 | 43,900 |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0 | 39,171 |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0 | 12,645 |
| National Botanical Area | 0 | 8,256 |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0 | 6,637 |
| National Historic Area | 0 | 6,540 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Forest Service Lands | 54.0\% | 8.4\% |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 50.4\% | 6.4\% |
| National Widerness | 3.5\% | 1.6\% |
| National Monument | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| National Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Game Refuge | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Wild River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Recreation River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Primitive Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Special Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Protection Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Recreation Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Botanical Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Historic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
Note: All acreages on this page were reported by the U.S. Forest Services' Land Areas Report 2009. The total acreage of Forest Service land
on this page may differ from that reported on previous page due to differences in values reported by the data sources.
Why is it important?
Forest Service lands have special designations that may fafect Forent Service lands have special designations

Methods
Lounty specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Retuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia
Additional Resources
A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available
at.ts. fed. us/land/statillar/2009/larogindex.htm/ ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$

Data Sources
USDA, FS - Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database





8 \&
The EPS-HDT Land-Use report uses national data sources to represent land cover and residential development. In an effort to report more accurate statistics for land ownership, a compilation of state level data was used. All the data in this report were the result of calculations made in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- TIGER/Line County Boundaries 2012

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html

- Developed Areas 2000 and 2010

Theobald, DM. 2013. Land use classes for ICLUS/SERGoM v2013. Unpublished report, Colorado State University.

- Protected Areas Database v 1.32012
U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006

National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm

- USDA, Forest Service

Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html

## 

EPS-HDT core approaches
EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-county regions, to accommodate a flexible range of userdefined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
www.nhd.usgs.gov
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.htm|
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions of terms.htm
headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.
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headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

www.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Note to Users:

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
Components of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.;: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of titerior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes all federal land payme
This page describes al federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
Federal land payments: These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals).
Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is erest Service Revenue Share paym: These are payments sased on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local $\frac{\text { Forest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools. }}{\text { Payments include the } 25 \% \text { Fund, Secure Rural Schools \& Community Self-Determination Act, and Bankhead--Iones Forest Grasslands. }}$

BLM Revenue Sharing: The BLM shares a portion of receipts generated on public lands with state and local governments, including grazing fee Hough the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California ( $O \& C$ ) grant lands.
USFWS Refuge: These payments share a portion of receipts from National Wildlife Refuges and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located.
$\frac{\text { Federal Mineral Royalies: These payments are distributed to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may }}{\text { Share at their discretion: }}$ Federal Fiscal Year: FY refers to the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1 and ends September 30

Why is it important?
State and local govermment cannot tax federally owned lands the way they would if the land were privately owned. A number of federal programs exist to compensate county yovernments for the eresence of ef edearal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of
local govermment revenue in rural counties with lagge feedera land holdings.

Before 1976, all federal payments were linked directly to receipts generated on public lands. Congress funded PILT with appropriations egining in 197 in recognition of the volatility and nadequacy of federal revenue sharing programs. 1.2 . was intended to stabilize and increase federal land payments to county govermments. Morer recently, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of
2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several maior concerns around receipt-based programs--volatility, the payment level, and the incentives provided to counties by linking federal land payments directly to around receipt-based programs

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Despite the increased appropiations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget concern are creating uncertainty for the future of both.
Methods
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, Data Limitations. Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported du
Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively insignificant at the federal level (data gaps on local distributions of
USFWS Retuge revenue sharing is less than one percent of total federal land payments in FFY 2009) but may be important to specific local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royalties represent a more significant omission in states that share a portion governments with significant USFW S acreage. Federal mineal royaties represent a more significant omission in states thas
royalties with local governments. Federal mineral royalties made up $68 \%$ of federal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.
Gorte, Ross W., M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Senice Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hot
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdtt ${ }^{(1)}$
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## ****
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What do we measure on this page?
This page lect

Why is it important?
A variety of state and local governments receive federal land payments, and the way these payments are distributed explains who benefits. For example. PLTT is directed to county government only while USFS payments are shared between county government and schools. II USSS
payments decine
phen payments deciine, the PILT tormula ensures that county govemment payments will increase, but school districts will not share in the increased
PILT payments. While PILT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activties on public lands, all the federal
land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenue sharing payments) are still inked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and govemors have a different set of expectations and incentives to lobby for particular outcomes on public lands than do county commissioners or school officials.

## Methods

State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) federal mineral royalties and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent istributions to local government according to state and federal statute (see note about data limitations). County Govermment Distributions. Consist of. (1) PILT; (2) portions of Forest service payments inctuang Secure Rural Schools and Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discretionary state govermment distributions of federal mineral royaties where these data are availiable. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Title $1,25 \%$ Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distributions: Consist of SRS Title II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on pub
land projects on the national forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and land projects on the national forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and
recommendations to the Forest Servicicon the development and implementation of psecial proiects on federal alads as authorized under the
Seciue interests and areas of expertise, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national forest personnel.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist tof BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). -

Additionat Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.

Gorte, Ross W., M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socieeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at

Data Sources
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S.


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liet of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agricuture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land. Management,
Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wiidlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wiidlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Departu
interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. orgleps-hdt

This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distributed to the state
school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Government by Permitted Use, FY 2013 ( 2013 \$s)


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
sounty governments (federal land payment distributed to the state, school districts. grazing districts, and RACs are excludeded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Why is it important?
County govermments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For ay for law enforcement mandtain county roads used by logging truck and recreational traftic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must the Forest Senvice, are specifically tarcyeted to help pay for these costs.

Methods
$\frac{\text { Unrestricted: Consist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Willdife Service Refigge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral }}{\text { royalties from the state government. }}$
Restricted-County Roads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Title I, (2) Forest Service $25 \%$
Fund, (3) Forest Service Owl payments (between 1993 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law mandates payments be insd for county roads and public schools. Each state determines how to split tunds between the two services.
Restricted--Special County Projects: Consist of $(1)$ SRS Titte Ill funds that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, protection plans.

Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royalties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Un
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S.
Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; ish and widalie Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic

## **



Federal Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007
$(2013$ \$s)

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state government general revenue.
$\frac{\text { Reporting Period: State and local financial data is stom the U.S. Census of Governments, conducted every five years. The latest was for Fiscal }}{\text { Year (FY) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY } 2006 \text { and }}$ teractive Table: Census of Govemment county tor FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007.
nteractive Table: Census of Govemment county financia statistics are based on a national survey and may hot match local government limitations and update data for the latest year.
Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax
tergovernmental Revenue: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including federal education, health care, and otal Charges: Charges imposed formments, and state assistance to local governments. All Other (Miscellaneous): All other general government revenue from their own sources.
Why is it important?
County payments are an important component of local government fiscal health for a handitul of rural counties with a large share of land in federal ownership. For counties with fewer public lands and larger economies, federal land payments are a small piece of a much broader
revenue stream. Counties most dependent on federal land payments are aftected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For the counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.
Methods
Reporting Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July 1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the
 during the tillowing FY. For example, Forest Senice payyments authorized and appropriated for $F$ FY 2007 are delivered to counties in January of
2000 , during the Census of Government $F Y$ 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2006 are compared to local govermment revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations
from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

Census of Governments Data Limitations: (1) county financial statistics may not match local govermment financial reports for three main reasons: (a) The Census of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (counts) government and all
agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and quasi-governmental entities). This may differ from the way loc gencies, institutions, and authorities connected toit (including government and quasi-governmental entities). This may differ from the way loca
governments define themselves tor budgeting purposes; ;b) dififerent reporting periods bermeen the Census of Govermments fiscal year and the reporting period used by local governments (for example, some counties use a calendar year for reporting purposes); and (c) survey methods
introduce error; (2) the last published edition of the Census of Governments was FY 2007, before the recent increase in payments from SRS and PILT; and ( 3 ) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other sources
of county revenue. of county revenue.
Additional Resources
U.S. Census Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census.gov/govs/estimatel $/^{(2)}$

For a detailed description of Census of Governments survey methocs, survey year (fiscal year), and definitions, see: 2006 Government Finance and Employment Classification Manual at census.gov/govs ${ }^{(3)}$
Schuster, Enin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May ingles, Brett. 2004. Changing the Funding Structure: An Analysis of the Secure Rural School and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 on National Forest Lands. Environmental Science and Public Policy Research Institute, Boise State University

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Govemments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wildifie Sevice, Washington,
D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hd

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of T Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S., Fish and Wildifit Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources
Revenue. Washington, D.C.: Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.rg/eps-hdt

****
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)
Congress authorized PILT in 1976 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing payment programs to compens sharing payments by paying counties based their borders (Public Law 94-565). PILT increases and stabilizes county government revenue and is subject to a population cap.
A low average per-acre PLLT payment may indicate significant revenue sharing payments from the previous year or that the county's population
A low average per-acre PLT payment may indicate significant rev.
is below the population cap that limits the base per acre payment.
PILT is permanently authorized, but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis. PILT was typically not fully funded until FY 2008
when counties received a guarantee of five years at tull payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Why is it important?
As county payments became more important to local goverrmment atter wwil (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-wa
housing and economic growth), volatilily became an issue. PIIT increased and stablized payments by housing and economic growin), Volatitity became an issue. PILT increased and stabilized payments by tunding counties from congressional local government services, but can be used at the discretion of county commissioners to tund any local government needs.

Additional Resources
. Departnent of the Interior maintains an online searchable database of PILT payments and eligible PILT acres by county and state total. Data are available back to FY 1999 at: doi. gov/nhbcrindex.cfm ${ }^{(4)}$

Schuster, Envin G. 1995. PILT - Its Purpose and Performance. Journal of Forestry. 93(8):31-35.
Corn, M. Lynne. 2008. PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes): Somewhat Simplified. Congressional Research Service Report RL31392.

Data Sources
S. De Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

## 


This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act (SRS), 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Forest Service Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Title I I Title || $>$ Title III $\mathbf{\bullet} 25 \%$ Fund $\mathbf{~ F o r e s t ~ G r a s s l a n d s ~} \mathbf{~ S p e c i a l}$ Acts

[^12]Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act
U.S. Forest Service 25 Percent Fund: The $25 \%$ Fund, established in 1908 , shares revenue generated trom the sale of commodities produced on publict and witht the country where the activities take place. TTenty-five percent of the value of public land receipts are distributed directly to counties and must be used to tund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services.
The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-etermination Act of 2000 (SRS), or Public Law 106-393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 ( (SRS), or Public Law 106 -393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to
provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counties affected by the decline in revenue from timber havests on federal lands. SRS was reauthorized for a single year in 2007, and again in 2008 for a period of four years. The SRS Act has three titles that allocate payments for specific purposes.
-Titte I - these payments to counties make up 80 to 85 percent of the total SRS payments and must be dedicated to funding roads and
schools. States determine the split between these two services, and some states let the counties decide.
schools. Staees determine the spirt between these two services, and some states let the counties decide.
(Titlell - these funds are retaned by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committee
(RACS) at the community level help make spending determination and
(RACS) at the conmunity level help make spending determinations and monitor project progress

- Titte III- these payments may be used to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program, to reimburse the county for search
and rescue and other emergency senvices, and to develop community wildire protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the $25 \%$ Fund and SRS? Counties elect to receive Secure Rural Schools Payments, of to continue with 25 prefer $25 \%$ Fund payments to Secure Rural Schools.
Forest Grasslands: Forest Grasslands are lands acquired by the Forest Service through the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (P.L. 75 . 210). The Act authorized acquisition of damaged lands to rehabilitate and use them for various purposes. Receipts from activities on Forest
Grasslands are shared directly with county governments.

Special Acts: These include Payments to Minnesota (Act of June 22, 1948,16 U.S.C. 577 g$)$, payments associated with the Quinault Specia
Management Area in Washington (P.L. $100-638,102$ Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quartz from the Ouachita National Forest in Management Area in Washington (P.L.L. 100-638, 102 Stat. 3327 ), and receipts from the sale of quartz trom the Ouachita National Forest in
Arkansas ( 5423 , Interior Appropriations Act for FY1989; P.L. 100-446, 102 Stat. 1774 ). Payments to Minnesta provides a special payment (75\% of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of titmber receitsts from the Quinault Special Management Area with both the Quinault Indian Tribe and with the State of
washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quartz from the Ouachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (rath han being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkansas counties with Ouachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

Why is it important?
USFS revenue sharing is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royalites are distributed to
states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local govermment revenue. Payments became important after WWIIl when tates). For some countiest provides a significant portion tiotal local government revenue. Paymenis became

As the timber economy shitted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it
Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owl" transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owl" "transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of
transition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS act. SRS changed USFS revenue shaing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) deco rransition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS act. SRS changed USFS revenue sharing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decoupled
county payments from National Forest receipts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewardship through Titte ll funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment equity concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title l formula is adjusted using each county's per capita personal income).

SRS transition payments are only authorized through FY 2011, at which point Congress must decide to extend and/or reform SRS, or allow it expire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the $25 \%$ Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on
Additional Resources
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act payments available at: fs. Gosca
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at

Uww.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

## *****

*     * 

This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived from a variety of revenue-generating activites on BLM land, including revenue trom the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.

BLM Payments to States and Local Governments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Santa Cruz County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total BLM Payments (\$) | 1,962 | 66,579,030 |
| Proceeds of Sales | 0 | 9,841,676 |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0 | 53,150 |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 1,962 | 12,684,340 |
| State Payments | 0 | 3,922,509 |
| National Grasslands | 0 | 447,217 |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0 | 39,630,138 |
| Titte I | 0 | 33,685,617 |
| Titte II | 0 | 3,343,873 |
| Title III | 0 | 2,600,648 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Proceeds of Sales | 0.0\% | 14.8\% |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 100.0\% | 19.1\% |
| State Payments | 0.0\% | 5.9\% |
| National Grasslands | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0.0\% | 59.5\% |
| Titte I | 0.0\% | 50.6\% |
| Titte II | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Titte III | 0.0\% | 3.9\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived tor BLM land, including revenue trom the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.
Mineral Leasing Act: These include oil and Gas Rise of land and materials.
not include royaties trom mineral leasing on BLM lands, which are distributed by the oftice of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). For ONRR payments see worksheet 10 .
Taylor Grazing Act: The Taylor Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, established grazing allotments on public land and extended tenure to district restricted to use for range improvements ( $e$ ) enacted fees to be shared with the county where allotments and leases are located. Funds are - Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns grazing pentrolts noxious weed programs) in cooperation with BLM or livestock organizaztions. - Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns issuing grazing leases on public lands outside the original grazing district established under the
$\frac{\text { National Grasslands: Revenue derived from the management of National Grasslands under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act ( } 7 \text { U.S.C. }}{\text { 1012), and Executive Order 10787, November } 6,1958 \text {. }}$

Oregon and Califormia Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (O\&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road
(CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. Amounts include Titte I Title ll, and Titt payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report tor definitions and information on the secure Puri, chools and $T$ community Self-Determination Act).

Why is it important?
The BLM is the nation's largest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adiacent communities, public sadety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to ol ocal govermments in in lieu of property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT).
Methods
BLM data on this page are from BLM FRD 196 and FRD 198 reports. The FRD 196 reports receipts by county and state of origin while the
 used. Some error is is ikely. In addition, some recipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table $3-31$ of BLM Public Land Statistics) was govermment are related to the previous FY's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2008 are received and reported by state and local govermment in FY 2009.)
Additional Resources
and Statistics website
blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct_Links_to_Publications/ann_rpt_and_pls.htmi( ${ }^{6}$.

Data Source
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available a

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { O\&C and CBWR land grants } & \text { ENational Grasslands } \\
\text {-Taylor Grazing Act } & \text { Mineral Leasing Act } \\
\text { - Proceeds of Sales } &
\end{array}
$$

Data Sources: U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hd

## * *

This page describes U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge revenue sharing.

USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes U.S. Fish and Widdifife Service Refuge revenue sharing.
Twenty-five percent of the net receipts collected from the sale of various products or privileges from Refige lands, or three-quarters of one percent $(0.75 \%$ ) of the adjusted purchase price of Refuge land, whichever is greater, is shared with the counties in which the Refuge is located.

Why is it important?
National Wildifife Refuges and other lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wiillife Service do not pay property taxes to local governments.
The Refuge revenue sharing program is intended to compensate counties tor non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing rograms, these payments can be important ited to compensate counties for non-taxable Reftuge lands. As with other revenue sharing 1
 create incentives for local government officials to lobby for particular uses of public land.

## Methods

Data Limitations: The USFWS publishes a database of Refige revenue sharing payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007 only, and does not make ata available for other years for the nation. Data on Refuge revenue sharing may be obtained directly from the receiving county government. County govemments may request county-specific Retuge revenue sharing payment data from U.S. Fish and Wildilife Services, Division .

Significance of Data Limitations: Data limitations are relatively insignificant on the national scale (USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments .
Additional Resources
A detailed description of USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments is available on the U.S. Fish and Wildilife Service Realty website at fws.gov/refiges/reaty/rirs. htm| ${ }^{(8)}$.

The Refuge Revenue Sharing Database is available at: fws.gov/refuges/reaty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing_Search_2007.ctm.). The database currently only includes payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007. The agency does not provide data tor the nation for additional years

Data Sources
US. Dens of iterior. 2007. U. . F. Fish and Widdife Service, Washington D.C.

## 


This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments.
Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources US Department of interior 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue Washington. D.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for
the region.
Royalties, rents, and bonus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49\% of revenue is returned to from offshore drilling the Gulf of Mexico (GOMESA) are shared directly with county governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of federal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (prioity must be given to areas socially or economically impacted
by mineral development for planning. construction/maintenance of public facilities, and provision of public sevvices).

Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royaty may be an established Royalties: Royaty payments fepresent a stated share orpoalty rate increases by steps as the averaqe production on the lease increases. A sliding-scale reypalty rate is is based on onaverage propoduction and applies to all production from the elease. A royalty is due when production begins. Geothermal: Geothermal payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. GOMESA: The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (GOMESA) makes distributions of offshore federal mineral royalties to coastal states and communities. The four s
Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Rents: A rent schedule is established at the time a lease is issued. Rents are annual payments, normally a fixed dolar amount per acre required to preserve the ight to a lease.
Bonuses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Bonuses represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease.
Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royalty, rent, or bonus.. Other revenue may include minimum royalities, settlement payments,
Why is it important?
Mineral royaties are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significicant demands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royalty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed pride an ongoing public benefit trom the depletion of non-renewable resources owned by the public.
Methods
Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaly distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local govermment of origin (the location where the royaties were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25
percent of the state government's share of federal mineral royalties with the county of origin. Because information about royalties by county of
 hese data. Headwaters Economics includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in hitp://headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdf.

Additional Resources
Headwaters Economics provides a methods document specific to the EPS-HDT Federal Lands Payments report that includes a list of state
distribution policy, links to data and contact information for Western US States in the EPS.HDT Federal State and Local Government distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Govermmen nancial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics. org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS.
HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdff ${ }^{101)}$.
For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available a
onrr.gow/Stats/pdftdocs/glossary. pfff11).
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

8 \＆
The EPS－HDT Government report uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：

## －U．S．Census of Governments

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce
www．census．gov／govs
Tel．800－242－2184
－U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service
Realty Division，U．S．Department of Interior
www．fws．gov
Tel．703－358－1713

## －U．S．Bureau of Land Management

U．S．Department of Interior
www．blm．gov
Tel．202－208－3801

## －U．S．Forest Service

U．S．Department of Agriculture
www．fs．fed．us
Tel．800－832－1355
－U．S．Office of Natural Resources Revenue
U．S．Department of Interior
www．onrr．gov
Tel．303－231－3078

## ＊来的卫粦

EPS－HDT core approaches
EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－county regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## Adjusting dollar figures for inflation

Because a dollar in the past was worth more than a dollar today，data reported in current dollar terms should be adjusted for inflation．The U．S．Department of Commerce reports personal income figures in terms of current dollars．All income data in EPS－HDT are adjusted to real（or constant）dollars using the Consumer Price Index．Figures are adjusted to the latest date for which the annual Consumer Price Index is available．

## 

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
www.census.gov/govs/
www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
www.fs.usda.gov/pts/
www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct Links to Publications/ann rpt and pls.html
www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing Search 2007.cfm
10 headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT Federal Land Payments Documentation 1-30-2011.pdf
www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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Note to Users:
Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV $>40 \%$.

[^13]
Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Communits Survey office, Washington, D.C.; U.s.
Department of commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.



This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age
Median Age: The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e, half the people are younger than this age and
haff are older.

Age \& Gender Distribution, 2013*

|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 211,968 | 311,536,594 |
| Under 5 years | 9,977 | 20,052,112 |
| 5 to 9 years | 10,452 | 20,409,060 |
| 10 to 14 years | 11,866 | 20,672,609 |
| 15 to 19 years | 11,693 | 21,715,074 |
| 20 to 24 years | 10,183 | 22,099,887 |
| 25 to 29 years | 9,329 | 21,243,365 |
| 30 to 34 years | 9,358 | 20,467,912 |
| 35 to 39 years | 10,011 | 19,876,161 |
| 40 to 44 years | 9,908 | 20,998,001 |
| 45 to 49 years | 12,750 | 22,109,946 |
| 50 to 54 years | 15,858 | 22,396,322 |
| 55 to 59 years | 17,797 | 20,165,892 |
| 60 to 64 years | 19,120 | 17,479,211 |
| 65 to 69 years | 17,137 | 13,189,508 |
| 70 to 74 years | 13,865 | 9,767,522 |
| 75 to 79 years | 9,444 | 7,438,750 |
| 80 to 84 years | 6,608 | 5,781,697 |
| 85 years and over | 6,612 | 5,673,565 |
| Total Female | 108,218 | 158,289,182 |
| Total Male | 103,750 | 153,247,412 |
| Change in Median Age, 2000-2013* |  |  |
| Median Age^ ( $2013^{*}$ ) | 50.1 | 37.3 |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 44.5 | 35.3 |
| Median Age \% Change | 12.6\% | 5.7\% | The data in this table are calculatid

characteristics during this period.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { - From } 2000 \text { to the } 2009-2013 \text { period, the } \\
\text { median age estimate increased the tost in }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { median age estimate increased the most in } \\
\text { Yavapai County, AZ (44.5 to } 50.1, \text { a } 12.6 \%
\end{array} \\
& \text { increase) and increased the least in the } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { increase) and increased the least in the } \\
\text { U.S. (35.3 to } 37.3 \text { a } 5.7 \% \text { increase). }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$



- Median Age^ (2000)

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Communits Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S

Age \& Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Yavapai County, Az | s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Under 5 years | 0.8\% | 0.0\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 4.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 3.7\% | 0.1\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 4.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 25 to 29 years | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| 30 to 34 years | 1.1\% | 0.0\% |
| 35 to 39 years | 3.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 40 to 44 years | 3.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 45 to 49 years | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| 50 to 54 years | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 3.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 3.2\% | 0.1\% |
| 65 to 69 years | 2.9\% | 0.1\% |
| 70 to 74 years | 3.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 75 to 79 years | 4.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 80 to 84 years | 4.4\% | 0.1\% |
| 85 years and over | 4.8\% | 0.1\% |
| Total Female | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Total Male | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age^ $2013^{*}$ ) | 0.1\% | 0.2\% |
| Median Age^ (2000) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age \% Change | 1.1\% | 3.0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

* *) Wan**

What do we measure on this page?
$\frac{\text { Median Age: }}{\text { older. }}$ The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are

Why is it important?
Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of reitrees, the age distribution may be
skewed towards categories 65 years and older. in counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group $18-29$. In skewed towards categories 65 years and older. In counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group 18-29. in many counties, the largest segment of the population is in the Baby Boomer generation (people born between 1946 and 1964).
The change in median age is one indicatoo of whether the population has gotten older or younger.
Methods
Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5 -year estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5 -year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, $2009^{*}$ may be listed as the year, but this is a 5 -year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of all people
regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and entorcement of environmental laws, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej ${ }^{j}$.
An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliancelejeresources(policylei_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pdf ${ }^{(1)}$. The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at stateotheusa.org ${ }^{\text {(5) }}$

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: ers.usda.gov/topics/ural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx ${ }^{(6)}$. Wiliam H. Frey's website provides links to pubications, issues, media stories, data tools and
and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.f.frey-demographer.org ${ }^{(1)}$.
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at
aoa.gov/aoarootlaging_statisticsindex.aspx ${ }^{\left({ }^{(6)}\right)}$.
The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas. This information is available at: http://www.census.gov/popest $t^{(9)}$

For information on county-level health ranking, see: countyhealthrankings.org/ ${ }^{\text {(10) }}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ******** |  |  |
| This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups. |  |  |
| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013* |  |  |
|  | 2000 | 2013* |
| Total Population | 167.517 | 211,968 |
| Under 18 | 35,403 | 39,392 |
| 18-34 | 27,285 | 33,466 |
| 35-44 | 22,165 | 19,919 |
| 45-64 | 45,848 | 65,525 |
| 65 and over | 36,816 | 53,666 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Under 18 | 21.1\% | 18.6\% |
| 18-34 | 16.3\% | 15.8\% |
| 35-44 | 13.2\% | 9.4\% |
| 45-64 | 27.4\% | 30.9\% |
| 65 and over | 22.0\% | 25.3\% |

FThe data in this
during this period.
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into
Why is it important
For public land managers, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups has a large retired population, or soon-to-be-retired population, for example, the needs and and atitudes of different age groups. If a geography on public land managesers than a geoography with a large number of minors or or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation (those born between 1946 and 1964). As this generation enters retirement age, their mobility, spending patterms, and consumer demands (for heath care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develop economically. An aging population can also affect changing emands on land use (e.g., recreation).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with (wo dols) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracey throughout a report, we suggest t unning another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:
..orgIJournalisis/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx ${ }^{(12)}$
For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will
.
The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: ensus.govipopulation/age/
The Next For Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25. 1138.pdf ${ }^{[23]}$

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and Its Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29. Washington, DC. ers.usda.gov/publications/er-economi--research-reportler79.aspx ${ }^{124}$.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regiona Demographics in the '00 Decade: The Role of Seniors, Boomers and New Minorities. The Brookings Instiution, Washington, D.C

Frey, W. H. 2007. Mapping the Growth of OIder America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21 st Century. Brookings Census 2000 Series.
Washington, D.C.: Brookings institution Merropolitan Poolicy Program. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitian Policy Program

Jacobsen, L. A., and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." Population Bulletin 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C..
Population Reference Bureau. -
U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030."
census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesexhtml ${ }^{(\text {P5) }}$. Retrieved September $1,2010$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office Washington D.C. . U.S. Department of
Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems support Division, Washington, D.C.

| Age \& Gender Distribution and Change, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2000 | $2009+$ |
| Total Population | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Under 18 | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| $18-34$ | $00 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| 65 and over | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation | 2000 | $2009+$ |
| Under 18 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $18-34$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | $00 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 65 and over | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

- 


This page describes the number of people who selfidentity as belonging to a particular race.
Race: Race is a selfiddentification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity.
The office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 tor how the Federal government collects and presents data on The ofice ormanal.
race and ethnicity.

Population by Race, 2013*

> In the $2009-2013$ period, the racial
category with the highest estimated category with the highest estimated percent
ot the population in the Yavapa county
was White alone ( 91.96$)$ and and the racial was White alone $(91.9 \%$ ), and the racial
category the lowest estimated percent of category the lowest estimated percent
the epopulatio was sative tawaian \&
Other Paccific Is. alone ( 0.020 ).

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Yavapai County AZ, 2013
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the number of people
$\frac{\text { Race: }}{\text { Office of }}$ Managenement and Budidication datat item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. The and ethnicity.
Race Alone Cateogories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone included by the $\frac{\text { Race Alone Categones: This includes the minimum five race categones required by the OMB, plus the some other race alone ' ncluded by the }}{\text { Census Bureau, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or Atrican-American alone, American Indian or Alaska }}$ Census Bureau, with the approval ot the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or Atrican-Americ
Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawaian or other Paccific sliander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or Atrican American," "American Indian and Alaska
Native." "Asian" and "Native Hawaian or Other Pacific lslander"" race categories described above. Respondents providing wite-in entries such as multiracial mixed, interacaial, or a HispaniclLLatino group (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban) in the "Some other race" witte-in as multiracial, mixed, interracial, or a hispanict-Latino group tor example, Mextan, Puen
spane are induded in this cateogr.
Two or More Races: People may have chosen to provide two or more races either by checking two or more race response check boxes, by Swe or More Races: People may have chosen to provide two or more races either by checking two or $m$
Tproviding mutiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and wite-in responses.
Why is it important?
Federal agencies make use of intormation on race and ethnicity tor implementing a number of programs, while also using this intormation to promote and entorce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act
According to the Census Bureau, "Many tederal programs are put into eftect based on the race data obtained trom the decennial census $(\mathbf{i}$.es
promoting equal employment opportunties; assessing racial disparties in heath and environmental iskss). In addition, "Data on ethnic groups
 and entorcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments to run
programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identitying segments of the population who may not be receiving medical serices under the programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identitying segments of the popplation who may not be receiving medical services unde
Pubbic Heatht Acti evaluating whether finanacial institutions are meeting the creafit needs of minoority populations under the Community Public Health Act: eval
Reinvestment Act):"
For public land managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether the action could have
disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations. This consideration, broadly referered to as "Envionmental Justice", is
 there is a potential environmental ustice issu:
Methods
Race cat
Race categores include both racial and national- origin groups. The concept t of race is separate from the concept of tispanic origin, which is
discussed elsewhere in this report. Percentages tor the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not te combined with the discussed ilsenhe.
percent thispanic.
Data accuracy is indicated as tollows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between
 Additional Resources

For intormation on revised Federal Oftice of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity se.goviomblfedreg_1997standards
For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau's publication "Overview of Race and rspanic Ongin, avalable at: census. gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-1. pdf
Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factifinder2. census. govflaces/navisistpages/index.xhtm| ${ }^{\text {(a) })}$
The American Human Development Proiect has created a useful resource on the health and weltare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A
Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Raciial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measureotamerica.orglacenturyapart tap .

Data Sources
US. Depar of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.
Study Guide

|  |  | USS. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | ${ }^{0 \%}$ | \% |
| White alone | 0\% | \%\% |
| Black or Afican Ameicican alone | 11\% | \% |
| Ameicica Indian alone | ${ }^{6 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Asian lone | 9\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawain \& Other Pacaicic is alone | 57\%\% | ${ }^{1 \%}$ |
| Some other race | ${ }_{\text {11\% }}^{11 \%}$ | \%\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  |  | US, |
| Black or Alican Ameiciaa alone | 10\% | \% |
| Ameician Indian lone | ${ }^{6 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Asian alone | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Native Hawaian \& Other Pacific is, alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 10\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 11\% | 0\% |
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term
"Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers }}{\text { race and }}$ Eace and Hispanic origin to be wo separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.
$\frac{\text { Hispanic or L Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latin" are those who classity themselves in one of the specific }}{\text { Hispanic or Latino catego }}$ Hispanic cr Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they
are "other are other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." "rigin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

## Why is it important?

Hispanics are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the
U.S. seff-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010 . The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the poph
2050. Between 2000 and 2010 , Hispanics accounted for over one-half of the nation's population grownh.

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and atitiudes of the Hispanic community in an area can be an important consideration for public land managers working to meet the needs of the public or evaluaing potentially adverse impacts on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e,
promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and envirommental riskss" and promoting equal employment opporuntites; assessing racial disparities in health and environmental isks)" and "Data on ethnic groups are
important tor putting into effecta number of federal stautes (ie enforcing biingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act monitoring and important tor putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e., enforcing bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act; monitoring and
enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civili Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local goverments to run programs and meet legistative requirements (i.e., identifying segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under then Public Health Act evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act)."

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity
(1997).see: whitehouse govembitedre (1997), see: whitehouse.gov/omb/fedree_1997standards ${ }^{\text {(12) }}$.

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-1.pdff ${ }^{(17)}$.
Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/js/pages/index.xhtm| ${ }^{1818)}$.
Additional information on the U.S. Hispanic population from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at:
census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.ppff ${ }^{20}$.
For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land mana
subject, see: icbemp.gov/sciencelhansistichard 10pg. pf ${ }^{(21)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Yavapai County, Az | s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 9\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawailan \& Oth.Pacific Is. alone | 57\% | 1\% |
| Some other race | 42\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 9\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, AZ | U.s. |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 0\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 12\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 3\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 8\% | 0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& oth.Pacific ls. alone | 0\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 0\% | 0\% |
| Two or more races | 9\% | 0\% |



What do we measure on this page?
This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who selfi-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisisons on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribe

 Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Sioux, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

Alaska Native: This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska
Native race and ethnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: }}{\text { Census }}$ This category y includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical andoror current tie to the land. Some management actions may have dispropoptionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceeded with wo dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the
National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.govicompliancelej/resources/policylé_guidance_nepa_ceq1297. pff ${ }^{(1)}$.
The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs resources
The U.S. Department of niterior's Incian Affars overs.
and contacts are available at: bia.govinindex.htm
The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including The American Indian Heritage Foundaation hosts an Amenican nodian Resource Directory with al ist of al Amenican Indian tribes, including
Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.orgindex.tm! ${ }^{(22])}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


| Region |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races. |  |  |
| American Indian \& Alaska Native Population, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population | 211,968 | 311,536,594 |
| Total Native American | 4.475 | 2,540,309 |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 4,066 | 1,997,487 |
| Apache | 152 | 69,740 |
| Blackeet | - | 26,474 |
| Cherokee | 121 | 273,192 |
| Cheyenne | - | 11,774 |
| Chickasaw | 0 | 22,917 |
| Chippewa | 17 | 115,253 |
| Choctaw | 35 | 90,189 |
| Colville | 0 | 8,182 |
| Comanche | 0 | 12,228 |
| Cree | 0 | 2,191 |
| Creek | 0 | 41,521 |
| Crow | 9 | 11,424 |
| Delaware | 0 | 7,471 |
| Houma | 0 | 9,488 |
| troquis | 25 | 45,639 |
| Kiowa | - | 8,691 |
| Lumbee | 0 | 68,171 |
| Menominee | 0 | 8,259 |
| Navaio | 1,382 | 305,552 |
| Osage | 0 | 8,332 |
| Ottawa | 0 | 7,026 |
| Paiute | 0 | 10,545 |
| Pima | 58 | 24,212 |
| Potawatomi | 41 | 19,337 |
| Pueblo | 172 | 71,029 |
| Puget Sound Salish | 0 | 13,971 |
| Seminole | 0 | 13,987 |
| Shoshone | , | 9,470 |
| Sioux | 32 | 124,383 |
| Tohono O'Odham | 33 | 20,343 |
| Ute | 0 | 8,629 |
| Yakama | 0 | 8,614 |
| Yaqui | 129 | 19,942 |
| Yuman | 151 | 7,944 |
| All other tribes | 1,709 | 491,367 |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 110 | 60,370 |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | 0 | 108,836 |
| Alaska Athabaskan | 0 | 15,882 |
| Aleut | 0 | 11,709 |
| Eskimo | 0 | 60,926 |
| Tlingit-Haida | 0 | 15,622 |
| All other tribes | 0 | 4,697 |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | 16 | 10,616 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; |  |  |
| *The data in this table are calculated by ACS | cled during 2009-20 | verage |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
That do we measure on this page?
This page describes in genear terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination
with one or more other races.
American Indian: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes
principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behali of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes
or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackreet. Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Choctaw, Colvill , Comanche cree,
 Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Siouxx, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

Alaska Native: This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska
Native race and ettnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.
$\frac{\text { Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the }}{\text { Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" o " "Alaska Native, ' or tribal entries not elsewhere classified. }}$
Why is it important?
Different groups of people may value and use public lands in dififerent ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of
American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and
historical andlor current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is
helptut to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dols) indicales a coefficient of variation >

Additional Resources
The U.S. Forest Service office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-ribal

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.

| American Indian \& Alaska Native Population, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yavapai County, Az |  |
| Total Population | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total Native American | 6\% |  |
| American Indian Tribes; Specified | 8\% | 0\% |
| Apache | 46\% | 2\% |
| Blackfeet | na | $3 \%$ |
| Cherokee | 52\% | 1\% |
| Cheyenne | na |  |
| Chickasaw | na |  |
| Chippewa | 97\% | 1\% |
| Choctaw | 80\% | 1\% |
| Colville | na | 5\% |
| Comanche | na | 6\% |
| Cree | na |  |
| Creek | na | 2\% |
| Crow | 115\% | 5\% |
| Delaware | na | 7\% |
| Houma | na | 6\% |
| Iroquois | 83\% | 2\% |
| Kiowa | na |  |
| Lumbee | na | 1\% |
| Menominee | na | 4\% |
| Navaio | 18\% | 1\% |
| Osage | na | 6\% |
| Otawa | na | 7\% |
| Paiute | na |  |
| Pima | 53\% | 4\% |
| Potawatomi | 80\% | 3\% |
| Pueblo | 41\% | 2\% |
| Puget Sound Salish | na |  |
| Seminole | na | 4\% |
| Shoshone | na |  |
| Sioux | 80\% | 1\% |
| Tohono O'Odham | 57\% | 5\% |
| Ute | na | 6\% |
| Yakama | na | 5\% |
| Yaqui | 67\% |  |
| Yuman | 31\% | 6\% |
| All other tribes | 14\% | 1\% |
| American Indian; Not Specified | 64\% | 3\% |
| Alaska Native Tribes; Specified | na | 1\% |
| Alaska Athabaskan | na | 4\% |
| Aleut | na |  |
| Eskimo | na | 1\% |
| Tlingit-Haida | na |  |
| All other tribes | na |  |
| Alaska Native; Not Specified | 87\% |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native; N c | 29\% |  |

## Page 7
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## 

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work (occupation) and where they work (by industry).
Employment by Occupation, 2013

|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 82,623 | 141,864,697 |
| Management, protessional, \& related | 25,404 | 51,341,226 |
| Serice | 19,734 | 25,645,065 |
| Sales and office | 20,862 | 34,957,520 |
| Farming, fishing, and forestry | 335 | 1,030,881 |
| Constuction, extraction, maint, \& repair | 9,020 | 11,832,435 |
| Production, transportation, \& material movins | 7,268 | 17,057,570 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Management, protessional, \& related | 30.7\% | 36.2\% |
| Serice | 23.9\% | 18.1\% |
| Sales and office | 25.2\% | 24.6\% |
| Farming, fishing, and forestry | 0.4\% | 0.7\% |
| Construction, extraction, maint. \& repair | 10.9\% | 8.3\% |
| Production, transportation, \& material movins | 8.8\% | 12.0\% |

 characteristics during this period.
Employment by Industry, 2013*

|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 82,623 | 141,864,697 |
| Agriculture, foresty, fishing \& hunting, minin | 2,117 | 2,731,302 |
| Constuction | 6,658 | 8,864,481 |
| Manutacturing | 4,345 | 14,867,423 |
| Wholesale trade | 1,886 | 3,937,876 |
| Retail trade | 10,363 | 16,415,217 |
| Transportation, warehousing, and utilities | 3,337 | 7,010,637 |
| Intormation | 1,326 | 3,056,318 |
| Finance and insurance, and real estate | 4,672 | 9,469,756 |
| Prot, scientific, mgmt, admin., \& waste mgr | 7,149 | 15,30,528 |
| Education, heath care, \& social assistance | 19,583 | 32,871,216 |
| Afts, entertain., rec., accomodation, \& food | 11,947 | 13,262,892 |
| Other senvices, except public administration | 5.173 | 7,043,003 |
| Public administration | 4,067 | 7,034,048 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing \& hunting, minin | 2.6\% | 1.9\% |
| Construction | 8.1\% | 6.2\% |
| Manutacturing | 5.3\% | 10.5\% |
| Wholesale trade | 2.3\% | 2.8\% |
| Retail trade | 12.5\% | 11.6\% |
| Transportation, warehousing, and utilities | 4.0\% | 4.9\% |
| Information | 1.6\% | 2.2\% |
| Finance and insurance, and real estate | 5.7\% | 6.7\% |
| Prof., scientific, mgmt, admin., \& waste mgr | 8.7\% | 10.8\% |
| Education, health care, \& social assistance | 23.7\% | 23.2\% |
| Arss, entertain., rec., accomodation, \& food | 14.5\% | 9.3\% |
| Other serices, except public administration | 6.3\% | 5.0\% |
| Public administration | 4.9\% | 5.0\% |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes what people do
This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work (occupation) and where they work (by industry).
$\frac{\text { Emplorment by Occupation: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classified into occupations }}{\text { with similar job duties, skills, education, andloo training, regardess of industry. }}$
Employment by industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System
(NAICS).
Why is it Important?
Employment statistics are usually reported by industry (as with other reports in EPS.HDT). This is a usetul way to show the relative diversity of people do tor a living and the type of work they do, regardiess of the industry. For example, management and protessional occupations are people do tor a alwng and the type of work they do. regarciess ofthe industry. For example, management and professional occupations aree
generaly of higher wage and require formal education, and these occupations could exist in any number of industries for example, managers could be working for a sottware firm, a mine, or a construction company). Occupation intormation describes what people do, while employmen by industry describes where people work

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceeded with one dot) indicates between
12 and $40 \%$ : and 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy
dditional Resources
The Census Bureau provides a definition of socs: census.govihhes/wwwiliondex(overiew.htm| ${ }^{\text {P55 }}$
Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.govisocl ${ }^{(22)}$
The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for diterent types of jobs induding tad earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: blss.gov/ocol/ ${ }^{(27)}$

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

| Yavapal County, Az US |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | 1\% | 0\% |
| Management, protessional, \& related | 3\% | 0\% |
| Serice | 4\% | 0\% |
| Sales and dffice | 4\% | 0\% |
| Farming, fisting, and torestry | 29\% | 1\% |
| Construction, extraction, maint, \& repair | 6\% | 0\% |
| Production, transporation, \& material movin! | 5\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coeefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Management, protessiona, \& related | 3\% | \%\% |
| Serice | 4\% | 0\% |
| Sales and office | 4\% | 0\% |
| Farming, Ifsing, and torestry | 30\% | 0\% |
| Constuction, extraction, maint. \& repair | 6\% | 0\% |
| Production, transporation, \& material movin! | 6\% | 0\% |
| Employment by Industry, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Civilian employed population $>16$ years | ${ }^{19}$ | 0\% |
| Agriculture, frestsy, ffshing \& hunting, minin | 12\% | 0\% |
| Constuction | 6\% | 0\% |
| Manulacturing | 9\% | 0\% |
| Wholesale trade | 13\% | 0\% |
| Retail trade | 5\% | 0\% |
| Transporation, warehousing, and utilities | 10\% | 0\% |
| Intormation | 13\% | 0\% |
| Finance and insurance, and real estate | ${ }^{8 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Prot, scientific, mgmt, admin., \& waste mgr | 7\% | 0\% |
| Education, healh care, \& social assistance | 3\% | 0\% |
| Ars, entertain., rec, accomodation, \& food | ${ }^{5 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Other senices, except public administration | 7\% | 0\% |
| Pubic administation | 9\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Agriculture, foresty, fisting \& hunting, minin | 12\% | 0\% |
| Construction | 6\% | 0\% |
| Manutacturing | 9\% | 0\% |
| Wholesale trade | 13\% | 0\% |
| Retail trade | 5\% | 0\% |
| Transporation, warehousing, and utitities | 9\% | 0\% |
| Intormation | 15\% | 0\% |
| Finance and insurance, and real estate | 8\% | 0\% |
| Prof., scientific, mgmt, admin., \& waste mgr | ${ }^{7 \%}$ | 0\% |
| Education, heath care, \& socia assistance | 3\% | 0\% |
| Ats, entertain, rec., accomodation, \& food | 5\% | 0\% |
| Other serices, except public administraion | 7\% | 0\% |
| Public administration | 9\% | 0\% |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information <br> 

What do we measure on this page?
.
Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irrespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual
worked 10 or 40 hours per week, it they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year"

## Why is it important?

Otten, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, translating to ower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture
employment have consistenty been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the U.S. Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Part-time jobs (those that average less than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to
remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to
telecommute and work shorter and more fiexible hours. And, in some cases, young adutts seek out seasonal tourism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960 s. during periods of economic stability, the vast majority of parastime workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, orly about one in seven part-ime workers were involuntary (individuals wanting full-time jobs but working less than 35 hours/week).

To understand the degree to which the data on this page are reatad to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, To understand the degree to which the dala on this page ar
data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count tull time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large percent ot the employment base is either part time or seasonaly employed this may explain faling wages or rates of employment that outpace
population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

## Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOL and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation> $>40$ report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.
a

Additional Resources
Maynard, D. C. \& Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G $06-12$ (501). Available at:
A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs
ceo.usc.edulpdffico612501.pdf ${ }^{(23)}$.

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-ime employment, see: bls.gov/opub/is/pati/opbis 571 .pdf ${ }^{(29)}$.
For information on unemployment, run the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

## Data Sources

u.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.

| Labor Participation Characteristics, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AZ | J.S. |
| Population 16 to 64 | 0\% | 0\% |
| WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: |  |  |
| Worked 50 to 52 weeks | 2\% | 0\% |
| Worked 27 to 49 weeks | 4\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 26 weeks | 4\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | \% | 0\% |
| HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: |  |  |
| Worked 35 or more hours per week | 2\% | 0\% |
| Worked 15 to 34 hours per week | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 14 hours per week | 8\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 2\% | 0\% |
| Mean usual hours worked for workers | 1\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: |  |  |
| Worked 50 to 52 weeks | 2\% | 0\% |
| Worked 27 to 49 weeks | 5\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 26 weeks | 5\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 2\% | 0\% |
| HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: |  |  |
| Worked 35 or more hours per week | 2\% | 0\% |
| Worked 15 to 34 hours per week | 3\% | 0\% |
| Worked 1 to 14 hours per week | 8\% | 0\% |
| Did not work | 2\% | 0\% |

＊+ 相
This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work．

Commuting Characteristics，2013＊

|  |  | Yavapai County，Az | u．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over |  | 80，247 | 139，786，639 |
| PLACE OF WORK： |  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence |  | 73，343 | 101，321，530 |
| Worked ousside county of residence |  | 6，904 | 38，465，109 |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK： |  |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes |  | 16，191 | 18，023，639 |
| 10 to 14 minutes |  | 12，359 | 19，150，654 |
| 15 to 19 minutes |  | 11，516 | 20，753，054 |
| 20 to 24 minutes |  | 9，940 | 19，796，414 |
| 25 to 29 minutes |  | 4，412 | 8，189，640 |
| 30 to 34 minutes |  | 9，427 | 18，220，851 |
| 35 to 39 minutes |  | 1，662 | 3，673，571 |
| 40 to 44 minutes |  | 1，621 | 4，920，004 |
| 45 to 59 minutes |  | 3，178 | 10，154，523 |
| 60 or more minutes |  | 4，355 | 10，857，904 |
| Mean travel time to work（minutes） |  | 22 | 26 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  |
| PLACE OF WORK： |  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence |  | 91．4\％ | 72．5\％ |
| Worked outside countv of residence |  | 8．6\％ | 27．5\％ |
| TRAVEL TIME TO WORK： |  |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes |  | 20．2\％ | 12．9\％ |
| 10 to 14 minutes |  | 15．4\％ | 13．7\％ |
| 15 to 19 minutes |  | 14．4\％ | 14．8\％ |
| 20 to 24 minutes |  | 12．4\％ | 14．2\％ |
| 25 to 29 minutes |  | 5．5\％ | 5．9\％ |
| 30 to 34 minutes |  | 11．7\％ | 13．0\％ |
| 35 to 39 minutes |  | 2．1\％ | 2．6\％ |
| 40 to 44 minutes |  | 2．0\％ | 3．5\％ |
| 45 to 59 minutes |  | 4．0\％ | 7．3\％ |
| 60 or more minutes |  | 5．4\％ | 7．8\％ |
| ＊The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009－2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period． |  |  |  |
| －In the 2009－2013 period，the U．S．had the highest estimated percent of people that worked outside the county of residence （27．5\％），and Yavapai County，AZ had the lowest（ $8.6 \%$ ）． | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ 90 \% \end{gathered}$ | W\％O |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80\% } \\ & 70 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70\% } \\ & 60 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | $60 \%$ $50 \%$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & 30 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 10 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 10\％ | Yavapai County，AZ | u．s． |
|  | －Worked outside county of residence |  |  |
|  |  | －Worked in county of residence |  |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## ＊ What do we measure on this page？ <br> What do we measure on this page？ This page describes workers who do not work

Place of Work：The values reported under＂place of work＂describe the number of workers that tive in the selected geographic area who worked
either in or outside the county they live in．If the selected geography is not a county，the workers may or may not work within the selected
 residents that worked in Maricopa County（but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix）．

## Why is it important？

－High rates of out－commuting are more common in non－metro areas，and in parts of the U．S．where communities are closer together．
Economic development is sometimes affected by commuting in unantitipated ways：strategies aimed at increasing iobs in a community will not
necessarily mean jobs for residents．Conversely，creating job opportunitites for residents does not always require bringing iobs into that necessarily mean jobs for residents．Conversely，creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing jobs into that
community．
High out－commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for services，complicating fiscal planning for local governments．
＂Bedroom communities，＂those with high levels of out－commuting，may struggle to provide social services，housing，and water and sewer
＂Becrioom communities，＂those with high levels of out－commuting，may struggle to provide social services，housing，and waver and sewer
facilities without an adequate source of evevue．Higherl levels and longed distance of commuting likely indicate a housing－job imbalance．This
can result from unafordable housing prices or other residential constraints．

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient tof variation＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $400 \%$ and RED BOLD（preceded with two dotss）indiciates a coefficient of variation $>$
a report，we wuggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale．

Additional Resources
Aldrich，L．，Beale，B．and K．Kasse．1997．Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places．Rural Development Aldrich，L．．．Beale，B．and K．Kasse． 1997 ．Commuting and the EConomic Function
Perspectives 12 （3）ers．usda．gov／Publications／RDP／RDP697／RDP697e．puf ${ }^{\text {（30）}}$ ．

Data Sources
U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey office，Washington，D．c．

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．

| Yavapai comm，Az U． |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over | 1\％ | 0\％ |
|  |  |  |
| Worked in county of residence | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| TRAVEL TME TO Work： |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Less than 10 minutes | 5\％ | \％ |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| 25.1029 minutes | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| 351039 minutes | 14\％ | 0\％ |
| 40 to 44 minues | 16\％ | 0\％ |
| 451059 minutes | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| 60 or more minutes | 8\％ | 0\％ |
| Mean tavel lime to work（minutes） | 3\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation PLACE OF WORK： |  |  |
| Worked in couny of residence | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| TRAVEL TME To Work： |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Less than 10 minues | ${ }^{5 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| 251029 minutes | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| ${ }^{30} 1034$ minues | ${ }^{6 \%}$ | ${ }^{0 \%}$ |
| 351039 minues | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| 4050044 minues | 15\％ | 0\％ |
| 451059 minutes | ${ }^{9 \%}$ | 0\％ |
| 60 or more minutes | 8\％ |  |




| Household Income Distribution, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | y, Az | U.S. |
| Per-Capita Income | 2\% | 0\% |
| Median Household income^ ${ }^{\wedge}$ (2013) \$s | 2\% | 0\% |
| Total Households | 1\% | 0\% |
| Less than \$10,000 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 7\% | 0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 4\% | 0\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 4\% | 0\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 4\% | 0\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 3\% | 0\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 8\% | 0\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 11\% | 0\% |
| Gini Coefficient | 2\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 6\% | 0\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 7\% | 0\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 4\% | 0\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 4\% | 0\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 4\% | 0\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 3\% | 0\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 5\% | 0\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 8\% | 0\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 13\% | 0\% |

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line．
Poverty：Following the Office of Management and Budget＇s Directive 14，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by
family size and composition to detect who is poor．If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty family size and composition to detect who is poor．．f the total income for a amily or an unrelated in
threshold，then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level．
Poverty，2013＊

|  | Yevapai County，Az | U．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 208，864 | 303，692，076 |
| Families | 56,865 | 76，744，358 |
| People Below Poverty | 33，026 | 46，663，433 |
| Families below povery | 6，118 | 8，666，630 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| People Below Poverty | 15．8\％ | 15．4\％ |
| Families below poverty | 10．8\％ | 11．3\％ | The data in this table are calcula）．

characteristics during this period．

－Percent below poverty level by age and family type is calculated by dividing the number of people by demographic in poverty by the
total population of that demogaphic． otal population of that demographic．

Data Sources：U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey Office，Washington，D．C．

```
Study Guide and Supplemental Information
```


## 

```
What do we measure on this page？
This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line．
Family：A group of two or more people who reside together and who are related by birth，marriage，or adoption．
Poverty：Following the office of Management and Budgets Directive 14 ，the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor．It he total income for a ammily or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold，
then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being＂below the poverty level
Why is it important？
Poverty is an important indicator of economic well－being．For public land managers，understanding the extent of poverty is important for several reasons．First，people with limited income may have different needs，values，and attitudes as they relate to public lands．Second，proposed activies on pubil lands may need to be analy zed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvanaged could experience ．
Poverty rates are often reported in aggregate，which can hide important differences．The bottom table shows poverty for various types of
individuals and families．This is in indormation（for example，the poverty rate for singe aggregate poverty rates（for example，families below poverty）may hide some important
```


## Methods

```
Data accuracy is indicated as follows：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation \(<12 \%\) ；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and \(40 \%\) ；and RED BOLD（preceded with wo dots）indicates a coefficient of variation \(>40 \%\) ．If data have consistently low accuracey through \(a \quad\) report，we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale．
Additional Resources
For more information on rural poverty，see U．S．Department of Agriculture，Economic Research Service，Briefing Room，＂Rural Income，Poverty． and Welfare：High Poverty Counties＂available at：ers．usda．govtropics／rural－economy－population／fural－poverty－well－being．aspx \({ }^{\text {（33）}}\)
The University of Michigan＇s National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States．See： wow．npc．umich．edu／poverty \({ }^{(360}\)
The U．S．Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental Justice as＂the fair treatment and meaningtul involvement of al people
regardless of race，color，national origin，or income with respect to the development，implementation，and entorcement of environmental laws， eys enylans，and policies．＂Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at epa gov／compliance／a
```


## Data Sources

```
U．S．Department of Commerce．2013．Census Bureau，American Community Survey office，Washington，D．C．
```


## Poverty，Coefficients of Variation

|  | Yavapai County，AZ | u．s． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent of Total，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Individuals Below Poverty | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Families Below Poverty | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family Type，Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Yavapai Count，Az | U．S． |
| People | 5\％ | 0\％ |
| Under 18 years | 6\％ | 0\％ |
| 65 years and older | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| Families | 7\％ | 0\％ |
| Families with related children＜ 18 years | 10\％ | 0\％ |
| Married couple families | 9\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜ 18 years | 15\％ | 1\％ |
| Female householder，no husband present | 13\％ | 0\％ |
| with children＜18 years | 15\％ | 0\％ |


|  |  | *口湯 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty. |  |  |
| Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. |  |  |
| Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity^, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population (all races) in Poverty | 33,026 | 46,663,433 |
| White alone | 29,118 | 28,254,647 |
| Black or African American alone | 241 | 10,165,935 |
| American Indian alone | 1,698 | 701,439 |
| Asian alone | 187 | 1,872,394 |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 13 | 99,943 |
| Some other race | 1,092 | 3,872,191 |
| Two or more races | 677 | 1,696,884 |
| All Ethnicities in Poverty |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,550 | 12,507,866 |
| Not Hispanic or Lationo (of any race) | 25.476 | 34,155,567 |
| Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) |  |  |
| White alone | 88.2\% | 60.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 0.7\% | 21.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 5.1\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 0.6\% | 4.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth. Pacificic is. alone | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| Some other race | 3.3\% | 8.3\% |
| Two or more races | 2.0\% | 3.6\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 22.9\% | 26.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 77.1\% | 73.2\% |
| ${ }^{\text {n Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or }}$ ethnic category by the total population. <br> *The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period. |  |  |
| Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty-, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| White alone | 15.1\% | 12.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 21.7\% | 27.1\% |
| American Indian alone | 39.5\% | 28.6\% |
| Asian alone | 11.6\% | 12.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 28.3\% | 19.6\% |
| Some other race alone | 22.5\% | 26.8\% |
| Two or more races alone | 14.8\% | 20.1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 26.5\% | 24.7\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 13.6\% | 10.6\% |
| -Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is ca race. | umber of people by rac | lation of that |
| Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C. |  |  |
| Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population (all races) | 5\% | 0\% |
| White alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 31\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 16\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 34\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 103\% | 2\% |
| Some other race | 32\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 21\% | 0\% |
| All Ethnicities |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 11\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 7\% | 1\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| White alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 33\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 17\% | 0\% |
| Asian alone | 32\% | \%\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oth.Pacific is. alone | 154\% | 0\% |
| Some other race | 33\% | 1\% |
| Two or more races | 21\% | 0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 0\% | 0\% |
| Not Hispanic/Latino | 3\% | 0\% |
| Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.s. |
| White alone | 5\% | 0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 33\% | 0\% |
| American Indian alone | 17\% | 1\% |
| Asian alone | 68\% | 1\% |
| Native Hawaiian \& Oceanic alone | 2053\% | 18\% |
| Some other race alone | $34 \%$ | 1\% |
| Two or more races alone | 24\% | 1\% |
| Hispanic or Latino alone | 11\% | 0\% |
| Non-Hispanic/Latino alone | 5\% | 1\% |


| * * **** W**- |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source. |  |  |
| Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013* |  |  |
|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| Total households: | 91,349 | 115,610,216 |
| Labor earnings | 58,575 | 90,436,935 |
| Social Security (SS) | 43,545 | 33,386,448 |
| Retirement income | 26,611 | 20,504,523 |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 4.070 | 5,716,592 |
| Cash public assistance income | 1,816 | 3,255,213 |
| Food Stamp/SNAP | 11,676 | 14,339,330 |
| Percent of Total^ |  |  |
| Labor earnings | 64.1\% | 78.2\% |
| Social Security (SS) | 47.7\% | 28.9\% |
| Retirement income | 29.1\% | 17.7\% |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 4.5\% | 4.9\% |
| Cash public assistance income | 2.0\% | 2.8\% |
| Food Stamp/SNAP | 12.8\% | 12.4\% |

^Total may add to more than $100 \%$ due to households receiving more than 1 source of income.
-The datai in this tatle are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during $2009-2013$ and are representative of average
characteristics during this period.
Percent of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013*

- In the 2009-2013 period, the highest
the Yavapai Conto pubic assistance in
the Yavapai County AZ was in the form
Social Security (SS) (47.7\%), and the
lowest was in the form of C Cash public
assistance income ( $2.0 \%$ ).

Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean earnings | \$52,562 | \$75,017 |
| Mean Social Security income | \$18,066 | \$17,189 |
| Mean retirement income | \$25,128 | \$23,589 |
| Mean Supplemental Security Income | \$8,693 | \$9,152 |
| Mean cash public assistance income | \$2.624 | \$3,808 |

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


Educational Attainment, 2013*


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

|  | Yavapai Count, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population 25 yrs or older | 0\% | 0\% |
| No high school degree | 4\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 1\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 4\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| No high school degree | 4\% | 0\% |
| High school graduate | 1\% | 0\% |
| Associates degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2\% | 0\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional | 4\% | 0\% |
| School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
|  | Yavapai Count, Az | U.S. |
| Total Population over 3 years old: | 0\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in school: | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 12\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in kindergarten | 10\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 5\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 13\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Enrolled in school: | 2\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in nursery school, preschool | 13\% | 0\% |
| Enroled in kindergarten | 11\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea | 5\% | 0\% |
| Graduate or professional school | 16\% | 0\% |
| Not enrolled in school | 0\% | 0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

* tovoz*

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes levels of education attainment
Educational Attainment: This refers to the evel of education completed by people 25 years and over in terms of the highest degree or the
highest level of schooling completed
School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private
school or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interview. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business


Why is it important?
Sucaies show that geograshies with a higher than average educated worktorce growew faster, have have higher incoumes, and sust suffer less during tudies show that geographies with a higher than average educated worktorce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during
conomic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geographic areas migh
and outreach efforts could be tailored to differentent audiences.
Shool enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age access to education. and potential for future growh. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

Methods
Dala accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low ccuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale

Additional Resources
For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-found employment, and unemployment rates, see:
The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.goviemplep_chart_001.htm (41),
U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available
at: census.goviprod/2002pubs/(p23-210.pdf ( 42 ).

Card, David (1999). The Causal Effect of Educ
vol. 3A. New York: Flseverer. po. $1801-63$.
vol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey office, Washington, D.C.


Study Guide and Supplemental Information **
What do we measure on this page?
This page measures the primary language people speak at home.
Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English
language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.
Why is it important?
For public land managers who are tring to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent to public clands, it its important to know whether
a significant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation a sigiticant portion of that population has trouble s.
may need to be conducted in multipiel languages.
Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates betwe
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy
12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with wo dots indicates a coefticient of variation $>40 \%$. It data have consistenty low accuracy
throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United
States. This tool is available at
Data Sources
S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.


大 1 人

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built
Housing Characteristics, 2013*


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and
$\frac{\text { Rent The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied }}{\text { vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview. }}$
$\frac{\text { For Seasonal. Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other }}{\text { Oche }}$
For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

Why is it important?
Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data is used to assess the demand for housing, to identity housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing market over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic
levels.
Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirabiility of a place for recreation and tourism. This could aso be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990 and early 2000 were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when
housing grew ata a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the erlative growth rates of housing is nousing grew at a fast rate (hhe late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country.) Understanding the relative grownt rates of housing is home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast future demand of services, such as energy consumption and fire protection.
Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop

Methods
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12\%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout and
a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources
For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see.
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Yavapai Count, Az | U.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Housing Units | 0\% | 0\% |
| Occupied | 1\% | 0\% |
| Vacant | 3\% | 1\% |
| For rent | 15\% | 1\% |
| Rented, not occupied | 48\% | 1\% |
| For sale only | 12\% | 1\% |
| Sold, not occupied | 27\% | 1\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional | 4\% | 0\% |
| For migrant workers | 76\% | 2\% |
| Other vacant | 9\% | 1\% |
| Year Built |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later | 26\% | 0\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Buill 1980 to 1989 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Built 1959 or earlier | 5\% | 0\% |
| Median year structure built | 0\% | 0\% |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Occupancy |  |  |
| Occupied | 1\% | 0\% |
| Vacant | 3\% | 1\% |
| For rent | 16\% | 0\% |
| Rented, not occupied | 63\% | 0\% |
| For sale only | 13\% | 0\% |
| Sold, not occupied | 19\% | 0\% |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional | 4\% | 0\% |
| For migrant workers | 0\% | 0\% |
| Other vacant | 9\% | 2\% |
| Year Built |  |  |
| Built 2005 or later | 19\% | 0\% |
| Built 2000 to 2004 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Built 1990 to 1999 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1980 to 1989 | 3\% | 0\% |
| Built 1970 to 1979 | 4\% | 0\% |
| Built 1960 to 1969 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Built 1959 or earlier | 5\% | 0\% |

*]
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

## 丸 <br> What do we measure on this page?

This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.
$\frac{\text { owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid }}{\text { for. }}$
Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.
Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs,
and condominium fees.

- $x$
$\frac{\text { Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilites (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels }}{\text { (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) if these are paid for by the renter (or paid for the renter by someone else). }}$

Why is it important?
An important indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share
devoted to housing that is below 15 percent is a good proxy for highly affordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

## Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 pe
excessive (or unaffordable) housing costs shat exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.
Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation $<12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40\%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >40\%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

## Additional Resources

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey has additional information on housing and housing affordability. See:

For housing prices, for--profit online real-estate services may have the most recent price information. See, for example, zillow.com ${ }^{45}$
For current calculations on housing affordabiility, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at
realtor.org/research/research/housinginx ${ }^{(46)}$.

## Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the
highest estimated monthly gross rent for
highest estimated monthly gross rent for
renter-ccupied hom
renter-occupied homes (\$904), and
Yavapai county,


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C

|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner-occupied housing units with a |  |  |
| morgage Monthly cost $<15 \%$ of household income | 6.4\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 3.7\% | 0.1\% |
| Specified renter-occupied units | 2.4\% | 0.20 |
| Gross rent < $15 \%$ of household income | 8.0\% | 0.3\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 4.5\% | 0.19 |
| Median monthly mortgage cost^ | 1.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Median gross rent^ | 1.6\% | 0.19 |
| Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation |  |  |
| Monthly cost $<15 \%$ of household income | 6.3\% | 0.3\% |
| Monthly cost $>30 \%$ of household income | 3.7\% | 0.2\% |
| Gross rent $<15 \%$ of household income | 8.3\% | 0.6\% |
| Gross rent $>30 \%$ of household income | 4.5\% |  |



This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators fom the region to the United States.
The term "benchmark" in this report should not be construed as having the same meaning as in the National Forest Management Act.
$\frac{\text { Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identity. The }}{\text { Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in } 1997 \text { for how the Federal govermment collects and presents data on race and }}$
Office of M
ethnicity.
Povery:F Following the Otfice of Management and Budgets Directive 14 , the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by tamily
size and composition to detect who is poor. It the total income tor a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant povery threshold,
 classtifed as being "below the poverty leve.


Social Security. Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability ssurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.
Retirement Income: Consists of tamilies that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benentits from a former employer, labor

does not include Social security income.

## Why is it important?

This page shows a quick comparison of a number of indicators covered in this report to highlight where the region is different trom the U.S.
It also offers an at-a-glance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a can help public land managers identity groups of people and aspects of hardship that can aid with outreach and consideration of whether the
impacts of land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on disadvantaged people or places.

Methods
The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure trom the region by the figure trom the U.S.
 12 and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceeded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy

Nedian Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability
ated bis usin characterisitics during this period.

The Yavapai County AZ is most different trom the U.S. in Percent Population American
$(\% \%$ change, 2000-2013
Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

|  | Region | us |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population Growh (\% change, 2000-2009*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Age (2009*) | 0.1\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population White Alone (2009*) | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (209*) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native | 5.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Population "Baby | 1.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Median Family Income (2009*) | 1.8\% | 0.1\% |
| Per Capita Income (2009*) | 2.0\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*) | 4.6\% | 0.4\% |
| Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*) | 7.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Households with Retirement and Social | 1.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income | 3.5\% | 0.3\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High | 4.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's | 2.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Percent Population That Speak English Less Than | 8.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*) | 4.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 3.7\% | 0.2\% |
| Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than $30 \%$ of | 4.5\% | 0.1\% |

EPS－HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：
－ 2000 Decennial U．S．Census
Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750

## －American Community Survey

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce．
http：／／www．census．gov
Tel．303－969－7750
The on－line ACS data retrieval tool is available at：
http：／／www．census．gov／acs／www／

## ＊柬縕紫 <br> EPS－HDT core approaches

EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－Regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## About the American Community Survey（ACS）

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1－3，all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey（ACS）of the Census Bureau．

The ACS is a nation－wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic，social，economic，and housing information about communities every year－information that until recently was only available once a decade．The ACS is not the same as the decennial census，which is conducted every ten years（the ACS has replaced the detailed，Census 2000 long－form questionnaire）．

Data used in this report are 5 －year ACS estimates．Moreso than the 1 or 3 －year estimates，the 5 －year estimates are consistently available for small geographies，such as towns．We show 5 －year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross－geography comparisons．The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period，only what the average value is over the full period．

Because ACS is based on a survey，it is subject to error．The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error（MOE）for every data point．In this report，we alert the user to the data accuracy using color－coded text in the tables：BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation（CV）＜12\％；ORANGE（preceded with one dot）indicates between 12 and $40 \%$ ；and RED BOLD （preceded with two dots）indicates a CV $>40 \%$ ．

The CV is a measure of relative error in the estimate，and is calculated directly from the MOE as the ratio of the standard error to the estimate itself．To get the standard error，the MOE is divided by 1.645 （for a 90 percent confidence interval）．The CV is expressed as a percentage．For example，if you have an estimate of $60+/-20$ ，the CV for the estimate is 20.3 percent．This estimate should be used with caution，since the sampling error represents more than 20 percent of the estimate．

## 成米日

## 

headwaterseconomics．org／eps－hdt

## 

Throughout this report，references to on－line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses．These resources are provided as hyperlinks here．

```
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej guidance nepa ceq1297.pdf
www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology main/
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
www.epa.gov/compliance/ej
www.stateoftheusa.org
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
www.frey-demographer.org
www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging statistics/index.aspx
www.census.gov/popest/
www.countyhealthrankings.org/
www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
uww.census.gov/population/age/
www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg 1997standards
www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22 cspan hispanics.pdf
www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard 10pg.pdf
www.bia.gov/index.htm
uww.indians.org/index.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
www.bls.gov/soc/
www.bls.gov/ocol
www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
uww.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009 ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
www.bls.gov/emp/ep chart 001.htm
www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
www.mla.org/map single
www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
www.zillow.com
www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
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headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

uww.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Land Ownership

What is the breakdown of land ownership? 1
What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 2
What are the different types of federal lands? 3
Land Cover
What is the breakdown of forest, grassland, and other land cover types?
4

Residential Development

What are the trends in residential land-use conversion? ..... 5-6
Data Sources \& Methods ..... 7
Links to Additional Resources ..... 8

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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## 

This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
U.S. Forest Service Land Types (Acres), 2009

|  | Yavapai County, Az | U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Area | 5,201,845 | 2,286,279,509 |
| Forest Service Lands | 1,969,331 | 192,750,310 |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 1,639,791 | 146,630,207 |
| National Wiiderness | 318,232 | 36,155,579 |
| National Monument | 0 | 3,661,327 |
| National Recreation Area | 0 | 2,950,660 |
| National Game Refuge | 0 | 1,198,099 |
| National Wild River | 5,168 | 568,059 |
| National Recreation River | 1,131 | 398,207 |
| National Scenic River | 5,009 | 289,617 |
| National Scenic Area | 0 | 230,459 |
| Primitive Area | 0 | 173,762 |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0 | 167,427 |
| Special Management Area | 0 | 164,707 |
| Protection Area | 0 | 45,051 |
| Recreation Management Area | 0 | 43,900 |
| National Scenic and Wildlife Area | 0 | 39,171 |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0 | 12,645 |
| National Botanical Area | 0 | 8,256 |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0 | 6,637 |
| National Historic Area | 0 | 6.540 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Forest Service Lands | 37.9\% | 8.4\% |
| Unspecified Designated Area Type | 31.5\% | 6.4\% |
| National Wilderness | 6.1\% | 1.6\% |
| National Monument | 0.0\% | 0.2\% |
| National Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Game Refuge | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| National Wild River | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| National Recreation River | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic River | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Primitive Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Volcanic Monument | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Special Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Protection Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Recreation Management Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Wildilife Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Scenic Recreation Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Botanical Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Scenic and Research Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| National Historic Area | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

Study Guide and Supplemental Information


What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the size (in acres) and share of different Forest Service land designations.
Note: All acreages on this page were reported by the U.S. Forest Services' Land Areas Report 2009. The total acreage of Forest Service land
on this page may differ from that reported on previous page due to differences in values reported by the data sources.
Why is it important?
orest Service lands have speecial designations scat may maferect Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forent Semic value lands and uses of associal desiated landions.

Methods
County specific acreages for Forest Service National Game Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia
Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.
Additional Resources
A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available
at.ts. fed. us/land/statillar/2009/larogindex.htm/ ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$

Data Sources
USDA, FS - Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database





8 \&
The EPS-HDT Land-Use report uses national data sources to represent land cover and residential development. In an effort to report more accurate statistics for land ownership, a compilation of state level data was used. All the data in this report were the result of calculations made in Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- TIGER/Line County Boundaries 2012

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/data/tiger.html

- Developed Areas 2000 and 2010

Theobald, DM. 2013. Land use classes for ICLUS/SERGoM v2013. Unpublished report, Colorado State University.

- Protected Areas Database v 1.32012
U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006

National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm

- USDA, Forest Service

Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html

## 

EPS-HDT core approaches
EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-county regions, to accommodate a flexible range of userdefined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
www.nhd.usgs.gov
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.htm|
www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions of terms.htm
headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php
```
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## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.
For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org, or 406-599-7425.


HEADWATERS
ECONOMICS
headwaterseconomics.org
Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.

www.blm.gov

The Bureau of Land Management, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.


The Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.
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## Note to Users:

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.

Components of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.. U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Asthington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Widlife Sevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of titerior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes all federal land paym
This page describes all federal land payments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin.
Cederal land payments: These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals).
Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is orest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local $\frac{\text { Forest Service Revenue Sharing: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools. }}{\text { Payments include the } 25 \% \text { Fund, Secure Rural Schools \& Community Self-Determination Act, and Bankhead--Iones Forest Grasslands. }}$

BLM Revenue Sharing: The BLM shares a portion of receipts generated on public lands with state and local governments, including grazing fee Hough the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California ( $O \& C$ ) grant lands.
USFWS Refuge: These payments share a portion of receipts from National Wildlife Refigges and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located.
$\frac{\text { Federal Mineral Royalies: These payments are distributed to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may }}{\text { Share at their discretion: }}$ Federal Fiscal Year: FY refers to the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1 and ends September 30 .

Why is it important?
State and local govermment cannot tax federally owned lands the way they would if the land were privately owned. A number of federal programs exist to compensate county yovernments for the eresence of ef edearal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of
local govermment revenue in rural counties with lagge feedera land holdings.

Before 1976, all federal payments were linked directly to receipts generated on public lands. Congress funded PILT with appropriations begining in 19 in recognition of the volatility and Inadequacy of ederara revenue sharing programs. PIL was intended to stabilize and crease federal land payments to county govermments. More recently, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of
2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receits. SRS received broad suport because it addressed several maior concerm around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment level, and the incentives provided to counties by linking federal land payments directly to extractive uses of public lands.
PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget concern are creating uncertainty for the future of both.
Methods
Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, Data Limitations. Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported du
Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively insignificant at the federal level (data gaps on local distributions of
USFWS Refuge revenue sharing is less than one percent of total federal land payments in FFY 2009) but may be important to specific loca governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royalties represent a more significant omission in states that share a portion governments with significant USFW S acreage. Federal mineal royaties represent a more significant omission in states thas
royalties with local governments. Federal mineral royalties made up $68 \%$ of federal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.
Gorte, Ross W.. M. Lyrne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic import
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdtt ${ }^{(1)}$
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009 . Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## ****



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of
 Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Fish and Wiidlifie Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Departmen interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources
tww.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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What do we measure on this page?
This page derne

Why is it important?
A variety of state and local governments receive federal land payments, and the way these payments are distributed explains who benefits. For example. PLLT is directed to county government only while USFS payments are shared between county government and schools. II USSS
payments decine, payments decine, the PILT formula ensures that county govemment payments will increase, but school districts will not share in the increased
PILT payments. While PILT and SRS have decoupled local government payments trom commercial activities on public lands, al the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalties, BLM revenue sharing payments) are still inked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legistators and govemors have a different set of expectations and incentives to lobby for particular outcomes on public lands than do county commissioners or school officials.

## Methods

State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) federal mineral royaties and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent istributions to local government according to state and federal statute (see note about data limitations). county Government Distributions: Consist of (1) PILT; (2) portions of Forest Serice payments including Secure Rural Schools and
Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Titte l and Title III, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands ; (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW Refige revenue sharing; and (5) discretionary state government distributions of federal mineral royaties where these data are available. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Titte I, 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands

Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distributions: Consist of SRS Titte II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on pub
land projects on the nationa forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and land projects on the national forest or BLM Tand where the payment oiginated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice and
recommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of special projects on federal lands as authorized under the
Secure Rural interests and areas of expertise, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national forest personnel.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments.
Grazing District Distributions: Consist t of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royaties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). -
Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Unit 4802 - Economic Aspects of Forest Management on Public Lands, Rocky Mountain Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, MT.

Gorte, Ross W.,. M. Lynne Corn, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts. Congressional Research Service Report RL30335.
Trends in federal land payments are closely tied to commodity extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of (jobs and income) of these activites, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at

Data Sources
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Sevice,
 Fish and Widllife Serice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic

This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distributed to the state
school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Government by Permitted Use, FY 2013 ( 2013 \$s)


Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What do we measure on this page?
to county governments (federal land paymets distributed to the state, school districts. grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payments.

Why is it important?
County govermments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For pay for law enforcement mandtain county roads used by logging truck and recreational traftic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with publi
the Forest Senvice, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

Methods
$\frac{\text { Unrestricted: Consist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Widlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral }}{\text { royaties from the state government. }}$
Restricted-County Roads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Title I, (2) Forest Service $25 \%$
Fund, (3) Forest Service Owl payments (between 1993 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law) mandates payments be insd for county roads and public schools. Each state determines how to split tunds between the two services.
Restricted-Special County Projects: Consist of (1) SRS Titte ill funds that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, protection plans.

Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royalties and some BLM payments, and these data may not be
available). available).

Additional Resources
An Inquiry into Selected Aspects of Revenue Sharing on Federal Lands. 2002. A report to The Forest County Payments Committee, Washington, D.C. by Research Un
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.

Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Idditional sources and methods available a., U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Offic
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## This pape compares federal land payments as a a proporion or total general county government revenues, based on loc government tinancial data entered directly into the table by the user.

$\frac{\text { Instructions: Use the Interactive Table below to input data (enter data only in the shaded cells). Data entered will automatically }}{\text { update the table and figures below. See the instuctions in the Sudy }}$ ( Guide for help on where to to find count data.
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## What do we measure on this page?

Proportion of total general county government reveruus, based on local government financial
y is it important?
 Instructions
 Financial Statemente
figures on this page
Audied Financial Satements: Most states require county governments 10 complete annual audits of government financial reports and tor report these to the state. Audited anvual financial statements are the best source for Iocal financial data because they report st
general county goverment
 are nos standardizized across local govermments and some work may be required to understand the accounting basis tor these reports. 2. Enter Federal Land Payments Datax Fill in the shaded cells in the interactive Table with federal land payments datat oro the year immediately
prior to the year for which you entered goverment t inancial data These datac can be found on page 2 of this report, or in the tidden "calcs" prior to the year tor which you enered government finacial datat These data can b
worksheet. To unhide worksheets. fight cicick on any worksheet tab and dick unhide.
3 Update Tex in Tables, Figures, and Bulles: Table and figure headings and bullets that describe the reporing period and geographies covered must te updated to toffect the year of datai enterecd, and the geographies sovered.

Additional Resources
Honade If y you have que
570.5626 .

## Data Sources




Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C. U. U.S. Department
of f nterior. 2009. Payment



## 


This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PLTT).
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*     * 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)
Congress authorized PILT in 1976 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of federal revenue sharing payment programs to compens sharing payments by paying counties based ther borders (Public Law $94-565$ ). PILT increases and stabilizes county government revenue sharing payments by paying countie
and is subject to a population cap.
Alow average per-acre PLLT payment may indicate significant revenue sharing payments from the previous year or that the county's population
Alow average per-acre PLT payment may indicate signiticant rev.
is below the population cap that limits the base per acre payment.
PILT is permanently authorized, but congress must appropriate funding on an annual basis. PILT was typically not fully funded until FY 2008
when counties received a guarantee of five years at tull payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Why is it important?
As county payments became more important to local goverrmment atter wwil (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-wa
housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PIIT increased and stablized payments by housing and economic growin), Volatitity became an issue. PILT increased and stabilized payments by tunding counties from congressional local government services, but can be used at the discretion of county commissioners to tund any local government needs.

Additional Resources
Th.S. Department of the Interior maintains an online searchable database of PILT payments and eligible PILT acres by county and state total. Data are available back to FY 1999 at: doi.gov/(nbccindex.cfm ${ }^{(4)}$

Schuster, Envin G. 1995. PILT - Its Purpose and Performance. Journal of Forestry. 93(8):31-35.
Corn, M. Lynne. 2008. PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes): Somewhat Simplified. Congressional Research Service Report RL31392.

Data Sources
S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

## *****


This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell Determination Act (SRS), 25\% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

Forest Service Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

$\qquad$

[^14]Study Guide and Supplemental Information

*     *         * 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act
U.S. Forest Service 25 Percent Fund: The $25 \%$ Fund, established in 1908 , shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced os public land with the county where the activities take place. Twenty-ive percent of the value of public land ereeeipts are diststibuted directly to
counties and must be used to tund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receits between these two local services. counties and must be used to fund roads and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local sevices.
The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS), or Public Law 106-393: SRS was enacted in FY 2001 to $\frac{\text { The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of } 2000 \text { ( (SRS), or Public Law } 106 \text {--393: SRS was enacted in FY } 2001 \text { to }}{\text { provide } 5 \text { years of transitional assistance to rural counties affected by the decline in revenue from timber havests on federal lands. SRS was }}$ reauthorized for a single year in 2007 , and again in 2008 for a period of four years. The SRS Act has three titles that allocate payments for specific purposes.
-Titte I - these payments to counties make up 80 to 85 percent of the total SRS payments and must be dedicated to funding roads and

TRACs) II - these t the communds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal
(Rake spending determinations and monitor project progress.

- Title III - these payments may be used to carry out activities under the Firewise Communities program, to reimburse the county for search
and rescue and other emergency services, and to develop community wildfire protection plans.
$\frac{\text { What is the Relationship Between the } 25 \% \text { Fund and SRS? Counties elect to receive Secure Rural Schools Payments, or to continue with } 25 \%}{\text { Fund payments. Most counties have elected to receive Secure Rural Schools payments. Some counties, particularly in the East, continue to }}$ prefer $25 \%$ Fund payments to Secure Rural Schools.
Forest Grasslands: Forest Grasslands are lands acquired by the Forest Service through the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 (P.L. 75 . 210). The Act authorized acquisition of damaged lands to rehabilitate and use them for various purposes. Receipts from activities on Forest
Grasslands are shared directly with county governments.

Special Acts: These include Payments to Minnesota (Act of June 22, 1948 , 16 U.S.C. 577 ), payments associated with the Quinault Special
Management Area in Washingto (P.L. $100-638,102$ Stat. 3327 ), and receipts from the sale of quartz from the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas (\$423, Interior Appropriations Act tor FY1989; P.L. 100-446, 102 Stat. 17744 ). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment ( $75 \%$ of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of titber receietst from the Quinault Special Management Area with both the Quinault Indian Tribe and with the State of than being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkansas counties with Ouachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

Why is it important?
USFS revenue sharing is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royalties are distributed to tates). For some counties it provides a significane porion total ocal govern ment ieverwe. Payments becas imber harvests on the National Forests increased sharply in response to post-war housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shitted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "Ow" "transition payments in the Pacific Northwest, and later extended the concept of
transition payments nationally in 2000 with the SRS
county payments sRS changed USFS Revenue sharing in three fundamental ways: SRS (1) decoupled frough Title II funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment equity concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Titte I formula is adjusted using each county's per capita personal income).

SRS transition payments are only authorized through FY 2011, at which point Congress must decide to extend and/or reform SRS, or allow it expire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the $25 \%$ Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on
xublic land.
Additional Resources
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act payments available at: fs. usdagoov/pts/(5)
Gorte, Ross W. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties. Congressional Research Service Report RL33822.
Data Sources
.S. Deparment of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at
U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Fo
www.headwaterseconomics. org/eps-hdt

## ****

*     * 

This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived from a variety of revenue-generating activities on BLM land, including revenue from the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.

BLM Payments to States and Local Governments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  | Yavapai County, AZ | u.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total BLM Payments (\$) | 66,169 | 66,579,030 |
| Proceeds of Sales | 0 | 9,841,676 |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0 | 53,150 |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 66,169 | 12,684,340 |
| State Payments | 0 | 3,922,509 |
| National Grasslands | 0 | 447,217 |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0 | 39,630,138 |
| Title I | 0 | 33,685,617 |
| Titte II | 0 | 3,343,873 |
| Titte III | 0 | 2,600,648 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |
| Proceeds of Sales | 0.0\% | 14.8\% |
| Mineral Leasing Act | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Taylor Grazing Act | 100.0\% | 19.1\% |
| State Payments | 0.0\% | 5.9\% |
| National Grasslands | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| O\&C and CBWR land grants | 0.0\% | 59.5\% |
| Title I | 0.0\% | 50.6\% |
| Titte II | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Titte III | 0.0\% | 3.9\% |



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and nethods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hc
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes BLM payments to states and local governments. Payments are derived BLM land, including revenue trom the sale of land and materials, grazing, and minerals leasing.
Mineral Leasing Act: These include oil and Gas Right of Way lease revenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do
not include royaties from mineral leasing on BLM lands, which are distributed by the office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). For ONRR payments see worksheet 10
Taylor Grazing Act: The Taylor Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, established grazing allotments on public land and extended tenure to district
grazers. In 1936 the Grazing Service (BLM) enacted fees to be shared with the county where allotments and leases are located restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predator control, noxious weed programs) in cooperation with BLM or livestock organizazions.
 - Section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerms issuing grazing leases on public lands outside the original grazing district established under the

National Grasslands: Revenue derived from the management of National Grasslands under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act ( 7 U.s.C.
1012), and Executive Order 10787, November 6,1958 .

Oregon and Califormia Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (O\&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road
(CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. Amounts include Titte I. Title ll, and Titte payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report tor definitions and information on the Secwre Pura schools and Community Self-Determination Act).
Why is it important?
The BLM is the nation's largest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adiacent communities. Simiary, , he non-laxable status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide sevvices to county residents, and provide
public saitety and law entorcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in lieu of property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT).
Methods
 Ised. To arrive at distribution amounts trom receite and local governments. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 repo used. Some error is is likely. In addition, some rectipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table $3-31$ of BLM Public Land Statistics) was government are related to the previous $F Y$ 's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal $F Y 2008$ are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2009.)
Additional Resources
and Statistics website:
blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct_Links_to_Publications/ann_rpt_and_pls.htm( ${ }^{(6)}$

Data Source
U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available a

## 

This page describes U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge revenue sharing.

USFWS Refuge Revenue Sharing Payments, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

|  |  |  | Yavapai County, Az |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USFWS Retuge Revenue Share |  |  | 0 |  | 936,12 |
|  |  | USFwS Refuge Revenue Sharing per FY, Yavapai County AZ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 0.0$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 0.0$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 

What do we measure on this page?
This page describes U.S. Fish and Widlilife Service Refuge revenue sharing.
Twenty-five percent of the net receipts collected from the sale of various products or privileges from Refuge lands, or three-quarters of one percent $(0.75 \%)$ of the adjusted purchase price of Refuge land, whichever is greater, is shared with the counties in which the Refige is located.

Why is it important?
National Wildifife Refuges and other lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wiillife Service do not pay property taxes to local governments.
The Refuge revenue sharing program is intended to compensate counties tor non-taxable Refuge lands. As with other revenue sharing programs, these payments can be important it to compensate counties for non-taxable Reftue lands. As with other revenue sharing 1
 create incentives for local government officials to lobby for particular uses of public land.

## Methods

Data Limitations: The USFWS publishes a database of Refigge revenue sharing payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007 only, and does not make ata available for other years for the nation. Data on Refuge revenue sharing may be obtained directly from the receiving county government. County govemments may request countr-specific Refige revenue sharing payment data from U.S. Fish and Wildifife Services, Division nancial Management, Denver Operations.
Signififance of Data Limitations: Data limitations are relatively insignificant on the national scale (USFWS Refige revenue sharing payments .

Additional Resources
A detailed description of USFWS Refuge revenue sharing payments is available on the U.S. Fish and wildife Service Reaty website at tws.gov/refigess/realty/ris.htm( ${ }^{(0)}$

The Refuge Revenue Sharing Database is available at: fws._govirefuges/reaty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing_Search_2007.ctm?. The database currenty only includes payments for FY 2006 and FY 2007. The agency does not provide data for the nation for additional years

Data Sources
U.s. Departm
US. Department of Interior. 2007 U U. Fish and widlife Senvice, Washington, D.C.

## 


This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments.
Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)


Data Sources US Department of interior 2012. Office of Natura Resources Revenue Washington. D.
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What do we measure on this page?
This page describes the components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for
the region.
Royalties, rents, and bonus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49\% of revenue is returned to from offshore drilling the Gulf of Mexico (GOMESA) are shared directly with county governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of federal mineral royaties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or economically impacted by mineral development tor planning, construction/maintenance of publicic facilities, and provision of public services).

Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royaty may be an established Royalties: Royaty payments represent a stated share or poyalty rate increases by steps as the average production on the lease increases. A
 Geothermal: Geothermal payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. GOMESA: The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (GOMESA) makes distributions of offshore federal mineral royalties to coastal states and communities. The four s
Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Rents: A rent schedule is established at the time a lease is issued. Rents are annual payments, normally a fixed dolar amount per acre required to preserve the ight to a lease.
Bonuses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Bonuses represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease.
Other Revenues: A disbursement that is not a royaty, rent, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalies, settlement payments,
Why is it important?
Mineral royaties are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significant demands on federal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royalty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed Methods

Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royaly distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal

 origin and state government distributions to local governments are not published by ONRR, EPS-HDT users must contact each state directly
these data. Headwaters Economics includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Methods and Resources document.
hitp://headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdif

Additional Resources
Headwaters Economics provides a methods document specific to the EPS.-HDT Federal Lands Payments report that includes a list of state distribution policy, links to data, and contact information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Governmen nancial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS
HDT_Federal_Land_Payments_Documentation_1-30-2011.pdff ${ }^{10)}$
For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available a.
onrr.gow/Stats/pdftdocs/glossary. pfff11).
Data Sources
U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

8 \＆
The EPS－HDT Government report uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country．All data used in EPS－HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source．The contact information for databases used in this profile is：

## －U．S．Census of Governments

Census Bureau，U．S．Department of Commerce
www．census．gov／govs
Tel．800－242－2184
－U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service
Realty Division，U．S．Department of Interior
www．fws．gov
Tel．703－358－1713

## －U．S．Bureau of Land Management

U．S．Department of Interior
www．blm．gov
Tel．202－208－3801

## －U．S．Forest Service

U．S．Department of Agriculture
www．fs．fed．us
Tel．800－832－1355
－U．S．Office of Natural Resources Revenue
U．S．Department of Interior
www．onrr．gov
Tel．303－231－3078

## ＊来的卫粦

EPS－HDT core approaches
EPS－HDT is designed to focus on long－term trends across a range of important measures．Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years．We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers．

EPS－HDT displays detailed industry－level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time．

EPS－HDT employs cross－sectional benchmarking，comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions，states，and the nation，to give a sense of relative performance．

EPS－HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies，such as multi－county regions，to accommodate a flexible range of user－ defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross－sectional comparisons．

## Adjusting dollar figures for inflation

Because a dollar in the past was worth more than a dollar today，data reported in current dollar terms should be adjusted for inflation．The U．S．Department of Commerce reports personal income figures in terms of current dollars．All income data in EPS－HDT are adjusted to real（or constant）dollars using the Consumer Price Index．Figures are adjusted to the latest date for which the annual Consumer Price Index is available．

## 

## 

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## 

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

```
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
www.census.gov/govs/
www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
www.fs.usda.gov/pts/
www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct Links to Publications/ann rpt and pls.html
www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html
www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/RRS/2007/RevenueSharing Search 2007.cfm
10 headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPS-HDT Federal Land Payments Documentation 1-30-2011.pdf
www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf
```


[^0]:    This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to: headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt
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    *D
    What do we measure on this page?
    This page describes the distribution of housenold income
    $\frac{\text { Per Capiti I Icome: Total personal income divided by total population of an area. }}{\text { Housenold: A household includes all the peopie who }}$
    Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
    represents perfect inequality. The lower the Ginin coefficient, the more equal the income distribution.
     perfect inequality. Every point on the Lorenzz curve can be used to
    income," or the top _\% of households have_ of of all income."

    ## Why is it important?

    For public land managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could
    experience dispropoprionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences wwithin and experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within
    between geoographies helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing economic hardship.
    The distribution of income can help to hightight several important aspects of economic well-being. A large number of households in the lower
    end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpeted as the size of the middle class. A end of income distribution indicates economic hardschip. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpeteded as the size of the middle class. A
    figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geography characterized by "haves" and "have-nots. end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. Abuige in the midale distribution can be interpeteed as the size of he middie class. A
    figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geography characterized by "haves" and "have-nots.

    Income distribution has always been a central concern of economic theory and economic policy. Classical economists were mainly concerned with the distribution of income between the main factors of production, land, labor, and capital. Modern economists have also addressed this
    issue, but have been more concemed with the distribution of income across individuals and households.

    According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage
    gains and those at the bottom real wage losses... At the same time, long-run changes in society's living arrangements have taken place also gains and those at the bottom real wage losses.. At the same time, long-run changes in societys living arrangements have taken place also
    tending to exacertate household income differences. For example, divorces, mantial separations, birtts out of wedlock, and the increasing age at first marriage have led to a shift away from married-couple households to single-parent families and nontamily households. Since non-married-couple households tend to have lower income and less equally distributed income than other types of households... changes in household composition have been associated with growing income inequality:"

    ## Methods

    While the Census Bureau does not have an official definition of the "middle class," it does derive several measures related to the distribution of
    income and income inequality. Two standard measures ofincome equaliy are the Lerenz Cuve and the income and income inequality. Two standard measures of income equality are the Lorenz Curve and the Gini Coofficient. Mean values for each
    comot were used to calculate towal income in the case of the to income chort. income was assumed to be $\$ 250.000$, a value which tends to yield lower than actual values for income disparity. For details on how to calculate, see Additional Resources below. Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
    and $40 \%$; and RED ROLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistenty low accuracy throughout
    a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a l lagger geographic scale. a rep

    The U.S. Department of Agricullure's Economic Research Service published a usefiul aricle on metro and non-metro income levels and
    inequality. McLaughin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at:
    ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamericadra172/ra172..pdff ${ }^{(31)}$
    For useful remarks and scholarly references on the level and distribution of economic well-being, see Federal Reserve System Chairman Ben S. Bernanke's speech on February 6, 2007, available at: federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bermanke20070206a.htm ${ }^{(22)}$
    For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.orgllessonssindex.php?lid=885erype=educator
    (a3).
    For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see:
    

    ## Data Sources

    Data Sources
    U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.
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    What do we measure on this page?
    This page describes the distribution of housenold income
    $\frac{\text { Per Capiti income: Total personal income divided by total population of an area. }}{\text { Household: A household includes all the people who }}$
    Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
    represents perfect inequality. The lower the Ginin coefficient, the more equal the income distribution.
     perfect inequality. Every point on the Lorenzz curve can be used to
    income," or the top _\% of households have_ of of all income."

    ## Why is it important?

    For public Pand managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could
    experience dispropoprionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within
    between geoographies helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing economic hardship.
    The distribution of income can help to hightight several important aspects of economic well-being. A large number of households in the lower
    end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpereted as the size of the middle class. A end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle e distribution can be interpreted as the size of the middle class. A
    figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geoggaphy characterized by "haves" and "have-nots.

    Income distribution has always been a central concern of economic theory and economic policy. Classical economists were mainly concerned with the distribution of income between the main factors of production, land, labor, and capital. Modern economists have also addressed this
    issue, but have been more concemed with the distribution of income across individuals and households.

    According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run
    increase in income inequality. The waeg distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at hes en increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage
    gains and those at the bottom real wage losses... At the same time, long-run changes in society's living arrangements have taken place also gains and those at the bottom real wage losses.. At the same time, long-run changes in society's living arrangements have taken place also
    tending to exacerbate household income differences. For example, divorces, mantial separations, births out of wedlock, and the increasing age at first marriage have led to a shift away from married-couple households to single-parent families and nontamily households. Since non-married-couple households tend to have lower income and less equally distributed income than other types of households... changes in household composition have been associated with growing income inequality:"

    ## Methods

    While the Census Bureau does not have an official definition of the "middle class," it does derive several measures related to the distribution of income and income inequality. Two standard measures of income equality are the Lorenz Curve and the Ginic Cofficieint. Mean values for each yield lower than actual values for income disparity. For details on how to calculate, see Additional Resources below.

    Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
    and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation >
    a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

    ## Additional Resources

    The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Sevice published a useful article on metro and non-metro income levels and
    inequality. McLaughtin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available
    ers.usda.gov/publications//uralamericaraa172/ra172..pdff ${ }^{\text {(31] }}$
    For useful remarks and scholarly references on the level and distribution of coconomic well-being, see Federal Reserve System Chairman Ben S, Bernanke's speech on February 6, 2007, available at: federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bermanke20070206a.htm ${ }^{(22)}$
    For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.orgllessonssindex.php?lid=885erype=educator
    (33).
    For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see:
    

    ## Data Sources

    U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
    Study Guide
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    What do we measure on this page?
    This page describes the distribution of housenold income
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    represents perfect inequality. The lower the Gini coefficient, the more equal the income distribution.
    
    perfect inequality. Every point on the Lorenzz curve can be used to
    income," or the top _\% of households have_ of of all income."

    ## Why is it important?

    For public land managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could
    experience dispropoprionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences wwithin and experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within
    between geoographies helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing economic hardship.
    The distribution of income can help to highlight several important aspects of economic well-being. A large number of households in the lower
    end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpeted as the size of the middle class. A end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle e distribution can be interpreted as the size of the middle class. A
    figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geoggaphy characterized by "haves" and "have-nots.

    Income distribution has always been a central concern of economic theory and economic policy. Classical economists were mainly concerned with the distribution of income between the main factors of production, land, labor, and capital. Modern economists have also addressed this
    issue, but have been more concemed with the distribution of income across individuals and households.

    According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run
    increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage
    gains and those at the bottom real wage losses... At the same time, long-run changes in societ's's living arrangements have taken place also gains and those at the bottom real wage losses.. At the same time, long-run changes in society's living arrangements have taken place also
    tending to exacerbate household income differences. For example, divorces, mantial separations, births out of wedlock, and the increasing age at first marriage have led to a shift away from married-couple households to single-parent families and nontamily households. Since non-married-couple households tend to have lower income and less equally distributed income than other types of households... changes in household composition have been associated with growing income inequality"

    ## Methods

    While the Census Bureau does not have an official definition of the "middle class," it does derive several measures related to the distribution of
    income and income inequality. Two standard measures ofincome equaliy are the Lerenz Cuve and the income and income inequality. Two standard measures of income equality are the Lorenz Curve and the Gini Coefficient. Mean values for each
    cohort were used to calculate total income, in the case of the top income cohort, income was assumed to be $\$ 250,000$ a value which tends to conor were used to calculate toat income, in the case of the top income conort, income was assumed to be $\$ 250,000$,

    Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < $12 \%$; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12
    and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>40 \%$. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout and $40 \%$; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation $>4$
    a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

    ## Additional Resources

    The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Sevice published a useful article on metro and non-metro income levels and
    inequality. McLaughtin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17 (2). It It available a.
    ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamericadra172/ra172c.pdf ${ }^{(31)}$
    For useful remarks and scholarly references on the level and distribution of coconomic well-being, see Federal Reserve System Chairman Ben S, Bernanke's speech on February 6, 2007, available at: federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bermanke20070206a.htm ${ }^{(22)}$
    For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.orgllessonsindex.php?lid=885\&type=educator
    (a33).
    For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see
    

    ## Data Sources

    Data Sources
    U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.
    Study Guide
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    perfect inequality. Every point on the Lorenz curve can be used to
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    ## Why is it important?

    For public Pand managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could
    experience dispropoprionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within
    between geoographies helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing economic hardship.
    The distribution of income can help to highlight several important aspects of economic well-being. A Alarge number of households in the lower
    end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpreted as the size of the middle class. A end
    figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geography characterized by "haves" and "have-nots.

    Income distribution has always been a central concern of economic theory and economic policy. Classical economists were mainly concerned with the distribution of income between the main factors of production, land, labor, and capital. Modern economists have also addressed this
    issue, but have been more concemed with the distribution of income across individuals and households.

    According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run
    increase in income inequality. The waeg distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at hes ton expeciencion increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage
    gains and those at the bottom real wage losses... At the same time, long-run changes in societ's's living arrangements have taken place also gains and those at the bottom real wage losses.. At the same time, long-run changes in societys living arrangements have taken place also
    tending to exacertate household income differences. For example, divorces, mantial separations, birtts out of wedlock, and the increasing age at first marriage have led to a shift away from married-couple households to single-parent families and nontamily households. Since non-married-couple households tend to have lower income and less equally distributed income than other types of households... changes in household composition have been associated with growing income inequality:"

    ## Methods

    While the Census Bureau does not have an official definition of the "middle class," it does derive several measures related to the distribution of
    income and income inequality. Two standard measures ofincome equaliy are the Lerenz Cuve and the income and income inequality. Two standard measures of income equality reathe Lorenz Curve and the Gini Coefficient. Mean values for each
    cohort were used to calculate total income, in the case of the top income cohort, income was assumed to be $\$ 250,000$, a value which tends to conort were used to calculate total income, in the case of the top income cohort, income was assumed to be $\$ 250,000$,
     Additional Resources
    The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Sevice published a useful article on metro and non-metro income levels and
    Thequality. MclLaughlin, Diaine K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at:
    ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdff ${ }^{(31)}$.
    For useful remarks and scholarly references on the level and distribution of economic well-being, see Federal Reserve System Chairman Ben S, Bernanke's speech on February 6, 2007, available at: federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bermanke20070206a.htm ${ }^{(22)}$
    For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.orgllessons index.php?lid=885etype=educator
    (a33)
    For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see:
    

    ## Data Sources

    U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.c.
    Study Guide
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