# **A Profile of Demographics**

**Coconino County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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.



**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.

# **Table of Contents**

Demographics How has population changed? What is the age and gender distribution of the population? What is the racial makeup of the population? What is the Hispanic makeup of the population? What is the tribal makeup of the population?	Page 1 2-3 4 5 6-7
Employment What occupations and industries are present? What are the characteristics of labor participation? What are commuting patterns?	8 9 10
Income How is income distributed? What are poverty levels? What are the components of household earnings?	11 12-13 14
Social Characteristics What are education and enrollment levels? What languages are spoken?	15 16
Housing What are the main housing characteristics? How affordable is housing?	17 18
Benchmarks How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
Data Sources & Methods	20
Links to Additional Resources	21

# 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%.

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

How has population changed?

### This page describes the total population and change in total population

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau, Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section the Savdy Guide text.

#### Population, 2000-2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Population (2013*)	134,795	311,536,594
Population (2000)	116,320	281,421,906
Population Change (2000-2013*)	18,475	30,114,688
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	15.9%	10.7%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average		







Percent Change in Population, 2000-2013\*

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		
	Coconino County, AZ	
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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How has population changed?

### What do we measure on this page?

w - w - ποιοιομία - μι το μαζμξε f This page describes the total population and change in total population. Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decemial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

#### /hy is this important?

r is uns important / This report covers a broad range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and home ownership. It is the only EPS+HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These include dists, towns, and consuss designated places, American Indian, Atakan nahve, and naive Hawaii areas, congressional distincts, and county

automation in addition to its usefulness for social research, the information throughout this report is valuable for public land managers and others in identifying whether the selected geographies contain minorities and people who are economically and/or socially disadvantaged. This is important because Executive Order (1998, Februar) 11, 1194 states that "acak federal agency what make achieving environmental alle to programs, policies, and achieves on minority opulations and low-income polautions." (see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and achieves on minority topulations and low-income polautions. "(see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and achieves on minority topulations and low-income polautions." nces)

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/isocially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management actions requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minority individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or any othen regative health effects from cumulative or multiple adverse adverses to environmental hazards), and disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or naive populations).

Iethods
The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). 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).

For populations of 65.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographice, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this proport are 5-year ACS estimates. Kores of han 16 or 3-year estimates, here 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographice, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographice since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for conse-geograp comparisons. The disadvantage is that multilyair estimates cannot be used to describe any parallelity are in the period, only what the average value is over the full period. For thready, state and figure titles show the latest year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to clarify that the data represent average characterization over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables. **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; ORANCE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with the dota) indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; another domographics report at a leagn groupped space. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the bless provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

#### Additional Resources sible publ

An indi on on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see: census gov/acs/wwwihethodology/methodology\_main/<sup>10</sup>. census gov/acs/wwwDownloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyotData2009.pdf <sup>10</sup>.

### Data Sources

tal Solures
U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Burseu, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce.
2000. Census Burseu, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.
Study Guide

31.0

29.6

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 rider

### 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	66.941	152 247 412

Change in Median Age, 2000-2013\*

Age & Gender Distribution Coefficients of Variation

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

Median Age, 2000 & 2013\*



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.

	Coconino County, AZ	U.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 is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes population distribution tion by age and gender, and the change in median age. This page describes population dis

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

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of refines, 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 many counties, the largest segment of the oppulation is in the Baby Boarner generation (people boarnets) motiversities (19-6). The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

thoos Data in his report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Cansus 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 2006 forwup 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 > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report a la larger geographic scale.

37.3

35.3 5.7%

Additional Resources The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, coor, 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<sup>14</sup>.

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/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

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: stateoftheusa.org<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistrib and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: aoa.go root/aging\_statistics/index.aspx

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/ <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: county-healthrankings.org/ (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.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population? This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age dis with age categories separated into

### Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013\*

		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 table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average chara 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 and Change, Coefficients of Variation		
	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 Varia	ition	
	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 is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 or five age groups.

#### hy is it important?

VIS It Important? For public land agency, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retined population, or soon-ba-enteid oppopulation. 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 minors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generatic (those 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 demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

#### ods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with none dod) indicates be and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two tods) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%; if data have consistently low accuracy thr a report, we suggest running another demographics trapent at a larger geographic scale. en 12

ditional Resources The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups sus.gov/pc

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2011 1138.pdf <sup>(13)</sup>.

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. Baby Boom Migration and Its Impact on Rural America. Economic Research Service, Report N Washington, DC. ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err/9.aspx<sup>(44)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regional 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 Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st 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.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html <sup>(15)</sup>. 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.

What is the racial makeup of the population?

cribes the number of people who self-ide ntify as belonging to a particular race This page de

Race: Race is a set-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or maces with which they most closely identify The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicky.

#### Population by Race, 2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	
Total Population	134,795	311,536,594
White alone	83,712	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	1,846	39,167,010
American Indian alone	36,510	2,540,309
Asian alone	1,929	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	152	526,347
Some other race alone	5,821	14,746,054
Two or more races	4,825	8,732,333
Percent of Total		
White alone	62.1%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	1.4%	12.6%
American Indian alone	27.1%	0.8%
Asian alone	1.4%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	"0.1%	0.2%
Some other race alone	4.3%	4.7%
	0.001	0.001

Two or more races 3.6% 2.8%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average s during this period

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Coconino County AZ, 2013\*



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

Population by Race, Coefficients of Variation		
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
White alone	1%	0%
Black or African American alone	8%	0%
American Indian alone	1%	0%
Asian alone	7%	0%
Native Hawaiian & 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 African American alone	9%	0%
American Indian alone	1%	0%
Asian alone	8%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	54%	0%
Some other race	10%	0%
Two or more races	10%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### Vhat is the racial makeup of the populat

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people ple who self-identify 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 identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race

and athnicity. Race Alexe Categories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureau, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawalan or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Nather, "Alast" and "Native Hausilian of Other Posicilis Islander" race categories described shows. Respondents providing write-in ertites such as multitical, invarie, interracial, or a Haganic Latino group (for example, Mexican, Pluento Rican, or Culban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category. <u>Two or Mace Races</u>: People may have chosen to provide two or more race response. Providing multiple write-in responses, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

ny is it important?

deral agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this information to omote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act.

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 nacial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic group are inportant for putting into effect a nature of federal statutes (i.e., envirosing billingual election naise whether Mong Rights Act; monitoring and entroring equal employment opportunities under the CNH Rights Act; Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local povernments to in programs and meeting (i.e., evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinessment 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, broady referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 128as. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whethe there is a potential environmental justice issue. For public land ma

### ods

Annue. Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elevelwere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with non edot) indicates be 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with non dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numming anothe demographics report at large geographic scalar.

dditional 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/federg\_1997standards<sup>(16)</sup>.

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 Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/ist/bages/ind

The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measurecfamerica.org/acenturyapart.<sup>(19)</sup>

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

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

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.

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Maxican," Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those indicate that the year of ther Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino" Origin can be viewed as the hertiage, unclanality group, langea, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spansh, Hispanic, or Latino or yeb or dary taxos.

#### Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	134,795	311,536,594
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	18,415	51,786,591
Not Hispanic or Latino	116,380	259,750,003
White alone	74,109	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	1,635	38,093,998
American Indian alone	35,311	2,061,752
Asian alone	1,901	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	115	488,646
Some other race	"153	606,356
Two or more races	3 156	6 387 422

Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	13.7%	16.6%
Not Hispanic or Latino	86.3%	83.4%
White alone	55.0%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	1.2%	12.2%
American Indian alone	26.2%	0.7%
Asian alone	1.4%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.1%	0.2%
Some other race	<b>"0.1%</b>	0.2%
Two or more record	2.29/	2.19/

Two or more races 2.3%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average ristics during this period.







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

	Coconino County, AZ	U.
al 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%	C
rcent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Coconino County, AZ	U
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	(
Not Hispanic or Latino	0%	(
White alone	0%	(
Black or African American alone	5%	(
American Indian alone	1%	(
Asian alone	9%	(
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0%	(
Some other race	54%	(
<b>T</b>	10%	0

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people who self-identity as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural destination, and Hispanics can be of any race.

Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal gover race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. ent considers

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mevican," "Puerto Rikan," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino". Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, inseque, or country of bith of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Hispanicas ere one of the tastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-dentified 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 200 and 2010, Hispanica accounded for ver one-hald of the trackin'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 imposition on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many feeder programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decomial census (i.e., promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial dispatities in health and environmental riskly and "Data or ethnic groups are important for puting from fields a name of decked astauce (i.e., and/orcing hingual electron nate) under the Voing Highs Act, monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act, Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments (i.e., and/miting local governments (i.e., and/miting under the Voing Act and a start the Voing Act and a start the Voing Act and a start the Public Health Act, evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act,"

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.

Iditional 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/fedreg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>.

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/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces

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.pdf <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf <sup>[21]</sup>.

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

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are member 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 54 decised American Indian categories: Apache, Blackted, Chevence, Chevence, Chicksaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chipeya

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013\*

In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the population that self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native (27.1%) and the U.S. had the lowest (0.8%).

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	134,795	311,536,594
Total Native American	36,510	2,540,309
American Indian Tribes	35,988	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes		108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	235	363,000
Percent of Total		
Percent of Total Total Native American	27.1%	0.8%
Percent of Total Total Native American American Indian Tribes	27.1% 26.7%	0.8%
Percent of Total Total Native American American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes	27.1% 26.7% 0.0%	0.8% 0.6% 0.0%

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.

Native American Population, Percent of Total, Coconino County AZ, 2013\*



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 15 Total Population Total Native American 0% 0% 0% American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes 1% 69% Non-Specified Tribe 31% 1% Percent of Total, Coeffi ents of Variation U.S. Total Native American 1% 0% 0% American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes Non-Specified Tribes 1% 0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? , the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in This page describes, in general ter with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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. Cansus data are available for 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categorizer, Sapeha, Bladketer, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickawa, Chipewa, Chotawa, Coville, Comanche, Cree, Creek. Crow, Delaware, Houma, Ioquids, Kiowa, Lumbee, Manorine, Navajo, Csage, Chawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatom, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shortone, Sixu, Tohoro O'Othum, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al Arber.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hy is it important?

V is it important ( Different groups depole may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native titbes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current is to be land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

# thoos 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%. Ideat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

ethods

### Additional Resources

An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance un National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq12 Environmental Justice: Guidance under the ces/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>. The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs res and contacts are available at: bia.gov/index.htm <sup>(22)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.org/index.html <sup>(23)</sup>.

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

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Ammore other races. an Indian and Alaska Native alo nation with one o

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013

Region

	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
Blackfeet	<b>"0</b>	26,474
Cherokee	62	273,192
Cheyenne	7	11,774
Chickasaw	···0	22,917
Chippewa	- 31	115,253
Choctaw	- 86	90,189
Colville	<b>"0</b>	8,182
Comanche	715	12,228
Cree	<b>"0</b>	2,191
Creek	···0	41,521
Crow	-24	11,424
Delaware	···0	7,471
Houma	<b>"0</b>	9,488
Iroquois	"3	45,639
Kiowa	711	8,691
Lumbee	···0	68,171
Menominee	<b>"0</b>	8,259
Navajo	31,578	305,552
Osage	<b>"0</b>	8,332
Ottawa	-30	7,026
Paiute		10,545
Pima	"149	24,212
Potawatomi	<b>"0</b>	19,337
Pueblo	'1,779	71,029
Puget Sound Salish	···0	13,971
Seminole	-19	13,987
Shoshone	23	9,470
Sioux	716	124,383
Tohono O'Odham	- 141	20,343
Ute	<b>"0</b>	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	<b>"0</b>	15,882
Aleut	-10	11,709
Eskimo	712	60,926
Tlingit-Haida	<b>"0</b>	15,622
All other tribes	<b>"0</b>	4,697
Alaska Native; Not Specified	"167	10,616
American Indian or Alaska Native;		

American Indian Or Alaba a native; 235 363,000 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.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general 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 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categories, Roden, Bladcket, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasw, Chipewa, Chockaw, Colvile, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, toquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menorinee, Navajo, Casge, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shochone, Siux, Tohomo Odotham, Ute Aviaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al cher.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### hv is it important?

V in important?
With the people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, belefs, 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 and/or current te to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

#### Methods

thoos 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

Iditional 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 relations. See: fs.led.us/spft/tribalrelations/index.shtml <sup>(24)</sup>.

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

Study Guid

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

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S
al Population	0%	0%
Total Native American	1%	0%
American Indian Tribes; Specified	1%	0%
Apache	40%	2%
Blackfeet	na	3%
Cherokee	53%	1%
Cheyenne	96%	69
Chickasaw	na	39
Chippewa	69%	19
Choctaw	42%	19
Colville	na	59
Comanche	73%	69
Cree	na	119
Creek	na	29
Crow	89%	59
Delaware	na	79
Houma	na	69
Iroquois	182%	29
Kiowa	122%	75
Lumbee	na	19
Menominee	na	49
Navajo	2%	19
Osage	na	69
Ottawa	101%	79
Paiute	81%	49
Pima	42%	49
Potawatomi	na	39
Pueblo	18%	29
Puget Sound Salish	na	49
Seminole	86%	49
Shoshone	69%	59
Sioux	76%	19
Tohono O'Odham	50%	59
Ute	na	65
Yakama	na	59
Yaqui	80%	59
Yuman	35%	69
All other tribes	29%	19
American Indian; Not Specified	85%	39
Alaska Native Tribes; Specified	69%	19
Alaska Athabaskan	na	49
Aleut	97%	59
Eskimo	91%	19
Tlingit-Haida	na	49
All other tribes	na	69
Alaska Native; Not Specified	55%	69
American Indian or Alaska Native; No	31%	

Employment

# What occupations and industries are present?

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\*

64,440	141 864 697
20,926	51,341,226
14,976	25,645,065
15,478	34,957,520
'373	1,030,881
5,554	11,832,435
7,133	17,057,570
32.5%	36.2%
23.2%	18.1%
24.0%	24.6%
0.6%	0.7%
8.6%	8.3%
	20.945 14.976 15.478 "373 5.554 7.133 22.5% 24.0% 0.6% 8.65%

# Employment by Industry, 2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	64,440	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	1,163	2,731,302
Construction	4,073	8,864,481
Manufacturing	4,019	14,867,423
Wholesale trade	1957	3,937,876
Retail trade	7,864	16,415,217
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	3,165	7,010,637
Information	'605	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	2,535	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	4,377	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	17,649	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	11,367	13,262,892
Other services, except public administration	2,503	7,043,003
Public administration	4,163	7,034,048
Percent of Total		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	1.8%	1.9%
Construction	6.3%	6.2%
Manufacturing	6.2%	10.5%
Wholesale trade	1.5%	2.8%
Retail trade	12.2%	11.6%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	4.9%	4.9%
Information	10.9%	2.2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	3.9%	6.7%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	6.8%	10.8%
Education, health care, & social assistance	27.4%	23.2%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	17.6%	9.3%
Other services, except public administration	3.9%	5.0%
Public administration	6.5%	5.0%

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

## Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Variation U.S. Civilian employed population > 16 years Management, professional, & related Service 1% 3% 3% 24% 7% 5% 0% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% Sales and office Farming, fishing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint., & repair Construction, extraction, maint. & repair Production, transportation, & mannial movin Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation Management, protessional, & related Service Sales and office Farming, fahing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, respontation, & mannial movin Employment by Industry, Coefficients of W 3% 3% 3% 21% 6% 5% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% ts of Vari Civilian employed population > 16 years Agriculture, forestry, fahing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mg Education, headh care, & sciola assistance Arts, ententian, ree., accomodation, & bod Other services, except public assistance nty, AZ U.S. 1% 13% 9% 7% 14% 5% 8% 16% 8% 7% 3% 4% 9% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Other services, except public administration 0% Public administration Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation 7% Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing 13% 9% 7% 12% 5% 9% 19% 8% 7% 3% 4% 9% 7% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Manufacturing Whicewale trade Real trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and Insurance, and real estate Prof. scientific, mgmt, admt, & waste mare Education, heath ace, & social assistem Activation and trade area, & social assistem Arts, enternain, rec., acconcision, & soci Other services, aceque public administration Public administration

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### /hat occupations and industries are present?

What do we measure on this page? 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: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classifi-with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry.

Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

### hy is it Important?

thods

y 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 relativity the eccorrowy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors. Employment by occupation dises additional information that desc people to its a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-ted by working to a onliving time, an entity or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while by industry describes where people work. ribes what tions are stries (for example, ma

thods Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor dod) indicates bet 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with no dods) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numbra prother demographics report at large geographic scale.

# Additional Resources The Census Bureau pr

u provides a definition of SOCS: census.gov/hhes/www/ioind

Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.gov/soc/

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: bis.gow/cor/<sup>(27)</sup>.

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

			Employment
What are the characteristics of labor participati	ion?		
his page describes workers by weeks worked per year	and usual hours works per week	-	
Labor Participation Characteristics, 2013	*		
	Cocooino Coun	by A7	113
Population 16 to 64	9	4,625	204,340,91
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:			
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	4	5,514	112,330,37
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	1.	4,765	21,646,42
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	1:	2,330	19,225,13
Did not work	2	2,016	51,138,98
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:	4	0.902	116 404 00
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	4	8,032 8,273	29 453 21
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week		4 4 4 4	7 324 48
Did not work	2	2.016	51,138,98
Mean usual hours worked for workers		36.5	38
Percent of Total			
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:			
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	4	8.1%	55.0
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	1	5.6%	10.6
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	1	3.0%	9.4
Did not work	2	3.3%	25.0
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:			
Worked 35 or more hours per week	5	2.7%	57.0
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	1	9.3%	14.4
Worked I to 14 hours per week		10.00/	3.0
	80%		
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 of 52 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	80% 60% 40% 20% 0%	aunty AZ	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconina County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	80% 60% 40% 0% Coconino Co	Dunty, AZ	US
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (56.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	80% 60% 40% 20% 0% Coconino Co 8Did not work	ounty, AZ	U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 pariod, the U.S. had the highest estimated parent of people that worked 50 to 52 weaks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, A2 had the lowest (46.1%).</li> </ul>	80% 60% 40% 20% Coconino Co 80 di not work Worked 27 to 49 wee	punty, AZ	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks red 50 to 52 weeks
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 biz swebs per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	Solid 60% 40% 20% Coconino Cd 80/ Coconino Cd 80/ Coconino Cd 80/ Coconino Cd 80/ Coconino Cd 80/ Coconino Cd 80/ Cd 80 Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ C Cd 80/ C Cd 80/ C Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ Cd 80/ C Cd 80/ C Cd 80/ C C Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd Cd	punty, AZ work ks = Work rked per Week, 3	U.S. d 1 to 26 weeks ad 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (56.9%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	80% 60% 40% 20% Coconine Ci 20% Coconine Ci 20% Hours Wo Hours Wo 100%	punty, AZ Work ks Work rked per Week, 3	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 bit 29 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	80% 60% 20% 0% Coconino Cd SDId not work Worked 27 to 49 wee Hours Wo 100%	bunty, AZ Worł rked per Week, 3	U.S. ad 1 to 26 weeks ad 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 bits 2 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> </ul>	20%     60%     60%     60%     60%     60%     Coconine Ci     20%     Coconine Ci     20H at work     Worked 27 to 49 wee     Hours Wo     100%     60%     60%     60%	sunty, AZ Work ks = Work rked per Week, 3	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 biz weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the</li> </ul>	Coconino Cd     Coconino Cd     Coconino Cd     Did not work     Worked 27 to 49 wee     Hours Wo     100%     60%     60%	Dunty, AZ	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 biz seeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that</li> </ul>		sunty, AZ	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 bits 2 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%),</li> </ul>	00% 60% 40% 20% 0% Coconino Cd Coconino Cd Hours Wo Hours Wo 80% 40% 20%	ounty, AZ	U.S. ad 1 to 26 weeks ad 50 to 52 weeks R013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours par week (57.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (52.7%).</li> </ul>	20%     4	burty, AZ BWorf ks Worf riked per Week, 2	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 bits 2 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that highest estimated percent of people that work (55.0%), and Cosinio County, AZ had the lowest (52.7%).</li> </ul>	Coconino Co Coconino Co Co Coconino Co Co Coconino Co Co Coconino Co Co Co Co Co Co Co Co Co Co	works Work ks Work rked per Week, :	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks R013* U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 bits 25 weeks per year (\$5.0%), and Occonine County, A2 had the lowest (\$6.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (\$7.0%), and Coconine County, A2 had the lowest (\$2.7%).</li> </ul>		aunty, AZ BWork ks Work rked per Week, a Unity, AZ rs/Week, a 1-14	U.S. U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013" U.S. U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per work (57.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (52.7%).</li> <li>Stata Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Ce</li> </ul>	Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Coconino Ci Si StauraWeek el 15-34 Hou nusus Bureau, American Communi	sunty, AZ Work ks Work ks Work ks Work ks Unity, AZ unity, AZ rs/Week 1-14 nity Survey Offici	U.S. U.S. ed 11 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013'' U.S. HoursWeek: #Did not work e, Washington, D.C.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (65.0%), and Coconino County, A2 had the lowest (68.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Coconino County, A2 had the lowest (52.7%).</li> <li>Xata Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Cell about Participation Characteristics. Commerce 2013.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>SDId not work</li> <li>Obdot work</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Solid and work</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Solid and work</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Solid and work</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Solid and work</li> <li>Coconino Ci</li> <li>Cocon</li></ul>	bunty, AZ Work ks Work fixed per Week, 3 Sounty, AZ Sounty, AZ TraWeek 1-14 nity Survey Offici	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks 2013* U.S. HoursWeek : sDid not work e, Washington, D.C.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 bits 2 weeks per year (55.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (48.1%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (52.7%).</li> <li>Xata Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Ce</li> <li>abore Participation Characteristics, Coefficient of Commerce Activity (52.0%).</li> </ul>	Coconino Ci      S54 HoursWeek      15-34 Hou: nsus Bureau, American Commu      ficients of Amatican      Coconino Ci	ounty, AZ Work see Work, AZ Sounty, AZ rs/Week, 1-14 nity Survey Office	U.S. ed 1 to 26 weeks ed 50 to 52 weeks to 13" U.S. Hours/Week & Did not work e, Weshington, D.C.

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	3%	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	3%	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	4%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	4%	0%
Did not work	3%	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	3%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the characteristics of labor participation?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

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".

#### /hy is it important?

One, it to be hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, intravitantia to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have considered been among the lowest of the industrial datases 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 how say to remain active in the workplice but due to treat works at all shedule. Advances is computer texthologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more fielde hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, burism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods ele concriming stability, the vast major (or part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time 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, 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 paronar of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed his may explain failing wages or rates of employment that outpace population change (see the Socioconnic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population change them).

#### hods

sthods 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 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/pdf/G0612501.pdf <sup>(28)</sup>.

## For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.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.

nd by travel time to work. onino County, AZ 63,296	U.S 139 766 636
nd by travel time to work. onino County, AZ 63,296	U.S 139.786.63
onino County, AZ 63,296	U.S
onino County, AZ 63,296	U.S 139 786 63
63,296	139 786 639
	100,100,000
58,573	101,321,530
4,723	38,465,109
16,780	18,023,639
14,130	19,150,654
10,436	20,753,054
6,113	19,796,414
2,064	8,189,64
3,520	18,220,851
'558	3,673,57
'658	4,920,004
2,088	10,154,523
3,500	10,857,904
19	26
	4,723 16,780 14,130 10,436 6,113 2,064 3,520 558 558 2,088 3,500 19

TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	26.5%	12.9%
10 to 14 minutes	22.3%	13.7%
15 to 19 minutes	16.5%	14.8%
20 to 24 minutes	9.7%	14.2%
25 to 29 minutes	3.3%	5.9%
30 to 34 minutes	5.6%	13.0%
35 to 39 minutes	0.9%	2.6%
40 to 44 minutes	1.0%	3.5%
45 to 59 minutes	3.3%	7.3%
60 or more minutes	5.5%	7.8%

5.5% 5.5% 5.5% contract emission of the second seco

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 percent of people that worked outside the county of residence (27.5%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (7.5%).



Worked outside county of residence Worked in county of residence

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are commuting patterns?

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 eaving, for the oily of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worker 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 necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job coportunities 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 sever facilities without an adequate source of revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

thoos 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 Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Perspectives 2(2), encudad gov/Publications/RDPR0/P697/RDP697/RDP697 epd<sup>(10)</sup>.

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

	Coconino County, AZ	
Vorkers 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%

		Income
How is income distributed?		
This page describes the distribution of household income.		
Household Income Distribution, 2013*		
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$23,382	\$28,155
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$49,555	\$53,046
Total Households	46,198	115,610,216
Less than \$10,000	4,317	8,380,364
\$10,000 to \$14,999	3,008	6,214,548
\$15,000 to \$24,999	4,594	12,468,604
\$25,000 to \$34,999	4,922	11,929,761
\$35,000 to \$49,999	6,433	15,723,148
\$50,000 to \$74,999	8,220	20,744,045
\$75,000 to \$99,999	6,116	14,107,031
\$100,000 to \$149,999	5,384	14,858,239
\$150,000 to \$199,999	1,906	5,651,848
\$200,000 or more	1,298	5,532,628
Gini Coefficient <sup>^</sup>	0.46	0.47
Percent of Total		
Less than \$10,000	9.3%	7.2%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	6.5%	5.4%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9.9%	10.8%

\$15,000 t0 \$24,999	9.9%	10.6%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	10.7%	10.3%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	13.9%	13.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	17.8%	17.9%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	13.2%	12.2%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	11.7%	12.9%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	4.1%	4.9%
\$200,000 or more	2.8%	4.8%

Autouto ti inter-Median Household income and Gini Coefficient are not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations. 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.



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

Household Income Distribution, Coefficients of Variation		
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### How is income distributed? What do we measure on this page?

 Date of we measure on this page?

 This page describes the distribution of household income.

 Per Capita Income.
 Total personal income divided by total population of an area.

 Household 1: household induced and the people who courgu a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
 Gini Coefficient; provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 represents perfect inequality. The were the Gini coefficient; the more quality the income distribution.

 Learner Quarks quarks arguing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect intequality. Every point on the Learner curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom \_% of households have \_% of all income."

</tabular

#### /hv is it important?

y is it important? For public land mages, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionality high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographics helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-polation 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 enterme sinclates a egospriph characterized by Thaves" and Tave-ords.

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 midvisulas and households. ned

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run Account protocol and the second secon

#### ethods

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 Durve and the Gain 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Iditional Resources The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-me inequality. McLaughin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf <sup>(31)</sup>. metro income lev

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/Bernanke20070206a.htm <sup>(20)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09W/IZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl:

#### Data Sources

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

### Income What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line

Powerty: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "bolw the poverty beaut".

### 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 poverty	4,638	8,666,630
Percent of Total		
People Below Poverty	23.0%	15.4%

15.4% 11.3% ntative of average 
 Families below povery
 2.3 U%

 15.5 %
 15.5 %

 \*The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are represe characteristics during this period.

<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County,</li> </ul>
AZ had the highest estimated percent of
individuals living below poverty (23.0%),
and the U.S. had the lowest (15.4%).
and the o.o. had the foreat (10.470).

In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County AZ had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty (15.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (11.3%).



People Below Poverty Families below poverty

### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
People	23.0%	15.4%
Under 18 years	28.1%	21.6%
65 years and older	11.6%	9.4%
Families	15.5%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	23.5%	17.8%
Married couple families	9.3%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	'13.4%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	'33.5%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	'43.6%	40.0%

-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.

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

Poverty, Coefficients of Variation		
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
People	0%	0%
Families	2%	0%
Individuals Below Poverty	4%	0%
Families Below Poverty	7%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Individuals Below Poverty	4%	0%
Families Below Poverty	7%	0%
Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family	Type, Coefficients of Variation	
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
People	4%	0%
Under 18 years	5%	0%
65 years and older	7%	0%
Families	7%	0%
Families with related children < 18 years	9%	0%
Married couple families	10%	0%
with children < 18 years	13%	1%
Female householder, no husband present	13%	0%
with children < 18 years	15%	0%

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of iduals 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 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their plealow the pover | level."

### y 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 teacors. First, people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attituides as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed aztivities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience dispropriormally files and adverse effects.

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 important because aggregate poverty rates (for example, families below poverty) may hide some important information (for example, the poverty rate of a radige onther switch hidren).

#### lethods

thoos 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

Intronal Nesources For more information on rural poverty, see U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Briefing Room, "Rural Income, Poverty, and Weitlare: High Poverty Counties" available at ers.usda.gov/topics/tural-economy-population/rural-poverty-weil-being aspx <sup>(39)</sup>. For more info

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: www.npc.umich.edu/poverty<sup>(38)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement all glosophe 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 as available as tage so/compliance(eff

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

## Income

### What are poverty levels?

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<sup>\*</sup>, 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 Ethnicition in Boyorty		
All Editiones in Foverty		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	5,469	12,507,866
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	5,469 23,702	12,507,866 34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov	5,469 23,702 rerty)	12,507,866 34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov White alone	5,469 23,702 rerty) 41.9%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov White alone Black or African American alone	5,469 23,702 rerty) 41.9% `1.1%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone	5,469 23,702 errty) 41.9% 1.1% 44.1%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5%
Hippenic of Latino (d any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (d any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone	5,469 23,702 rerty) 41.9% 1.1% 44.1% 2.0%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0%
Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov White alone Black or African American alone American Indina alone Astive Hawaian & Oth-Pacific Is. alone	5,469 23,702 erty) 41.9% 11.1% 44.1% 2.0% 70.2%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60,5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2%
Hippenic of Latino (d any race)     Not Hispanic or Latino (d'any race)     Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov     White alone     Biack or African American adole     American Indian alone     Aaina alone     Native Hawasian & Oth-Pacific Is, alone     Some other race	5,469 23,702 rerty) 41.9% 11.1% 44.1% 2.0% 70.2% 5.7%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3%
Hispanic of Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in pov White alone Black or African American alone American Indina Aone Asian alone Native Hawaian & Oth-Pacific Is: alone Some other race Two or more races	5,469 23,702 erty) 41.9% 1.1% 44.1% 44.1% 70.2% 5.7% 5.1%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21,8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6%
Hispanic or Lafno (of any race)     Not Hispanic or Lafno (of any race)     Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in pov     White alone     Black or African American atore     American Indian atore     Asian atore     Native Hawasian & Oh-Pacific Is, atore     Some other race     Two or more races     Two or more races     Hispanic or Lafno (of any race)	5,669 23,702 erty) 41,9% 1,1% 44,1% 2,0% 0,2% 5,7% 5,7% 5,1% 18,7%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60,5% 21,8% 1,5% 4,0% 0,2% 8,3% 3,6% 26,8%

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.

### Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty~, 2013\*

	Coconino County, Az	
White alone	15.7%	12.5%
Black or African American alone	21.5%	27.1%
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%
Non-Hispanic/Latino alone	14.2%	10.6%

-Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that

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

	Coconino County, AZ	
Total Population (all races)	4%	0%
White alone	5%	0%
Black or African American alone	32%	0%
American Indian alone	6%	1%
Asian alone	23%	1%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	64%	2%
Some other race	21%	1%
Two or more races	26%	0%
All Ethnicities		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	9%	0%
Not Hispanic/Latino	6%	1%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
White alone	5%	0%
Black or African American alone	34%	0%
American Indian alone	6%	0%
Asian alone	22%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	66%	0%
Some other race	21%	1%
Two or more races	26%	0%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	0%
Not Hispanic/Latino	2%	0%
Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnie	city, Coefficients of Variation	
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
White alone	5%	0%
Black or African American alone	33%	0%
American Indian alone	6%	1%
Asian alone	49%	1%
Native Hawaiian & Oceanic alone	507%	18%
Some other race alone	23%	1%
Two or more races alone	28%	1%
Hispanic or Latino alone	9%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? 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 deat-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: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their "below the poverty level".

### /hy is it important?

V is it important? For public land magners, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the contact of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

THOUS The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their ball family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of heiled children under 15 present (see below for poverty) releaf thresholds.

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local vinations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at census, goothers/wwwpoerty/dathreshold/reskum<sup>100</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

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 University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: nor.umich.deuterach/ethnicity<sup>100</sup>.

The U.S. Cansus Bureau briefing on "Powerty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: census, gov/pounditor/scdeen/distation/sclowarea.three/spoundies/powera.three/

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

	Income
What are the components of household earnings?	
This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source.	

### Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

characteristics during this period.

	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
Retirement 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 <sup>^</sup>		
Labor earnings	83.0%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	23.1%	28.9%
Retirement income	16.7%	17.7%

 
 Retirement income
 1.6.7%
 1.1

 Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
 4.5%
 4.4

 Cash public assistance income
 2.3%
 2

 Food Samp/SMAP
 1.1
 1.1%
 1.1

 \* Total may add to more than 100% due to households receiving more than 1 source of income.
 1.1
 1.1%

 \* Total amount table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average
 1.1%
 1.1%
 17.7% 4.9% 2.8% 12.4%

Percent of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*



### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Mean earnings	\$62,076	\$75,017
Mean Social Security income	\$16,707	\$17,189
Mean retirement income	\$25,878	\$23,589
Mean Supplemental Security Income	\$9,230	\$9,152
Mean cash public assistance income	\$3,220	\$3,808

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

tamber of fredeeneras freeering Earlinge, B	Courses, Coontrolondo en Vanadien	
	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%
Retirement 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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the components of household earnings?

#### What do we measure on this page? This page describes household ea ngs by source

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Ratirament income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to 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 item.

#### ethods

URUS 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 groups include.

### Why is this important?

Vis 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 reflement and Social Socium<sup>1</sup>. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of referee (referement payments), other measures for example, SSI or Food Sampa) are an indication of a concome hardship.

#### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_doc tation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDef initions.pdf (40).

#### Data Sources

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

What are education and enrollment levels?		
This page describes educational attainment and schoo	l enrollment.	
Educational Attainment, 2013*		
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S
Total Population 25 yrs or older	78,523	206,587,852
No high school degree	9,773	28,887,721
High school graduate	68,750	177,700,131
Associates degree	6,965	16,135,795
Bachelor's degree or higher	24,445	59,583,138
Bachelor's degree	14,060	37,286,246
Graduate or professional	10,385	22,296,892
Percent of Total		
No high school degree	12.4%	14.0%
High school graduate	87.6%	86.0%
Associates degree	8.9%	7.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher	31.1%	28.8%
Bachelor's degree	17.9%	18.0%
Graduate or professional	13.2%	10.8%
A2 had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree or higher (31.1%), and the U.S. had the lowest (28.8%).	35% 25% 20% 12.4% 15% 12.4% 15% 0% Complex Curlet: 42	28.8%
(14.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the lowest (12.4%).	No high school degree Bachelori	U.S. s degree or higher
ure age of 25 with to right school degree (14.0%), and Occorrino County, AZ had the lowest (12.4%). School Enrollment, 2013*	No high school degree     NBachelor's     Coconino County, AZ	U.S. s degree or higher U.S
Une age of 25 with to high school degree (14.0%), and Occordino County, A2 had the lowest (12.4%). School Enrollment, 2013* Fotal Population over 3 years old:	No high school degree Bachelori Coconino County, AZ 129,655	U.S. s degree or higher U.S 299,795,523
(14.0%), and 20 comins county, AZ had the lowest (12.4%). School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school:	No high school degree     Bachelori     Coconino County, AZ     129,655     45,319	U.S. s degree or higher U.S 299,795,523 82,624,805 82,624,805
vie age of 25 with no might school wighted     (14.0%), and Coconino County, AZ had the     lowest (12.4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     fold Population over 3 years old:     Errolled in school:     Errolled in numery school, preschool	No high school degree     NBachelori      Coconino County, A2     122,655     45,319     1,974	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,523 82,624,800 5,011,193
vie age 4.2 min to run solvo degle8     (14,0%), and coome County. A2 lad the     lowest (12,4%).     School Enrollment, 2013     Call Population exerts old:     Enrolled in nurses school, preschool     Enroled in nurses	■No high school degree ■Bachelori Cocomino County, AZ 22,655 45,319 1,571 1,551	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,806 5,011,192 4,208,394 4,208,394
vice age 2 of with the right school begins     (14,0%), and cocknice County, A2 had the     lowest (12,4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old:     Enrolled in school:     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in indedatatien     Enrolled in indedatatien     Enrolled in indedatatien	No high school degree  Reachedor  Coconing County, A2  122,655  45,319  1,974  1,551  6,635	U.S. s degree or higher 299, 796, 523 82, 624, 800 5, 011, 192 4, 208, 394 16, 286, 434 16, 286, 434
the apple of 25 with the type school deglet     (14,0%), and cocknine County, A2 had the     lowest (12,4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Catal Population over 3 years old:     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	■No high school degree ■Bachelori Coconno Courty, AZ 122,655 43,319 1,974 1,551 6,635 6,635 6,532	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,523 82,624,806 5,011,192 4,200,394 16,256,342 16,510,313
view age vi 20 with the tign school begins     (14,0%), and cooking County, A2 had the     lowest (12,4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old:     Enrolled in school:     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in indedatatien     Enrolled in anded 10 grade 4     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4     Enrolled in grade 12	Coconing County, A2     No high school degree     Coconing County, A2     122,655     45,319     1,974     1,555     6,685     6,582     7,009	U.S. s degree or higher U.S. 2997,955,522 82,624,806 5,011 19 4,228,344 16,510 31 17,153,555 17,153,555
the apple of 20 with the right school deglet     (H,4%), and Cookine County, A2 had the     lowest (12.4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Call Population over 3 years old:     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in codey, undergraduate yea	Coconing County, 12     C	U.S. s degree or higher 200,705,522 82,624,000 5,011,102 4,208,394 16,228,542 16,208,513 17,153,356 19,333,036 19,333,036
the age of 2.5 with the inight school degree     (14.0%), and Coconino County, A2 had the     lowest (12.4%).     School Enrollement, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old:     Errolled in school:     Errolled in nursery school, preschool     Errolled in inder to grade 4     Errolled in grade 15 to grade 4     Errolled in grade 15 to grade 1     Errolled in orgade 12     Errolled in ochool	Coconing County, AZ     No high school degree     Coconing County, AZ     122,655     45,319     1,974     1,555     6,552     7,009     119,175     2,333	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,510,313 177,183,565 19,333,030 4,121,765 19,333,030 4,121,765 19,333,030 4,121,765
the apple of 20 with the right school deglet     (H, 4%), and cocknine County, A2 had the     lowest (12.4%).     School Enrollment, 2013     Call Population over 3 years old:     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in school years old:     More and the problem in school     Not are professional school     Not are model in school	Coconin County, 12     Coconing County, 12     Co	U.S. s degree or higher 2009.795.522 28.654.300 5.011.192 4.208.394 16.510.313 17.153.555 19.333.052 4.121.765 2.171.7170.717
the approximation of the second sequence of the second sequence of the second sec	Coconing County, AZ  No high school degree Coconing County, AZ  Coconing County, AZ  122,655  43,319  1,974  1,551  6,585  6,585  6,585  1,975  2,333  84,336  15,951  2,393  84,336  15,951  1,974  1,975 1,975  1,975  1,975  1,975	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,000 5,011,192 4,208,542 16,510,312 17,153,058 19,117,195 2,117,170,117 2,117,170,117 2,117,170,117
the approx d.2 with the ting's school deg(He (14,2%), and Coconine County, AZ had the towest (12,4%).     School Enrollement, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in sindersgrafe Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in orgade 10 to grade 4 Enrolled in orgade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school:     Enrolled in school:	Coconing County, A2     To high school degree     Coconing County, A2     128,655     132,655     133,19     1,551     6,535     6,532     7,009     10,175     2,333     8,336     35,0%	U.S. a degree or higher 2997,755,325 2987,755,325 2987,755,325 4,228,349 4,227,655 217,170,717 227,6%
the gray of 25 with the right solution digitity     (Hulls), and cocomine County, A2 had the     lowest (12.4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Tabl Population over 3 years old:     Enrolled in nurses yschool, preschool     Enrolled in nurses yschool, preschool     Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea     Graduate or professional school     Not enrolled in school     Tertonile in nurses yschool, preschool     Renotled in nurses     School Enrolled in     Enrolled in nurses     School Enrolled in     School Enrolled	Coconing County, AZ     No high school degree     Coconing County, AZ     122,655     45,319     1,974     1,551     6,655     6,582     7,007     15,175     2,333     84,336     35,0%     1,5%	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,800 5,011,162 4,208,394 16,510,311 17,153,565 19,333,009 4,121,766 217,170,117 27,6% 1,778
the apple of 20 with the right school deglet     (14.9%), and occomine County, A22 had the     lowest (12.9%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Call Population over 3 years odd:     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8     Enrolled in chode;     Enrolled in school     Enrolled in school     Enrolled in school     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in school     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool     Enrolled in school     Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	Coconing County, A2     To high school degree     Coconing County, A2     120,655     46,319     12,651     6,532     7,009     10,175     2,333     6,4335      5,0%     1,5%     1,5%	U.S. a degree or higher U.S. 2007/05/32: 82.263.902 4.208.394 16.286.543 16.285.545 16.285.545 19.333.038 4.127.107.17 227.6% 1.7% 1.4%
the approx did wait in traje school stights     (14,0%), and Coconino County, A2 had the     towest (12,4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old:     Ernolled in nucersy school, preschool     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in school     Renolled in school     Total     Ernolled in school     Total     Ernolled in school     Ernolled in school     Renolled in nucersy school, preschool     Renolled in school     Total     Ernolled in school     Ernolled in nucersy school, preschool     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in nucersy school, preschool     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in school:     Ernolled in school     Ernolled	■No high school degree ■ Maschelori Cocome Courty, AZ 22,655 123,655 123,655 13,551 1,555 1,	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,510,311 17,133,556 19,333,030 4,121,761 217,170,111 27,6% 1,17% 1,4% 5,4
the approx 4.2 with the imprised to 4.9(96     (14.2%), and Coconine County, A2 had the     towest (12.4%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old:     Errolled in achol:     Errolled in school:     Errolled in school:     Errolled in grade 5 to grade 6     Errolled in organe 9 to grade 12     Errolled in achol:     Errolled in school:     Errolled in in school:     Errolled in inschool:     Errolled in grade 5 to grade 4     Errolled in grade 5 to grade 5	Coconino County, 42      No high school degree      Coconino County, 42      Coconino County, 43      Coconino Count	U.S. a degree or higher 299,705,822 62,634,000 42,634,000 42,634,000 42,634,000 42,634,000 42,634,000 42,634,000 41,512,654 17,753,554 1,775 1,
tes age u.d.3 with ite ingit school sciples (14.0%), ind Coconine County, A2 had the towest (12.4%). School Enrollement, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in school: Enrolled in grade 10 grade 12 Enrolled in grade 10 grade 12 Enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in school: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in ingrade 10 grade 4 Enrolled in ingrade 15 grade 4 Enrolled in grade 15 grade 4 Enrolled in grade 15 grade 4 Enrolled in grade 15 grade 4	Cocons county (C     Cocons county (C     Cocons County A     128,655     45,319     1,551     6,555     6,555     6,555     6,55	U.S. s degree or higher 2007/05.527 2007/05.527 2007/05.227 2007/05.021 4.228.34 16.228.34 16.228.34 17.153.35 4.121.76 4.121.76 4.121.77 1.47 1.47 5.48 5.57 1.77 1.47 1.57 1.77 1.47 1.57 1.77 1.47 1.57 1.77 1.47 1.57 1.77 1.47 1.57 1.77 1.47 1.57 1.77 1.47 1.57
tes age u.d.3 with no ingris school deg/f68 (14.2%), and Coconine County, AZ had the lowest (12.4%). School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in norsers school, preschool Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in orshool Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in inschool Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in ordege, undergraduate yea	Coconino County, A2     Coconino County, A2     Coconino County, A2     122,855     439     1374     1551     6,585     6,582     7,009     10,175     2,383     8,386      5,58	U.S. a degree or higher 299,765,522 82,824,804 5,011,102 4,2885,455 119,333,038 4,122,767 1,770,711 227,697 1,777 1,745 5,559 5,777 6,449 5,4
the expected of wait the ingrised add addies (14.0%), and a Coconine County, A2 had the toreest (12.4%). School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 5 Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 1 Enrolled in code yearde 1 Enrolled in code yearde 1 Enrolled in code 1 school Enrolled in code 1 school Enrolled in code 1 school Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school Enrolled in code yearde 1 Enro	the high school degree	U.S. a degree or higher 2007,056,325 2007,056,325 2007,056,325 2007,056,307 4,208,304 16,208,345 16,208,345 16,208,345 16,208,345 16,208,345 16,208,345 16,208,345 17,153,357 1,495 1,

Not enrolled in school 65.0% 72.4% Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

### Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

	Cucunino County, Az	
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 professional	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 kindergarten	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%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are education and enrollment levels? What do we measure on this page? This page describes levels of educational attainment.

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.

<u>School Errollment</u>: 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.

hy is it important? Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and lack of education is closely linked to poverty. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during economic 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 might experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication and outrach efforts could be tailored of different addresces.

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 growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

### ds

thods 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 support unning another demographics report at a larger egospathic scale.

Additional Resources For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemployment rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm (41).

U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," ave at: census.gov/prod/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 E vol. 34, New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

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

# **Social Characteristics**

# What languages are spoken?

This page mea sures 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.

### Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	126,061	291,484,482
Speak only English	96,432	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	29,629	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	9,446	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	11,414	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	1,207	9,539,099
Other languages	17,562	2,626,244
Speak English less than "very well"	10,148	25,148,900
Percent of Total		
Speak only English	76.5%	79.3%
Speak a language other than English	23.5%	20.7%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	7.5%	12.9%
Other Indo-European languages	11.1%	3.7%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	1.0%	3.3%
Other languages	13.9%	0.9%
Speak English less than "very well"	8.1%	8.6%

Speak English ress that very well \* 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 Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



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

# Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

F upulation 5 yrs or older	070	0.0
Speak only English	1%	0%
Speak a language other than English	2%	0%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	4%	0%
Other Indo-European languages	30%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	11%	0%
Other languages	3%	1%
Speak English less than "very well"	5%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Speak only English	1%	0%
Speak a language other than English	2%	0%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	4%	0%
Other Indo-European languages	33%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	13%	0%
Other languages	3%	0%
Speak English less than "very well"	5%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What languages are spoken? 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.

Hy is it important? For public lead managers who are trying to communicate with obtains of communities adjacent to public leads, 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 may need to be conducted in multiple languages.

TROS 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 numary another demographics report at latery 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: mix.org/map\_single <sup>(13)</sup>.

U.S.



		Housing
What are the main housing characteristics?		
This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for	or rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.	
Housing Characteristics, 2013*		
	Coconino County AZ	115
Total Housing Units	63.679	132.057.804
Occupied	46.198	115.610.216
Vacant	17.481	16.447.588
For rent	1,094	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 earlier	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	<b>``0.2%</b>	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 earlier	8.1%	29.9%

# Built 1980 to 1989 24.7% 1 Built 1970 to 1979 19.1% 1 Built 1960 to 1979 19.1% 1 Built 1960 to 1979 7.1% 1 Built 1960 to 1979 7.1% 1 Built 1960 to 1979 7.1% 1 Built 1960 to 1979 8.1% 2 Alwdian year structure built and available for metrolron-metro or regional aggregation. 1 The data in the table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average divarker/sites/sites/during this period. Housang Cocupancy, Coconino County AZ

In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing (27.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (12.5%).

and the control



■Occupied ■Vacant

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

The dening of a deterior of the of the dening of the deterior	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total Housing Units	0%	0%
Occupied	1%	0%
Vacant	2%	1%
For rent	13%	1%
Rented, not occupied	31%	1%
For sale only	17%	1%
Sold, not occupied	49%	1%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	3%	0%
For migrant workers	91%	2%
Other vacant	9%	1%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	23%	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	4%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	4%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	3%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	4%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	5%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	6%	0%
Median year structure built	0%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Occupancy		
Occupied	1%	0%
Vacant	2%	1%
For rent	14%	0%
Rented, not occupied	28%	0%
For sale only	19%	0%
Sold, not occupied	64%	0%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	3%	0%
For migrant workers	0%	0%
Other vacant	9%	2%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	25%	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	4%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	4%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	3%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	3%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	5%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	6%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## What are the main housing characteristics?

What do we measure on this page? This bace describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

Bent: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other 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,

#### v is it important?

y to a mulportaint r 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 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 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 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a test rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant for public lands managers in the cost of the wildland-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

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 nunning another demographics report a la large geographic scale.

Additional Resources For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_docr umentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

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

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

## Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Owner-occupied housing units with a		
mortgage	16,156	49,820,840
Monthly cost <15% of household income	3,101	9,215,740
Monthly cost >30% of household income	5,894	17,636,343
Specified renter-occupied units	18,698	40,534,516
Gross rent <15% of household income	2,146	4,355,942
Gross rent >30% of household income	9,533	19,581,493
Median monthly mortgage cost*	\$1,515	\$1,540
Median gross rent <sup>*</sup>	\$996	\$904

### Percent of Total

Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost >30% of household income Gross rent <15% of household income 35.4% 10.7% 36.5% 1 1.57% 1 51.0% 4 /non-metro or regional aggregations. ing 2009-2013 and are representative of average Gross rent >0% of household income Gross rent >0% of household income A Median monthy mortgage cost and median gross rent are not available for metrolin - The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted durin characteristics during this period. 48.3%

# Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\* 60% 50% 30% 20% 51.0% 36.5%

Coconino County, AZ

- In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of owner-occupied households where greater than 30% of household income was spent on mortgage costs (36.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (35.4%).
- In the 2009-2013 period, Coconino County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of renter-occupied household where greater than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (51.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (48.3%).
- 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 gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$996), and the U.S. had the lowest (\$904).



Coconino County, AZ

Median monthly mortgage cost^ Median gross rent^

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

\$500

\$0 ÷

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation			
	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.	
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%	0.2%	
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 <sup>*</sup>	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%	

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# How affordable is housing?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

upied 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

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.

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 acconomic hardship is whether housing is alfordable. This page measures housing alfordability in terms of the share of housing 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 alfordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for highly alfordable.

48.3%

35.4%

US

U.S.

Iethods
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
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%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report as 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/ahs.html <sup>(44)</sup>.

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 affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: realtor.org/research/research/research/nousinginx<sup>(46)</sup>.

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

				Benchmarks
How	do demographic, income, and social characteristic	cs in the region c	ompare to the U	LS.?
This	page compares key demographic, income, and social indi	cators from the region	on to the United S	tates.
Ind	icators	Coconino County AZ	U.S.	Coconino County AZ vs. U.S.
	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	15.9%	10.7%	
s	Median Age (2013*)	31.0	37.3	
aphic	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	62.1%	74.0%	
mogr	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	13.7%	16.6%	
ă	Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013*)	27.1%	0.8%	
	Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*)	27.8%	30.6%	
	Median Household Income (2013*)	\$49,555	\$53,046	
	Per Capita Income (2013*)	\$23,382	\$28,155	
me	Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)	23.0%	15.4%	
Inco	Percent Families Below Poverty (2013*)	15.5%	11.3%	
	Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*)	39.9%	46.6%	
	Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income (2013*)	19.9%	20.2%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*)	12.4%	14.0%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*)	31.1%	28.8%	
ture	Percent Population That Speak English Less Than 'Very Well' (2013*)	8.1%	8.6%	
Struc	Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*)	21.2%	3.9%	•
	Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*)	36.5%	35.4%	
	Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*)	51.0%	48.3%	
				0 50

# \* 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. The Coconino County AZ is most different from the U.S. in Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013\*), Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013\*), and Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013\*).

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

	Region	
Population Growth (% change, 2000-2009*)	0.0%	0.0
Median Age (2009*)	0.4%	0.
Percent Population White Alone (2009*)	0.7%	0.
Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2009*)	0.0%	0.
Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native	1.1%	0.
Percent of Population *Baby	1.3%	0.
Median Family Income (2009*)	2.1%	0.
Per Capita Income (2009*)	2.0%	0.
Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*)	4.2%	0.
Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*)	6.7%	0.
Percent of Households with Retirement and Social	2.3%	0.
Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income	4.6%	0.
Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High	4.4%	0.
Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's	2.3%	0.
Percent Population That Speak English Less Than	5.3%	0.
Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*)	2.6%	0.
Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of	5.2%	0.
Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of	4.4%	0.

\_

Study Guide and Supplemental Information How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? What do we measure on this page? The page compare 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 self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and

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 threshold, then the family or our unrelated individual is dastellid as being facelow the poverty level.<sup>1</sup>

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been bom between 1946-1964. The reported percent of population that are 'baby boomers' has some associated error since ACS generally reports age classes in 5-year increments (55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, etc.).

Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimburnament.

Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer; labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

/hy 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 from the U.S.

It also offers an at-splance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a geography has an odder population, relatively unaflocatable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indicators can help uplic land manages intently groups of people and aspects of hadding that can all with bureach and consideration of whether the impacts of land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on disadvantaged people or places.

NOGS The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure from the region by the figure from the U.S.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor 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 as larger geographic scale.

Median Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability.

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

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

# **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceg1297.pdf
- 2 <u>www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\_main/</u>
- 3 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
- 4 <u>www.epa.gov/compliance/ej</u>
- 5 www.stateoftheusa.org
- 6 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
- 7 www.frey-demographer.org
- 8 <u>www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx</u>
- 9 www.census.gov/popest/
- 10 www.countyhealthrankings.org/
- 11 www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
- 12 www.census.gov/population/age/
- 13 www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
- 14 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
- 15 <u>www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html</u>
- 16 <u>www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\_1997standards</u>
- 17 www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
- 18 http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- 19 www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
- 20 www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\_cspan\_hispanics.pdf
- 21 www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf
- 22 www.bia.gov/index.htm
- 23 www.indians.org/index.html
- 24 www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
- 25 www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
- 26 www.bls.gov/soc/
- 27 www.bls.gov/oco/
- 28 www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
- 29 www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
- 30 www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
- 31 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
- 32 www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
- 33 www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
- 34 https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
- 35 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
- 36 www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
- 37 www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
- 38 www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
- 39 www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
- 40 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
- 41 www.bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm
- 42 www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
- 43 www.mla.org/map\_single
- 44 www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
- 45 <u>www.zillow.com</u>
- 46 www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx

# **A Profile of Land Use**

**Coconino County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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
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

### 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



en De ana el landi y surversi y. De dels presented in Dis. report serve saturaled units mattern Ryalmers (GHZ) bands. These pr

# Land Ownership

What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 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 Wilderness	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 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	27.5%	8.4%
Unspecified Designated Area Type	20.9%	6.4%
National Wilderness	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 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 Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

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

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the different types of Forest Service lands?

# 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? These data allow the user to see the range and scale of Forest Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forest Service lands have special designations that may affect management considerations. Different types of designation may impact the economic value and uses of associated lands. ethods

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/staff/ar/2009/lar08index.html<sup>49</sup>.

Forest Service Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at: fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm<sup>(5)</sup>.

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



# For an analysis on the effect on local economies, in particular on resource-based industries, from Wilderness designations, see: Duffy-Deno, K. T. 1998. "The Effect of Foderal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." Journal of Regional Science. 39(1): 109-136.

For the results of a national survey of residents in counties with Wilderness, see: Rudzitis, G. and H.E. Johansen. 1991. "How Imp Wilderness? Results from a United States Survey." Environmental Management. 15(2): 227-233.

For analysis of the role of transportation in high-amenity areas, see: Rasker, R., P.H. Gude, J.A. Gude, J. van den Noort. 2009. "The Economic Importance of Air Travel in High-Amenity Rural Areas." Journal of Rural Studies. 25(2009): 343-353.

Data Sources: Rasker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207; U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas: Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3

Coconino County, A

•Туре А вТуре В КТуре С

Coconino County, AZ has the largest share of Type C land (68.8%), and the U.S. has the smallest (49.4%).

#### ta So

Raker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207: U.S. Gedogical Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3 Study Guide







# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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.
- USDA, Forest Service
   Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
   <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html</u>
- Protected Areas Database v 1.3 2012 U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006
   National Aeronautics and Space Administration
   <a href="http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm">http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm</a>

# **Methods**

## 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
- 2 gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- 3 www.nhd.usgs.gov
- 4 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html
- 5 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm
- 6 headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
- 7 http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- 8 <u>www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php</u>
# **A Profile of Federal Land Payments**

**Coconino County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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	1
What are rederariand payments:	1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated	2
to unrestricted and restricted uses?	3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? How important are federal land payments to state and local governments	4
(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



What are federal land payments?

**Federal Land Payments** 

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information hat are federal land payments

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. <u>Ederal land payments</u>. These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. Payments are funded by idealia appropriations (e.g., PILT) and from receipts received by federal agencies from activities on federal public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals). <u>Payments</u> in Law of <u>Taxes</u> (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is based on a maximum per-scre payment neduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. <u>Forst Service Revenue Sharing</u>. These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools. 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 through the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California (0 & C) grant lands. <u>USEVXS Raluga</u>, these payments sine a portion of receipts from National Wildlie Reluge and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located. Executed States and they are located. Executed States and they are located in the state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may afters, at their discretion, a portion of revenues with the local governments where insplates were generated. Executed Texture 2012; Privers to the federal facual year with be local governments where insplates were generated.

### hy is it important?

y is a important? State and local government 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 presence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of local government thremun in rural counties with large ledenal 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 detrait revenue haring programs. PILT was instead to basilitize and increase federal and payments to courd governments. Nore recently, the Recure Rurd Schools and Community SetDetermination Act of 2000 (1985) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several major concerns around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment lowel, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several indices of around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment wells, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the structure of the structure of the structure services of the structure servi eceipt-based programs e uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization A 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget cor are creating uncertainly for the future of both. ion Act of

### thods

thtods Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments. Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are instaively insignificant at the idental 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 local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant onision in states that share a portion of royaties with local governments. Federal mineral royatiles made up 68% of lederal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.

toyation 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 Mountian Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M.T.
Gorte, Ross W. M. Lynne Com, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Congressional Research Station, Bergor EL, 2005.
Trends in federal land payments are closely text to commodity estraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Scoteconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.

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 Managament, 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.;
Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

0.5%

How are federal land payments distributed to state and local gover nts This page describes how federal land payments are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origi

Grazing Districts

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

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments by		
Geography of Origin (\$)	5,875,716	2,787,139,550
State Government	0	2,005,231,997
County Government	3,698,773	616,271,004
Local School Districts	1,813,285	113,488,835
RACs	341,324	33,302,236
Grazing Districts	22,334	12,684,340
Percent of Total		
State Government	0.0%	71.9%
County Government	63.0%	22.1%
Local School Districts	30.9%	4.1%
RACs	5.8%	1.2%



0.4%

ELocal School Districts
 County Government
 State Government

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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes how federal land payments are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origin.

by 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 sample, PLIT is derived to ocurry government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments decline, the PLIT formula ensures that county government payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments, While PLIT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalities, BLI hreenue sharing payments) are still linked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and governors have a different set of expectations and incentives to tobby for particular outcomes on public lands fram do county commissioners or school officials.

thods State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) lederal mineral royalises and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and lederal statute (see note about data limitations). <u>Country Government Distributions:</u> Consist of (1) PILT: (2) portions of Forest Service apprents including Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR5) Title 1 and Title III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW S Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discriptional state and the III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Title 1, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

# Resource Advisory Council (RACI Distributions: Consist of SRS Title II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on public land projects on the rational licent or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advisor and recommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of special projects on Ideal lands as authorized under the Secure Ranal Schools Act and Community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 people expression Interests and areas of operflaw, who wick calaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and naisonal locat

<u>Grazing District Distributions</u>: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. <u>Data Limitations</u>: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states made discretionary distributions of inviend regulaties and score BLM payments, and these data may not be

Additional Resources An Inquiry into Selected Appents 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 importa jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics or glose-hei<sup>10</sup>. ortance (in terms of

### Data Sources

ia 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/spe-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distribut school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payme ed to the state

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

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments to County		
Government (\$)	3,698,773	616,271,004
Unrestricted	1,586,829	457,219,872
Restricted-County Roads	1,813,285	143,265,915
Restricted-Special County Projects	298,659	15,785,217
Percent of Total		
Unrestricted	42.9%	74.2%
Restricted-County Roads	49.0%	23.2%



100%

80% 60% -Restricted-County Roads

----- Restricted-Special County Projects

# Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Governments by Permitted Use, FY 2013

Coconino County, AZ

In FY 2013, restricted-county roads federal land payments were the largest type of payment to the county government in Coconino County AZ (49%), and restricted-special county projects were the smallest (8.1%).

40% 20% 0%

> Restricted-Special County Projects Restricted-County Roads Unrestricted

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 Wildline 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.hadwateresconnois.cog/ep-bd

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses?

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

### Vhy is it important?

(s) is important?
County governments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For exemple, counties must maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with public lands. Several federal land payment programs, particularly those from the Forest Service, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

sist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral

<u>interinted</u>: Consist of (1) PLIT, (2) U.S. Fish and virusing service results in the service of the service estimation 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 ailable)

Additional Resources An Inquiry into Selected Appends 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. 2008. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000: Forest Service Payments to Counties. Congressional Research Service Report RL33822. Cong

### Data S ources

Ia Sources US. 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/sps-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How important are federal land payments to state and local gov nts This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state gover nent gene

### deral Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)

	Coconino County, AZ	U.S.
Total General Revenue	157,451	na
Taxes	53,628	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	73,501	na
Total Charges	15,317	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	15,005	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	5,671	3,312,736
Percent of Total		
Taxes	34.1%	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	46.7%	na
Total Charges	9.7%	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	9.5%	na





3.60%



4.0% 3.5% 3.0% 2.5% 2.0% 1.5% 1.0% 0.5%

4.0%

0.0%

na U.S. Coconino County, AZ

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liau of Taxee (PLUT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Services Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2008 Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Frish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resour Newnus. Washington, D.C.; Additional Sources and methods available at www. headvaterscommics orgiges-hd

### udy Guide and Supplemental Information

### w important are federal land payments to state and local governments?

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 (FV) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. Interaction Table: Census of Government county financial statistics are based on a national 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 for the latest year.

Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax. <u>Intergovernmental Revenue</u>: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including Ideral education, health care, and transportation assistance to state governments, and state assistance to local governments. <u>Tatal Charges</u>: Charges imposed for providing ourrent services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges. <u>All Other (Missioneus</u>): All other general government revenue from their own iscurces.

### v is it important?

() In important is 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 revenue stream. Counties must dependent on federal land payments are a effected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For these counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.

thods
Regarding Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the federal FV beginning October 1 and ending September 31. Federal land payments reported for the current FY are often distibuted to counties during the following FV. For example, Forest Service or symemst subhritized and appropriated for FV 2007 are deviewed to counties in January of 2008, during the following FV. For example, Forest Service or symemst subhritized and appropriated for FV 2007 are deviewed to counties in January of 2008, during the Census of Government FV 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FV 2006 are compared to Local government reviewe received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be undereported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

<u>Census of Governments Data Limitations</u>: (1) county linancial statistics may not match local government linancial reports for three main reasons; (a) The Genus of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agenesis, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and quasi-government) entities). This may differ from the way to governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) different reporting periods between the Genus of Governments financial year and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of the different and governments was a Governments for SMS? and PLT, and (3) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other source of country revenue.

### dditional Resources

ditional Resources U.S. Censes Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census gov/govs/estimatel<sup>(2)</sup>. For a detailed description of Census of Government survey methods, survey year (fiscal year), and definitions, see: 2006 Government Finance and Employment Classification Manual at census, gov/gove<sup>(2)</sup>. Schuster, Ervin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May 2001 pp 30-35. Ingles, Bert. 2004. Changing the Funding Structure: An Analysis of the Secure Rural Schol and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 on National Forest Lands. Environmental Science and Public Policy Research Institute, Boles State University.

### Data Sources

Ia 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 Apriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Evenue 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.hadsvatersconnois.org/eps-ht





### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)?

# 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 compensate 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 Dase payment' that is reduced by the amount of revenue sharing payments and is subject to appouldance;

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 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 full payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Vhy is it important? As county payments became more important to local government after WWII (largely due to high timber extraction levels to luel the post-war housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PLT increased and stabilized payments by funding counties from congressional appropriations rather than directly from commodity receipts. PLT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local government services, but can be used at the discritorition of county commissioners to lund 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/nbc/index.cfm<sup>(4)</sup>.

Schuster, Ervin 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 U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing? 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)



 In FY 2013, Title I payments were the greatest portion of Forest Servic revenue sharing in Coconino County AZ (85%), and 25% Fund were the smallest (0%). 80% 60% 40% 20% 0% Coconino County, AZ U.S.

Title I Title II Title III 25% Fund Forest Grasslands Special Acts

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

### udy Guide and Supplemental Information hat is Forest Service Re nue Sharing'

# What do we measure on this page?

This pa cribes Ec . ue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act

This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR), 25K, https://dx.and.forest/Grasslands. U.S. Forest Service <u>25 Percent Funct</u>: The <u>25K</u> Fund, established in 1908, shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with schools and function of the sale of schools and function of the schools and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services. The <u>Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act</u> d 2000 (SRS) or Public Lan Vio-303: SRS was senacted in FX 2001 to provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counting affected by the decline in revenue from timber harvests 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 schoots. States determine the split between these two services, and some states is the counties decide.
 Title I - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committees (RACs) at the community level help make specifing determinations and monitor project progress.
 Title II - these symmets 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 wildline protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the 25% Fund and SRS2 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. <u>Forest Grasslands</u>: 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.

### hy is it important?

USES memory battering is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royslites are distributed to states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when timber harvesto on the National Ferests increased sharply in response to post-was housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shifted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it. Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owi" 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 sharing in three fundament ways: SRS (1) does county payments from National Forest needpts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewards through Titel II funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment quily concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title 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 to expire. If SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the 25% Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on public land.

### dditional Resources

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determ ation Act payments available at: fs.usda.gov/pts/ 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 Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt Study Guide

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is BLM Revenue Sharing?

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

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

	Coconino County, AZ	
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
Title I	0	33,685,617
Title 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%
Title I	0.0%	50.6%
11001	0.070	
Title II	0.0%	5.0%



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and

rseconomics.org/eps-hdt

methods available at www.head

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information Vhat is BLM Revenue Sharing?

What do we measure on this page? 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. <u>Proceeds of Sales</u>: These include receipts from the sale of land and materials. <u>Include regarder</u> Act: These include OI and Gas Right of Way lases nervenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do not include regarders workshet 10.

payments see worksneet to. Taylor Charina Apt. 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. Funds are restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predetor contrd, noisous weed programs) in cooperation with BLM of livestock organizations. • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the • Section 5 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the Act.

Nuc. 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 California 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 SaliDetermination Act. Amounts include Title I, Title II, and Title III payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report for definitions and information on the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sali-Determination Act).

Vhy is it important? The BLM is the nation's targest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adjacent commu Similarly, the non-tanable status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide services to county residents, and pro public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in I property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT). dents, and provide overnments in lieu of

xthod 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. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 report i used. To arrive at distribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table 3-1 of BLM Public Land Statistics) was used. Some environ is filley. In addition, some data are usefund directly from states. Distribution satistics of the to fill and government are related to the provides FV seported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2006 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2006.)

### dditional Resources

BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics web blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html<sup>(6)</sup>.

Information about the Taylor Grazing Act is available at: blm.gov/wv/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html<sup>(7)</sup>.

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-hdt



# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What are Federal Mineral Royalties?

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local government This pa cribes com

	Coconino County, AZ	U.8
tal Federal Royalty	0	2,001,309,48
Royalties	0	1,784,591,30
Coal	0	353,201,18
Natural Gas	0	498,654,39
Gas Plan Products	0	141,034,61
Oil	0	693,515,90
Other	0	98,185,21
Non-Royalty Revenue	0	216,482,99
Rents	0	22,126,37
Bonus	0	330,986,89
Other Revenues	0	-136,630,27
Geothermal	0	3,659,32
GOMESA	0	235.18
Royalties	na	89.2
Coal	na	17.69
Natural Gas	na	24.9
Gas Plan Products	na	7.0
Oil	na	34.7
Other	na	4.9
Non-Royalty Revenue	na	10.8
Rents	na	1.1
Bonus	na	16.5
Other Revenues	na	-6.8
		0.2
Geothermal	na	0.1



udy Guide and Supplemental Information

Vhat are Federal Mineral Royalties?

### What do we measure on this page?

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for This page describes the compone the region.

Royalties, rents, and borus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49% of revenue is returned to states and 51% is retained by the folderal government). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on tederal lands and a share of royalties from dishone difficult in the Gut difficult of the shared of the difficult ocurry governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of folderal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or eccommically impacted by mineral divergement for planning, construction/maintenance of public calcities, and provision of public aevice).

<u>Boyalities</u>: Royality payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royality may be an established minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royality rate increases by steps as the average production on the less increases. A sliding-scale royality rate is based on average production and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat: Seathermat is and statuted directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Contamined the state of the state and the state state and the state state and the state state and the state state state and their eligible political studentions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the GOMESA the counties where the activity takes place.

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. Borusses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Boruses represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease. <u>Other Revenues</u>: A disfusement that is not a royally ren, or borus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments, gas storage fees, estimated payments, recoupments, and fees for sand and gravel used for beach restoration.

# hv is it important?

y is it important / Minent royalises are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significant demands on lederal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royalty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed to provide an ongoing public brendit from the depletion of non-revensible resources owned by the public.

### thods

Ithods Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royalty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalies were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25 percent of the state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of origin and state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of these data. Headwates Economics Incides a list of state distribution policy. Inits to data, and contract information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Mintods and Resources document. http://headwates.conomics.org/whytwi-pocretinty/buddeEPS-HDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf.

### Additional Resources

attional Kesources
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 contax information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government
Financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPSHDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf<sup>(10)</sup>.

For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at: onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/qlossarv.odf<sup>(11)</sup> ary.pdf<sup>(</sup>

Data Sources U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

• U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- U.S. Bureau of Land Management U.S. Department of Interior <u>www.blm.gov</u> Tel. 202-208-3801
- U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture <u>www.fs.fed.us</u> Tel. 800-832-1355

<u>www.onrr.gov</u> Tel. 303-231-3078

U.S. Department of Interior

# **Methods**

# 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 <u>headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt</u>
- 2 www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
- 3 <u>www.census.gov/govs/</u>
- 4 www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
- 5 <u>www.fs.usda.gov/pts/</u>
- 6 www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html
- 7 www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
- 8 <u>www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html</u>
- 9 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
- 11 www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf

# **A Profile of Demographics**

**Gila County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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.



**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.

# **Table of Contents**

Demographics How has population changed? What is the age and gender distribution of the population? What is the racial makeup of the population? What is the Hispanic makeup of the population? What is the tribal makeup of the population?	Page 1 2-3 4 5 6-7
Employment What occupations and industries are present? What are the characteristics of labor participation? What are commuting patterns?	8 9 10
Income How is income distributed? What are poverty levels? What are the components of household earnings?	11 12-13 14
Social Characteristics What are education and enrollment levels? What languages are spoken?	15 16
Housing What are the main housing characteristics? How affordable is housing?	17 18
Benchmarks How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
Data Sources & Methods	20
Links to Additional Resources	21

# 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%.

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

### How has population changed?

This page describes the total population and change in total population

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau, Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section the Savdy Guide text.

### Population, 2000-2013\*

and the second		
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Population (2013*)	53,335	311,536,594
Population (2000)	51,335	281,421,906
Population Change (2000-2013*)	2,000	30,114,688
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	3.9%	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.		



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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How has population changed?

### What do we measure on this page?

w - w - ποιοιομία - μι πια μαμμε τ This page describes the total population and change in total population. Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decemial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

### /hy is this important?

/ Is this important? This report covers a broad range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and home ownership. It is the only EPS+HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These include dises, towns, and census designated places, American Indian, Atakan nahve, and naive Hawaii areas, congressional districts, and county

automation in addition to its usefulness for social research, the information throughout this report is valuable for public land managers and others in identifying whether the selected geographies contain minorities and people who are economically and/or socially disadvantaged. This is important because Executive Order (1998, Februar) 11, 1194 states that "ack-federal agency what landex exhibiting environmental all to programs, policies, and advices on minority opulations and low-income polautions." (see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and advices on minority topulations and low-income polautions. The set Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and advices on minority topulations and low-income polautions... The set Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs. Policies and advices on Page 2 d the is the polautions... The set Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs. Policies, and advices on Page 2 d the is the polautions... The set Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to polaution... The set Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is the polaution... The set Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to polaution... The polaution is the polaution of the polaution is the set of the polautions... The set of the polaution is the set of the polaution is the set of the polaution is the set of the polaution... The set of the polaution is the set of the polaution is the polaution of the polaution is the set of the polaution is the polaution of the polaution is the polaution stice acts of report nces)

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/isocially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management actions requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minotify individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as body); and infirmity, illness, or any other negative health effects from cumulative or multiple devices exposures to environmental hazards), and disproprioritately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or naive populations).

### thods

LINUS The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). 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 unit 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).

For populations of 65.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographice, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this proport are 5-year ACS estimates. Kores of han 16 or 3-year estimates, he 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographice, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographice since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cose-geograp comparisons. The disadvantage is that multilyair estimates cannot be used to describe any parallelity are in the period, only what the average value is over the full period. For thready, table and figure titles show the latest year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to clarify that the data represent average characterization over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables. **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; ORANCE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with the dota) indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; another domographics report at a leagn groupped space. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the bless provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

### Additional Resources sible publ

An indi on on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see: census gov/acs/wwwihethodology/methodology\_main/<sup>10</sup>. census gov/acs/wwwDownloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyotData2009.pdf <sup>10</sup>.

### Data Sources

ta 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. Study Cuide

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 rider

### 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	26.407	152 247 412

Change in Median Age, 2000-2013\*

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

35.3 5.7% Median Ape / 2000)
Median Ape / 2000)
13.27%
Median Ape is AcAnge
Amedian App is Acange

47.9 42.3



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.

tion Cooffi

	Gila County AZ	US
Total Population	0.0%	0.0%
Linder E ventre	1 3%	0.0%
E te O verere	E 0%	0.0%
5 to 9 years	5.578	0.1%
10 to 14 years	0.5%	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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes population distribution tion by age and gender, and the change in median age. This page describes population dis

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

### hy is it important?

y is it important? Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of refines, 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 many counties, the largest segment of the oppulation is in the Baby Boarner generation (people boarnets) motiversities (19-6). The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

37.3

thoos Data in his report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Cansus 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 2006 forwup 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 > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest huming another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of mace, 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<sup>16</sup>.

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/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

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: stateoftheusa.org<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistrib and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: aoa.go root/aging\_statistics/index.aspx

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/ <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: county-healthrankings.org/ (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.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population? This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age dis with age categories separated into

### Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 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 table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average chara 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.

Total Population	0%	0%
Under 18	0%	2%
18-34	0%	3%
35-44	0%	5%
45-64	0%	2%
65 and over	0%	3%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Varia	ation	
	2000	2009*
Under 18	0%	0%
18-34	0%	0%
35-44	0%	0%
45-64	0%	0%
of 1	0%	0%

Study Guide and Supplemental Information What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 ca five age groups.

### hy is it important?

VIS It Important? For public land agency, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retined population, or soon-ba-enteid oppopulation. 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 minors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the reterement of the "Baby Boomen" generation (those 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 demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

### ods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with none dot) indicates be and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%; if data have consistently low accuracy the a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. ween 12

dditional Resources The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at: The non-profit Population Reference prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups us.go

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010 1138 ndf <sup>(13)</sup> 1138.pdf

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 gow/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx <sup>(44)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regional 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 Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st 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.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html <sup>(15)</sup>. 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.

What is the racial makeup of the population?

cribes the number of people who self-ide ntify as belonging to a particular race This page de

Race: Race is a set-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or maces with which they most closely identify The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicky.

### Population by Race, 2013\*

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	53,335	311,536,594
White alone	42,459	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	1306	39,167,010
American Indian alone	7,910	2,540,309
Asian alone	194	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	"16	526,347
Some other race alone	1,275	14,746,054
Two or more races	1,175	8,732,333
Percent of Total		
White alone	79.6%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	0.6%	12.6%
American Indian alone	14.8%	0.8%
Asian alone	0.4%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race alone	2.4%	4.7%
-		

Two or more races 2.2% 2.8%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average s during this pe

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Gila County AZ, 2013\*



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

Population by Race, Coefficients of Variation		
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
White alone	1%	0%
Black or African American alone	19%	0%
American Indian alone	1%	0%
Asian alone	29%	0%
Native Hawaiian & 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 African American alone	21%	0%
American Indian alone	2%	0%
Asian alone	33%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0%	0%
Some other race	15%	0%
Two or more races	17%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### Vhat is the racial makeup of the populat

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people ple who self-identify 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 identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race

and athnicity. Race Alexe Categories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureau, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawalan or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Nather, "Alast" and "Native Hausilian of Other Posicilis Islander" race categories described shows. Respondents providing write-in ertites such as multitical, invarie, interracial, or a Haganic Latino group (for example, Mexican, Pluento Rican, or Culban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category. <u>Two or Mace Races</u>: People may have chosen to provide two or more race response. Providing multiple write-in responses, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

ny is it important?

deral agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this information to omote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act.

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 nacial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic group are inportant for putting into effect a nature of federal statutes (i.e., envirosing billingual election naise whether Mong Rights Act; montoing and entroicing equal employment opportunities under the CNH Rights Act; Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local povernments to in programs and meeting (i.e., evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinessment 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, broady referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 128as. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whethe there is a potential environmental justice issue. For public land ma

### ods

Annue. Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elevelwere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with non edot) indicates be 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with non dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numming anothe demographics report at large geographic scalar.

dditional 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/federg\_1997standards<sup>(16)</sup>.

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 Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/ist/bages/ind

The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measurecfamerica.org/acenturyapart.<sup>(19)</sup>

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

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

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.

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Maxican," Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those the indicate that the year "ofter Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino" Origin can be viewed as the hertiage, unclanding trouge, Ineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spansh, Hispanic, or Latino may be dary taxos.

### Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	53,335	311,536,594
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	9,702	51,786,591
Not Hispanic or Latino	43,633	259,750,003
White alone	34,645	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	'270	38,093,998
American Indian alone	7,839	2,061,752
Asian alone	194	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	-16	488,646
Some other race	-27	606,356
Two or more races	'642	6,387,422
Percent of Total		

Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	18.2%	16.6%
Not Hispanic or Latino	81.8%	83.4%
White alone	65.0%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	0.5%	12.2%
American Indian alone	14.7%	0.7%
Asian alone	0.4%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race	<sup></sup> 0.1%	0.2%
Turn of more source	14, 296	2.1%

Two or more races '1.2%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average istics during this period



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

	Gila County, AZ	U.
al 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%	C
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	95%	1
Some other race	97%	1
Two or more races	22%	(
rcent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Gila County, AZ	U
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	(
Not Hispanic or Latino	0%	(
White alone	0%	(
Black or African American alone	12%	(
American Indian alone	1%	(
Asian alone	33%	(
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0%	(
Some other race	120%	(
Two or more record	20%	0

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people who self-identity as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural destination, and Hispanics can be of any race.

Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal gover race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. ent considers

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mevican," "Puerto Rikan," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino". Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, inseque, or country of bitm of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

### hy is it important?

y is it important? Hispanicas ere one of the tastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-dentified 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 200 and 2010, Hispanica accounded for ver one-hald of the trackin'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 imposition on a population.

According to the Cansus 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 dispatises in health and environmental riskly and "Data on ethnic groups are important for puting into effect a number of federal statuse (i.e., enforcing intogramal environmental riskly) fights Act, monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civit Rights Act, Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments (i.e., enforcing intograms and mencils) are not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act, evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act."

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.

Iditional 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/fedreg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>.

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/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces

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.pdf <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf <sup>[21]</sup>.

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

## **Demographics** What is the tribal makeup of the population?

This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are member of a principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 thrites or Satectad American Indian categories: Apache, Blackfeet, Cheverse, Chicksaw, Chipyene, Chickaw, Chipyene, Shan, Yao, Li Wanaw, Jao, Ulawan, Jao, Ulawan, Jao, Ulawan, Jao, Ulawan, Jao, Ulawan, Jao, Ulawan, Jao, Li Chickaw, Chipyene, Shan, Xiao, Yuawan, Yao, Wanaw, Jao, Wan

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

### 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	7,893	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes	<b>"0</b>	108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	- 17	363,000
Percent of Total Total Native American	14.8%	0.8%
American Indian Tribes	14.8%	0.6%
Alaska Native Tribes	<b>`0.0%</b>	0.0%
Non-Specified Tribes	0.0%	0.1%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using	annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and	are representative of average

\* The data in this table are calcula characteristics during this period.

In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the population that self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native (14.8%) and the U.S. had the lowest (0.8%).

Native American Population, Percent of Total, Gila County AZ, 2013\*



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

American Indian & Alaska Native Popula	ation, Coefficients of Variation	
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
Total Native American	1%	0%
American Indian Tribes	1%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	na	1%
Non-Specified Tribes	75%	1%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation	n	
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Native American	2%	0%
American Indian Tribes	2%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	na	0%
Non-Specified Tribes	0%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? , the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or This page describes, in general ter with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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. Cansus data are available for 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categorizer, Sapeha, Bladketer, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickawa, Chipewa, Chotawa, Coville, Comanche, Cree, Creek. Crow, Delaware, Houma, Ioquids, Kiowa, Lumbee, Manorine, Navajo, Csage, Chawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatom, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shortone, Sixu, Tohoro O'Othum, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al Arber.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hy is it important?

V is it important ( Different groups depole may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native titbes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current is to be land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

# thoos 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%. Ideat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

ethods

### dditional 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.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>. The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs res and contacts are available at: bia.gov/index.htm <sup>(22)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.org/index.html <sup>(23)</sup>.

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

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Ammore other races. an Indian and Alaska Native alo nation with one o

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013

Region

	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
Blackfeet	<b>"0</b>	26,474
Cherokee	713	273,192
Cheyenne	<b>"0</b>	11,774
Chickasaw	<b>"0</b>	22,917
Chippewa	<b>"0</b>	115,253
Choctaw	<b>"0</b>	90,189
Colville	<b>"0</b>	8,182
Comanche	<b>"0</b>	12,228
Cree	<b>"0</b>	2,191
Creek	"6	41,521
Crow	23	11,424
Delaware	<b>"0</b>	7,471
Houma	<b>"0</b>	9,488
Iroquois	<b>"0</b>	45,639
Kiowa	<b>"0</b>	8,691
Lumbee	<b>"0</b>	68,171
Menominee	<b>"0</b>	8,259
Navajo	'399	305,552
Osage	<b>"0</b>	8,332
Ottawa	<b>"0</b>	7,026
Paiute	<b>"O</b>	10,545
Pima	- 95	24,212
Potawatomi	<b>"9</b>	19,337
Pueblo	70	71,029
Puget Sound Salish	<b>"O</b>	13,971
Seminole	7	13,987
Shoshone	<b>"O</b>	9,470
Sioux	721	124,383
Tohono O'Odham	~230	20,343
Ute	<b>"0</b>	8,629
Yakama	<b>"O</b>	8,614
Yaqui	<b>"0</b>	19,942
Yuman	711	7,944
All other tribes	'616	491,367
American Indian; Not Specified	<b>"0</b>	60,370
Alaska Native Tribes; Specified	<b>"O</b>	108,836
Alaska Athabaskan	<b>"0</b>	15,882
Aleut	<b>"0</b>	11,709
Eskimo	<b>"0</b>	60,926
Tlingit-Haida	<b>"0</b>	15,622
All other tribes	<b>"0</b>	4,697
Alaska Native; Not Specified	<b>"0</b>	10,616
American Indian or Alaska Native;		
		000 000

Not Specified
 To associate the second seco

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general 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 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categories, Roden, Bladketer, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasw, Chipewa, Chockaw, Colvile, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, toquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menorinee, Navajo, Casge, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shotone, Siux, Tohomo Odotham, Ute Aviaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al cher.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hv is it important?

y is in important: Different groups people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, belefs, 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 and/or current to be the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately 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 (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

Iditional 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 relations. See: fs.led.us/spft/tribalrelations/index.shtml <sup>(24)</sup>.

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

Study Guid

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

	Gila County, AZ	U.:
I Population	0%	0'
Total Native American	1%	0'
American Indian Tribes; Specified	1%	0'
Apache	4%	2
Blackfeet	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
Navajo	23%	1
Osage	na	6
Ottawa	na	7
Paiute	na	4
Pima	56%	4
Potawatomi	101%	3
Pueblo	56%	2
Puget Sound Salish	na	4
Seminole	96%	4
Shoshone	na	ŧ
Sioux	78%	1
Tohono O'Odham	52%	ŧ
Ute	na	e
Yakama	na	ŧ
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	e
Alaska Native; Not Specified	na	6
American Indian or Alaska Native: No	75%	1

Employment

# What occupations and industries are present?

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

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	18,378	141,864,697
Management, professional, & related	5,402	51,341,226
Service	4,741	25,645,065
Sales and office	4,010	34,957,520
Farming, fishing, and forestry	"130	1,030,881
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	2,428	11,832,435
Production, transportation, & material moving	1,667	17,057,570
Percent of Total		
Management, professional, & related	29.4%	36.2%
Service	25.8%	18.1%
Sales and office	21.8%	24.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	"0.7%	0.7%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	13.2%	8.3%
Production, transportation, & material moving	9.1%	12.0%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve	eys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average

# characteristics during this period. Employment by Industry, 2013\*

		0.5.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	18,378	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	1,868	2,731,302
Construction	1,245	8,864,481
Manufacturing	591	14,867,423
Wholesale trade	145	3,937,876
Retail trade	2,092	16,415,217
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	899	7,010,637
Information	183	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	1944	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	1,317	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	4,618	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	2,219	13,262,892
Other services, except public administration	725	7,043,003
Public administration	1,532	7,034,048
Percent of Total		
Percent of Total Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	10.2%	1.9%
Percent of Total Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction	10.2% 6.8%	1.9% 6.2%
Percent of Total Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing	10.2% `6.8% `3.2%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5%
Percent of Total Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade	10.2% *6.8% *3.2% *0.8%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8%
Percent of Total Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Whokesale trade Retail trade	10.2% `6.8% `3.2% `0.8% 11.4%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8% 11.6%
Percent of Total Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Retail trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	10.2% 16.8% 13.2% 10.8% 11.4% 14.9%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8% 11.6% 4.9%
Parcent of Total Adviculture, krestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Resail trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information	10.2% 6.8% 3.2% 0.8% 11.4% 4.9% 1.0%	1.9% 6.2% 2.8% 11.6% 4.9% 2.2%
Percent of Total Ariculture, forestry, fahing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Whoesale trade Retall trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and Insurance, and real estate	10.2% 6.8% 3.2% 0.8% 11.4% 4.9% 1.0% 5.1%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8% 11.6% 4.9% 2.2% 6.7%
Percent of Total Astrubure, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Whotenale trade Retail trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prot., scientific, mort, mort, a waten my	10.2% 6.8% 3.2% 0.8% 11.4% 4.9% 1.0% 5.1% 7.2%	1.9% 8.2% 10.5% 2.8% 11.6% 4.9% 2.2% 6.7% 10.8%
Percent of Total Adjustment Scientry, fabing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale Itade Retail Itade Transportation, werehousing, and utilities Information Issumch. and real estate Prot, scientific, mgmt, admin. & water mgr Education, health cma, & social assistance	10.2% 6.8% 3.2% 0.8% 11.4% 4.9% 5.1% 7.2% 25.1%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8% 11.6% 4.9% 2.2% 6.7% 10.0% 10.0%
Percent of Total Astruture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Workstrein ingo Petal Inode Transportation, werehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prot., solenific, mort, adm., & waste mor Education, health care, & accula assistance Arts, entertain, e.e., accundation, & fod	10.2%, 5.2%, 7.2%, 11.4%, 4.9%, 7.0%, 5.1%, 7.2%, 25.1%, 12.1%,	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8% 4.9% 4.9% 6.7% 10.8% 2.2% 5.7% 10.8% 23.2% 9.3%
Percent of Total Adjustment Sensity, fabing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Retail trade Retail trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and finances, and neal estate Prance and finances, and neal estate Character have a social estatement Education, health care, & social estatement Ats, entertain, rec, accomodation, & bod Other services, except public administration	10.2% 6.8% 3.2% 0.8% 11.4% 4.9% 1.0% 5.1% 2.5% 25.1% 12.1% 3.3%	1.9% 6.2% 10.5% 2.8% 4.9% 2.2% 6.7% 10.8% 2.3% 9.3% 5.0%

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

# Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Variation U.S. Civilian employed population > 16 years Management, professional, & related Service 3% 7% 7% 45% 9% 11% 0% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% Sales and office Farming, fishing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint., & repair Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, transportation, & manetal moving Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation Management, protessional, & related Service Sales and office Farming, sching, and torestry Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, transportation, & manetal moving Employment by Industry, Coefficients of M 7% 7% 43% 9% 11% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% ts of Var Civilian employed population > 16 years Agriculture, forestry, fahing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mg Education, headh care, & sciola assistance Arts, ententian, ree., accomodation, & bod Other services, except public assistance nty, AZ U.S. 3% 12% 14% 35% 10% 15% 33% 19% 13% 7% 10% 17% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Other services, except public administration 0% Public administration Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation 11% Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 12% 14% 19% 39% 10% 15% 31% 14% 14% 14% 11% 17% 10% Mandacturing Wholesale trade Reall Inde Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt, admin, & waste mgre Education, heath area, & social assets mgre Define services, except public administration Public administration

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### Vhat occupations and industries are present?

What do we measure on this page? 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: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classifi-with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry. Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

# hy is it Important? y 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 relativity the eccoreary and the degree of dependence on certain sectors. Employment by occupation dises additional information that desc people to its a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-ted by working to a onliving time, an entitie, or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while by industry describes where people work. stries (for example, m

thods

ribes what tions are

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates bet 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 trunning another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

dditional Resources The Census Bureau pr u provides a definition of SOCS: census.gov/hhes/www/ioind

Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.gov/soc/

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: bis.gow/cor/<sup>(27)</sup>.

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

hat are the characteristics of labor participat	ion?	
his page describes workers by weeks worked per year	and usual hours works per week.	
abor Participation Characteristics, 2013	*	
	Gila County A	7 U
opulation 16 to 64	30,53	3 204,340,91
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	13,80	B 112,330,37
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	2,77	4 21,646,42
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	2,44	9 19,225,13
Did not work	11,50	2 51,138,98
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:		
Worked 35 or more hours per week	14,15	3 116,424,22
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	4,17	3 29,453,21
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	/0	5 7,324,48
Maan usual bours worked for workers	11,50	2 51,138,98
Wear usual hours worked for workers	37.	5 30
ercent of Total		
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	45.29	6 55.0
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	9.19	6 10.6
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	8.09	6 9.4
Did not work	37.79	6 25.0
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:		
Worked 35 or more hours per week	46.49	6 57.0
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	13.75	6 14.4 /
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	2.31	5 J.O
	100%	
	80%	
	60%	
In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the	40%	
highest estimated percent of people that	40.0	
worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%),	20%	
and Gila County, AZ had the lowest	0%	
(40.2.%).	Gila County, A	vz 0.8.
	8 Did not work	Worked 1 to 26 weeks
	Worked 27 to 49 weeks	Worked 50 to 52 weeks
	Hours Worked	per Week, 2013*
	100%	
	80%	
	60%	
	-070	
In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the		
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that</li> </ul>	40%	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%),</li> </ul>	40%	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Gila County, AZ had the lowest</li> </ul>	40%	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Gia County, AZ had the lowest (46.4%).</li> </ul>	40% 20% 0% Gila County, /	IZ U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Gila County, AZ had the lowest (46.4%).</li> </ul>	40% 20% 0% Gila County, / Gila County, /	IZ U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Glia County, A2 had the lowest (46.4%).</li> </ul>	40% 20% 0% Gila County, / Gila County, /	IZ U.S.

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Population 16 to 64	0%	0%
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	3%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	10%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 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%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	16%	0%
Did not work	4%	0%
Mean usual hours worked for workers	1%	0%
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 1 to 26 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%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	16%	0%
Did not work	4%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the characteristics of labor participation?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

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".

### /hy is it important?

One, it to be hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, it ranslams to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. 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 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 how say to remain active in the workplice but due to treat works at all schedule. Advances is computer texthologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more fielde hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, burism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods ele concriming stability, the vast majority of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time 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, 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 his may explain failing wages or rates of employment has observe population change (see the Scooconcin Kleasures report for changes in wages, employment, and population change the second sec

### nods

sthods 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 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/pdf/G0612501.pdf <sup>(28)</sup>.

# For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.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.

		Employment
Vhat are commuting patterns?		
his page describes workers who do not work from home by pla	ce of work and by travel time to work.	
Commuting Characteristics 2012*		
community characteristics, 2013		
	Gila County, AZ	U.S
Vorkers 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	18,220,85
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 county 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%	5.99
30 to 34 minutes	7.7%	13.0%
35 to 39 minutes	71.3%	2.6%
40 to 44 minutes	1.4%	3.5%
45 to 59 minutes	1.9%	7.3%
60 or more minutes	18.7%	7.8%

40 to 44 minutes 1.44% 45 to 59 minutes 1.09% 60 or more minutes 8.7% 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.

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 Gila County, AZ had the lowest (11.9%).



Worked outside county of residence Worked in county of residence

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## What are commuting patterns?

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 eaving, for the oily of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worker 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 necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job coportunities 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 sever facilities without an adequate source or revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

thoos 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 numing 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 Perspectives 2(2), encudad gov/Publications/RDPR0/P697/RDP697/RDP697 epd <sup>(10)</sup>.

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

Study Guide

	Gila County, AZ	
orkers 16 years and over	3%	0
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	4%	0'
Worked outside county of residence	7%	0'
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	7%	0'
10 to 14 minutes	8%	0'
15 to 19 minutes	9%	0'
20 to 24 minutes	10%	0'
25 to 29 minutes	18%	0'
30 to 34 minutes	12%	0'
35 to 39 minutes	45%	0'
40 to 44 minutes	23%	0'
45 to 59 minutes	21%	0'
60 or more minutes	13%	0'
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	7%	0
ercent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	4%	0'
Worked outside county of residence	8%	0'
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	7%	0'
10 to 14 minutes	8%	0'
15 to 19 minutes	9%	0'
20 to 24 minutes	10%	0'
25 to 29 minutes	19%	0'
30 to 34 minutes	12%	0'
35 to 39 minutes	43%	0'
40 to 44 minutes	22%	0'
45 to 59 minutes	19%	05
60 or more minutes	13%	0

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

		Income
How is income distributed?		
This page describes the distribution of household income.		
Household Income Distribution, 2013*		
	Gila County, AZ	U.S
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$20,792	\$28,15
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$39,954	\$53,04
Total Households	20,601	115,610,21
Less than \$10,000	1,930	8,380,36
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1,281	6,214,54
\$15,000 to \$24,999	3,291	12,468,60
\$25,000 to \$34,999	2,529	11,929,76
\$35,000 to \$49,999	3,603	15,723,14
\$50,000 to \$74,999	3,798	20,744,04
\$75,000 to \$99,999	2,048	14,107,03
\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,619	14,858,23
\$150,000 to \$199,999	'367	5,651,84
\$200,000 or more	135	5,532,62
Gini Coefficient <sup>A</sup>	0.42	0.4
Percent of Total		
Less than \$10,000	9.4%	7.25
\$10,000 to \$14,999	'6.2%	5.49
\$15,000 to \$24,999	16.0%	10.85
\$25,000 to \$34,999	12.3%	10.3
\$35,000 to \$49,999	17.5%	13.69
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18.4%	17.99
\$75,000 to \$99,999	9.9%	12.2
\$100,000 to \$149,999	7.9%	12.95
\$150,000 to \$199,999	1.8%	4.99
\$200,000 or more	'0.7%	4.89



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

Household Income Distribution, Coefficients o	f Variation	
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Per-Capita Income	3%	0%
Median Household Income^ (2013) \$s	3%	0%
Total Households	2%	0%
Less than \$10,000	11%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	13%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	7%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	8%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	7%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	6%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	9%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	10%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	29%	0%
\$200,000 or more	33%	0%
Gini Coefficient	3%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Less than \$10,000	12%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	13%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	7%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	8%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	7%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	6%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	9%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	10%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	31%	0%
\$200,000 or more	37%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information How is income distributed?

### What do we measure on this page?

 Date of we measure on this page?

 This page describes the distribution of household income.

 Per Capita Income.
 Total personal income divided by total population of an area.

 Household 1: household induced and the people who courgu a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
 Gini Coefficient; provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 represents perfect inequality. The were the Gini coefficient; the more quality the income distribution.

 Learner Quarks quarks arguing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect intequality. Every point on the Learner curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom \_% of households have \_% of all income."

</tabular

### /hv is it important?

y is it important? For public land mages, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionality high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographics helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-polation 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 fagure that shows a propriorinal jurge number of households at both enterme inclates a segregriph characterization by Thaves' and Thave-not

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 mixidualis and households. ned

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run Account protocol and the second secon

### ethods

White 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 Gari 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Iditional Resources The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-me inequality. McLaughin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf <sup>(31)</sup>. metro income lev

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: federal reserve gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm <sup>(20)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=e

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09W/IZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl:

### Data Sources

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

## Income What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line

Powerty: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "bolw the poverty beaut".

### Poverty, 2013\*

	Gila 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%

15.4% 11.3% ntative of average 
 Families below poverty
 1.0%

 \* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representance inside a uring this period.

In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ
had the highest estimated percent of
individuals living below poverty (21.6%),
and the U.S. had the lowest (15.4%).

In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty (13.4%), and the U.S. had the lowest (11.3%).



People Below Poverty Families below poverty

### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
People	21.6%	15.4%
Under 18 years	35.9%	21.6%
65 years and older	'7.4%	9.4%
Families	13.4%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	27.2%	17.8%
Married couple families	'8.4%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	'19.7%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	'30.4%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	'41.4%	40.0%

-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.

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

Poverty, Coefficients of Variation		
	Gila County, AZ	
People	0%	0%
Families	3%	0%
Individuals Below Poverty	7%	0%
Families Below Poverty	10%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation	n	
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%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of iduals 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 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 threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their plealow the pover | level."

### y 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 teacors. First, people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attituides as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed aztivities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience dispropriormally files and adverse effects.

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 important because aggregate poverty rates (for example, families below poverty) may hide some important information (for example, the poverty rate of carging embers with children).

### lethods

thoos 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

Intronal 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, gov/topics/tvrai-economy-population/tural-poverty-well-being.aspx<sup>(56)</sup>. For more info

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: www.npc.umich.edu/poverty<sup>(36)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement all glosophe 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 as available as tage so/compliance(eff

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

Income

### What are poverty levels?

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<sup>\*</sup>, 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	<b>"0</b>	1,872,394
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	<b>"0</b>	99,943
Some other race	197	3,872,191
Two or more races	'249	1,696,884
All Ethnicities in Poverty		10 507 000
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	1,811	12,507,866
All Ethnicities in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	`1,811 9,490	12,507,866 34,155,567
All Eminicines in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty)	'1,811 9,490	34,155,567
All Efficiences in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Net Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone	1,811 9,490 59.9%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5%
All Enforcines in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone	1,811 9,490 59.9% <b>1.0%</b>	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8%
All Efficiences in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone American Indian Aone	1,811 9,490 59.9% ~1.0% 35.1%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5%
All chinicities in Pover(y) Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone	1,811 9,490 59.9% ~1.0% 35.1% ~0.0%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0%
All Enforcines in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone American Indian Alone Asian alone Native Hewaiian & Oth-Pacific Is. alone	1.811 9,490 59.9% ~1.0% 35.1% ~0.0% ~0.0%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60,5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2%
All Efficiences in Pover(y) Hispanic or Laino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Laino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Heavaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone Some other race	1,811 9,490 59.9% `1.0% 35.1% `0.0% `0.0% `1.7%	12,507,865 34,155,567 60,5% 21,8% 1,5% 4,0% 0,2% 8,3%
All Enforcines in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hewaiian & Oth-Pacific Is. alone Some other race Two or more races	1,811 9,490 59,9% ~1.0% 35.1% ~0.0% ~0.0% ~1.7% 2.2%	12,507,865 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6%
All Enforcines in Pover(y) Hispanic or Laino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Laino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone Bink or African American alone Anian alone Asian alone Native Hewalian & Oh. Pacific Is. alone Some other race Two or more races Two or more races	1,811 9,490 59,9% 10% 35,1% 70,0% 70,0% 11,7% 12,2% 18,0%	12,507,865 34,155,567 60,5% 21,8% 4,0% 0,2% 8,3% 3,6% 26,8%

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.

### Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty~, 2013\*

	Gila County, AZ	
White alone	16.2%	12.5%
Black or African American alone	"48.1%	27.1%
American Indian alone	50.7%	28.6%
Asian alone	<sup></sup> 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%

Pover inspenied at the 15.6% 10.6% -Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that

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

	Gila County, AZ	
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 Ethni	city, 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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? 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 deat-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: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their "below the poverty level."

### /hy is it important?

V is it important? For public land magners, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the contact of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

THOUS The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their ball family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of heiled children under 15 present (see below for poverty) releaf thresholds.

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local vinations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at census, goothers/wwwpoerty/dathreshold/reskum<sup>100</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

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 University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: nor.umich.deuterach/ethnicity<sup>100</sup>.

The U.S. Census Bursau briefing on "Poverty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: census, gov/population/scdem/sistatise/byoarea.html<sup>209</sup>.

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

	Income
What are the components of household earnings?	
This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source.	

### Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

	Gila County, 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 <sup>^</sup>		
Labor earnings	62.1%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	46.6%	28.9%

28.9% 17.7% 4.9% 2.8% 12.4%

characteristics during this period.



### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

	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.

	Gila County AZ	118
Total bousebolds:	2%	0%
Labor earnings	3%	0%
Social Security (SS)	3%	0%
Retirement income	4%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	13%	0%
Cash public assistance income	16%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	8%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Labor earnings	3%	0%
Social Security (SS)	3%	0%
Retirement income	4%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	13%	0%
Cash public assistance income	15%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	7%	0%
Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source,	Coefficients of Variation	
	Gila County, AZ	U.S
Mean earnings	3%	0%
Mean Social Security income	4%	0%
Aean retirement income	9%	0%
Mean Supplemental Security Income	19%	0%
Mean cash public assistance income	30%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the components of household earnings?

### What do we measure on this page? This page describes household ea ngs by source

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Ratirament income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to 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 item.

### Methods

HOUS 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 BDLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest funning another demographics report at a larger georganic scade.

# Why is this important?

Vis 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 reflement and Social Socium<sup>1</sup>. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of referee (reflement) payments), other measures for example, SSI or Food Sampa) are an indication of a concome hardship.

### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_doc ntation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

### Data Sources

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

	Social Cha	aracteristics
What are education and enrollment levels?		
This page describes educational attainment and school	enrollment.	
Educational Attainment, 2013*		
	Gila County, AZ	U.S
Fotal Population 25 yrs or older	38,494	206,587,852
No high school degree	6,060	28,887,721
High school graduate	32,434	177,700,131
Associates degree	3,389	16,135,795
Bachelor's degree or higher	6,199	59,583,138
Bachelor's degree	3,488	37,286,246
Graduate or professional	2,711	22,296,892
Percent of Total		
No high school degree	15.7%	14.0%
High school graduate	84.3%	86.0%
Associates degree	8.8%	7.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher	16.1%	28.8%
Bachelor's degree	9.1%	18.0%
Graduate or professional	7.0%	10.8%
<ul> <li>The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annu- sharacteristics during this period.</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people over</li> </ul>	ual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are Educational Attainment, 201 35%	28.8%
the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree or	30%	2000000
higher (28.8%), and Gila County, AZ had	25%	
the lowest (16.1%).	20% 15.7% 16.1%	14.0%
	376 1	000000
	10%	
In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ	10%	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had</li> </ul>	10% 5% 0% Gila County, AZ	U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Glis County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).</li> </ul>	Gila County, AZ     No high school degree	U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15,7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14,0%).</li> <li>School Enrollment, 2013*</li> </ul>	Gila County, AZ     Gila County, AZ     No high school degree BBachelori	U.S.
In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Enal Resultation period.	Gila County, AZ	U.S. a degree or higher
In the 2009-2013 period. Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15 7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Peopletion over 3 yeas old: Errolled in cethods:	Cila County, AZ  No high school degree  RBachelori  Cila County, AZ  Cila County, AZ  Cila County, AZ  S1, 460  S1, 467	U.S. s degree or higher 299,796,522 82,624 ABC
In the 2009-2013 period. Glia County, AZ has the highest estimated percent of people our the sage of 25 when of y school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school:	Glia County, AZ Bio high school degree Blachelori Glia County, AZ Bi, 446 10,407 10,407	U.S. s degree or higher U.S. 299,795,522 82,624,806 5 (111,102)
In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school:     Enrolled in School:	Gila County, AZ     G	U.S. U.S. s degree or higher U.S. 299,795,522 299,795,522 299,795,522 299,795,522 299,795,522 200,795,522 200,795,525,525 200,795,525 20
In the 2009-2013 period. Glis County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population ver 3 years old: Enrolled in nursers school, preschool Enrolled in inviergentern e.e.	Glia County, AZ Glia County, AZ No high school degree BiBachelori Glia County, AZ Glia County,	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,000 5,011,192 4,208,394 1,296,547
In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, A2 had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15,7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14,0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in unusery school, preschool Enrolled in indicatarten Enrolled in orache 5 to aracke 8	Citia County, AZ  No high school degree  RBachelori  Cita County, AZ  Cita County, AZ  Cita County, AZ  S1,446 10,07 1075 2050 2,426 2,210	U.S. U.S. s degree or higher 2007.076.522 2007.076.523 2007.076.524 2007.076 20
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of period degree (55.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollement, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursers school, preschool Enrolled in indergarten Enrolled in grade 9 percent 9 Enrolled in grade 9 percent 9 Enrolled in grade 9 percent 9	Gila County, AZ Gila County, AZ Gila County, AZ No high school degree Bachelori Gila County, AZ S1,446 S1,440 S1,4	U.S. U.S. a degree or higher U.S. 299,795,522 82,624,000 5,011,192 4,208,545 16,510,313 117,1153,555 117,1155 117,115
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, A2 had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in school: Errolled in school: Errolled in grade 9 to grade 8 Errolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Errolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Errolled in ograde 9 to grade 12	10%         Gila County, AZ           ® No high school degree         BBachelori           Cita County, AZ         51,446           10,407         51,447           10,407         505           2,466         2,210           2,460         2,240           2,450         2,490           2,490         2,490           2,490         1,992	U.S. U.S. s degree or higher 200,706,522 200,706,525 200,706 20
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high the lowest (14 0%).     School Enrollment, 2013 <sup>2</sup> Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursers school, preschool Enrolled in indergaren Enrolled in ingreb 5 in garde 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 2 Enrolled in organ 2 to grade 2	10%         Gila County, AZ           • No high school degree         Blachelori           • No high school degree         Blachelori           • No high school degree         Blachelori           • St.446         10,407           • S75         380           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 464         464	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,606 5,011,162 4,208,394 16,228,634 16,103,826 11,103,826
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depret (15,7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14,0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Fold Population over 3 years old: Errolded in school: Errolded in school: Errolded in underspräme Errolded in underspräme Erolded i	10%         Gila County, AZ           ® No high school degree         Blachelori           Cita County, AZ         51,446           10,407         51,447           10,407         5050           2,460         2,210           2,460         1,902           1,902         494           41,039         1409	U.S. s degree or higher 2007 705 522 28,074 000 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,510,312 17,153,555 14,1155,555 14,1155,5555 14,11555,5555 14,11555,5555 14,11555,5555 14,1
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of period degree (5.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollement, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in nursers school, preschool Errolled in indersarten Errolled in indersarten Errolled in indersarten Errolled in grade 1 to grade 4 Errolled in grade 9 to grade 1 Errolled in grade 9 to grade 1 Errolled in collegy, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school	10%         Gila County, AZ           • No high school degree         • Bachelori           • State         • State	U.S. s degree or higher 299(795,522 82(624,606 5,011,12) 4,208,394 16(286,521) 4,128,555 17(1153,555 17(1153,555 17(1153,555 17(1153,555 17(1153,555 17(1153,555 17(1153,555)17(1153,555) 17(1153,555) 17(1153,555)17(1153,555) 17(1153,555)17(1153,555) 17(1153,555)17(1153,555) 17(1153,555)17(1153,555)17(1153,555) 17(1153,555)
In the 2009-2013 period. Glia County, A2 had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school depres (15 7/k), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollement, 2013*     Total Peopletion over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursers yechod, preschool Enrolled in sindergarane Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in orgade 9 to grade 14 Enrolled in orgade 9 to grade 14 Enrolled in school Not enrolled in school     Percent of Total Enrolled in school	Cila County, AZ Cila C	U.S. U.S. 2997/95/522 2997/95/522 2997/95/522 2997/95/52 2997/95/52 2097/95/52 4/23/55 19,333,09 4/23/76 217,170/17 27,5%
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high intervention of the age of 25 with no high intervention of the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrolled in Autoration of the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in grade 50 grade 2 Errolled in grade 51 grade 2 Errolled in grade 50 grade 2 Errolled in grade 50 grade 2 Errolled in school: Errolled in school Not errolled in school Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in nursery school, preschool	10%         Gila County, AZ           • No high school degree         Baschelori           • State         1,446           10,407         575           • 380         2,246           • 2,426         1,902           • 484         41,039           • 20,2%         1,1%	U.S. s degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,906 5,011,102 4,208,394 16,228,542 4,208,394 16,228,542 4,208,394 16,228,542 4,208,394 16,228,542 4,121,765 2,171,770,717 2,276% 1,278 1,2
In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ has the highest estimated percent of people over the sage of 25 with ho high school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in instances tools, preschool Enrolled in instances tools, preschool Enrolled in orade 1 orade 4 Enrolled in orade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in orade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in orade 10 orade 12 Enrolled in schools Enrolled in schools Enrolled in kindergaren	10%         Glia County, AZ           9%         Glia County, AZ           ■ No high school degree         Blachelori           Glia County, AZ         51,446           10,607         10,607           10,607         360           2,426         2,210           2,426         2,210           1,662         4,469           1,602         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,210         2,456           2,210         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,104         3,652           2,105         2,456           2,210         2,456           2,210         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,103         2,456           2,105         2,456           2,105         2,756	U.S. a degree or higher U.S. 200,705,522 28,654,000 5,011,92 4,208,394 16,510,313 17,138,365 16,333,030 217,170,717 217,170,717 27,545 1,455 1
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high the lowest (14 0%).     School Enrollment, 2013*     Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in ingrade 5 to grade 1 Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 1 Enrolled in school: Errolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school:	Old         Old           0%         Gila County, AZ           ■ No high school degree         Blachelori           0 Hon high school degr	U.S. s degree or higher U.S. 299,795,522 89,624,606 5,011,92 4,208,394 16,228,644 16,513,312 4,208,394 16,228,644 16,513,312 17,170,717 217,170,717 27,674 1,474 5,493
In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ has the highest estimated percent of period or entry the says of 25 with or bigh school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enroellie and the says of 25 with a Enrolled in kind school to the same Enrolled in kindscarten Enrolled in grade 15 to grade 12 Enrolled in ordet 15 orate 4 Enrolled in ordet 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in ordet 5 to grade 14 Enrolled in understation Enrolled in understation Enrolled in understation Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	10%         Glia County, AZ           9%         Glia County, AZ           • No high school degree         Bachelori           10,465         10,465           10,465         2,426           2,210         2,426           2,210         2,426           2,426         2,410           1,002         1,462           1,102         1,425           1,102         1,426           1,102         1,426           1,102         4,456           2,240         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,456         2,456           2,756         3,56	U.S. a degree or higher 2007 05,522 28,264,300 5,011,102 4,208,344 16,510,313 17,153,555 19,333,056 4,121,766 217,170,171 227,657 1,775 27,657 1,775 2,755
In the 2009-2013 period, Glia County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high center of the age of 25 with no high school Enrolled in center of the age of 25 with Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in indergarten Enrolled in ingrade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in order 50 with a 68 Enrolled in order 50 with a 68 Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school 10 Percent of Total Enrolled in school Enrolled in school Enrolled in indergarten Enrolled in inder 50 with 68 Enrolled in inder 50 with 68 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 3 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 3 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 3 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 3 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4	10%         Gila County, AZ           • No high school degree         • Bachelori           • Stilde         51,446           • 10,407         575           • 360         2,426           • 2,426         2,445           • 2,420         2,445           • 11,047	U.S. s degree or higher U.S. 299,795,522 89,795,522 89,795,522 89,795,522 89,795,523 4,208,394 16,286,343 17,153,053 4,121,765 4,121,776 1,177 227,6% 1,574 5,474 5,57%
In the 2009-2013 period. Glia County, A2 thad the highest estimated percent of school degree (15.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (14.0%).     School Enrollement, 2013*     Total Population vers 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school yearshool perschool Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in order to reade 1 Enrolled in orgade 10 Enrolled in orgade 10 Errolled in school Not annelled in school Not annelled in school Enrolled in school 2 Enrolled in School 2 Enrolle	10%         Glia County, AZ           • No high school degree         • Bachelori           • St, 446         10,407           • 262         2,426           • 2,426         2,426           • 2,426         2,430           • 10,402         -           • 40,75         -           • 10,402         -           • 40,75         -           • 10,50         -           • 2,626         -           • 2,450         -           • 2,450         -           • 10,402         -           • 10,502         -           • 2,650         -           • 2,750         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -           • 10,502         -<	U.S. a degree or higher U.S. 209.705.22 6.2294.705.22 6.2294.705.22 6.2294.705.22 6.211.92 4.208.545 16.510.31 17.735.555 19.333.056 4.121.765 2.17.777 1.44 4.545 6.455 6.455 6.4555 6.4555555555555555555555555555555555555

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

79.8%

### Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

Not enrolled in school

	Glia Courity, AZ	0.5.
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		
Enrolled in school:	3%	0%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	22%	0%
Enrolled 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%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are education and enrollment levels? What do we measure on this page? This page describes levels of educational attainment.

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.

<u>School Enrollment</u>: 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.

hy is it important? Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and lack of education is closely linked to poverty. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during economic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for most information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geographic areas might experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication and outrach efforts could be tailored of different addresces.

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 growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

thods 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 support unning another demographics report at a larger egospathic scale.

Additional Resources For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemployment rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.gov/emp/ep\_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.gov/prod/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 Ec vol. 34, New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

72.4%

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

What languages are spoken?

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.

### Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	50,237	291,484,482
Speak only English	42,997	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	7,240	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	4,103	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	376	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	"115	9,539,099
Other languages	2,646	2,626,244
Speak English less than "very well"	1,693	25,148,900
Percent of Total		
Speak only English	85.6%	79.3%
Speak a language other than English	14.4%	20.7%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	8.2%	12.9%
Other Indo-European languages	"0.7%	3.7%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	"0.2%	3.3%
Other languages	5.3%	0.9%
Speak English less than "very well"	'3.4%	8.6%

Speak English ress that very well \* 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 Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



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

- Carolina et lleme Cartfiel

	Gila County, AZ	
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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What languages are spoken? 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.

/hy is it important? For public land managers who are trying to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent to public lands, it is important to know wh a significant protor of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implement may need to be conducted in multiple languages. ether ation

TROS 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%, it data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numary another demographics report at latinger 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: mix.org/map\_single <sup>(13)</sup>.



the main housing characteristics?		

This page des cribes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built

### Housing Characteristics, 2013

What are

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Housing Units	32,749	132,057,804
Occupied	20,601	115,610,216
Vacant	12,148	16,447,588
For rent	525	3,230,123
Rented, not occupied	-107	599,884
For sale only	'841	1,682,020
Sold, not occupied	710	608,590
For seasonal, recreational, occasional us	9,127	5,122,778
For migrant workers	"46	34,233
Other vacant	1,492	5,169,960
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	181	771,765
Built 2000 to 2004	4,317	19,385,497
Built 1990 to 1999	6,724	18,390,124
Built 1980 to 1989	7,121	18,345,244
Built 1970 to 1979	6,757	21,042,566
Built 1960 to 1969	2,685	14,634,125
Built 1959 or earlier	4,964	39,488,483
Median year structure built*	1983	1976
Percent of Total		
Occupancy		
Occupied	62.9%	87.5%
Vacant	37.1%	12.5%
For rent	'1.6%	2.4%
Rented, not occupied	'0.3%	0.5%
For sale only	2.6%	1.3%
Sold, not occupied	Ĩ <b>0.0%</b>	0.5%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	27.9%	3.9%
For migrant workers	<b>``0.1%</b>	0.0%
Other vacant	'4.6%	3.9%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	'0.6%	0.6%
Built 2000 to 2004	13.2%	14.7%
Built 1990 to 1999	20.5%	13.9%
Built 1980 to 1989	21.7%	13.9%
Built 1970 to 1979	20.6%	15.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	8.2%	11.1%
Built 1959 or earlier	15.2%	29.9%

Built 1960 of earlier 1967. And an analysis of the second second

# In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing (37.1%), and the U.S. had the lowest (12.5%).

and the control



Cccupied Vacant

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

	Gila County, 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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

Housing

## What are the main housing characteristics?

What do we measure on this page? This bace describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

Bent: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other 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,

### hv is it important?

y to a mulportaint r 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 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 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 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a test rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant for public lands managers in the cost of the wildland-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

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 nunning another demographics report a la large geographic scale.

Additional Resources For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_docr entation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

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

		Housing
How affordable is housing?		
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and	renters.	
Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2	2013*	
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Owner-occupied housing units with a		
mortgage	7 515	49 820 840

Median gross rent <sup>A</sup>	\$743	\$904
Median monthly mortgage cost*	\$1,182	\$1,540
Gross rent >30% of household income	2,149	19,581,493
Gross rent <15% of household income	693	4,355,942
Specified renter-occupied units	4,982	40,534,516
Monthly cost >30% of household income	3,166	17,636,343
Monthly cost <15% of household income	1,111	9,215,740

### Percent of Total

Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost >30% of household income Gross rent <15% of household income 14.8% 42.1% 35.4% 10.7% Cross ret 2016 of household income
 Conserved and the construction of the cons 48.3%

### Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

- In the 2009-2013 period, Gila County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of owner occupied household where greater than 30% of household income was spent on 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 than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (48.3%), and Gila County, AZ 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 gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$904), and Gila County, AZ had the lowest (\$743).



48.3%

35.4%





Median monthly mortgage cost^

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				
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.		
Owner-occupied housing units with a				
mortgage	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 <sup>A</sup>	2.9%	0.0%		
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%		

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## How affordable is housing?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

upied 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

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.

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 acconomic handship is whether housing is alfordable. This page measures housing alfordability in terms of the share of housing 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 alfordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for highly alfordable.

Iethods
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
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%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report as 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/ahs.html <sup>(44)</sup>.

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 affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: realtor.org/research/research/research/nousinginx<sup>(46)</sup>.

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

				Benchmarks
How	do demographic, income, and social characteris	tics in the region c	ompare to the U.S.?	
This	page compares key demographic, income, and social in	dicators from the regi	on to the United States.	
Ind	instara	011-0		Cilo County AZ un 11 S
inu		Gila County AZ	0.5.	Gila County AZ vs. 0.3.
	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	3.9%	10.7%	l l
s	Median Age (2013*)	47.9	37.3	
aphic	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	79.6%	74.0%	
mogr	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	18.2%	16.6%	
De	Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013*)	14.8%	0.8%	
	Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*)	37.8%	30.6%	
	Median Household Income (2013*)	\$39,954	\$53,046	
	Per Capita Income (2013*)	\$20,792	\$28,155	
a	Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)	21.6%	15.4%	
Inco	Percent Families Below Poverty (2013*)	13.4%	11.3%	
	Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*)	77.7%	46.6%	
	Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income (2013*)	25.3%	20.2%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*)	15.7%	14.0%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*)	16.1%	28.8%	
ture	Percent Population That Speak English Less Than 'Very Well' (2013*)	'3.4%	8.6%	
Struc	Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*)	27.9%	3.9%	-
	Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*)	42.1%	35.4%	
	Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*)	43.1%	48.3%	
				0 20

\* 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. The Gla County AZ is most different from the U.S. in Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013<sup>+</sup>), Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013<sup>+</sup>).

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

Indicators		
	Region	US
Population Growth (% 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%

\_

Study Guide and Supplemental Information How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? What do we measure on this page? The page compare 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 self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and

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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or our unrelated individual is dastellid as being facelow the poverty level.<sup>1</sup>

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been bom between 1946-1964. The reported percent of population that are 'baby boomers' has some associated error since ACS generally reports age classes in 5-year increments (55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, etc.).

Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimburnament.

Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer; labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

/hy 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 from the U.S.

It also offers an at-splance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a geography has an odder population, relatively unaflocatable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indicators can help uplic land manages intently groups of people and aspects of hadding that can all with bureach and consideration of whether the impacts of land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on disadvantaged people or places.

NOGS The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure from the region by the figure from the U.S.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor 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 as larger geographic scale.

Median Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability

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

# **Data Sources & Methods**

## **Data Sources**

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

## **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

## For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceg1297.pdf
- 2 <u>www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\_main/</u>
- 3 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
- 4 <u>www.epa.gov/compliance/ej</u>
- 5 www.stateoftheusa.org
- 6 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
- 7 www.frey-demographer.org
- 8 <u>www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx</u>
- 9 www.census.gov/popest/
- 10 www.countyhealthrankings.org/
- 11 www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
- 12 www.census.gov/population/age/
- 13 www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
- 14 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
- 15 <u>www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html</u>
- 16 <u>www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\_1997standards</u>
- 17 www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
- 18 http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- 19 www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
- 20 www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\_cspan\_hispanics.pdf
- 21 www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf
- 22 www.bia.gov/index.htm
- 23 www.indians.org/index.html
- 24 www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
- 25 www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
- 26 www.bls.gov/soc/
- 27 www.bls.gov/oco/
- 28 www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
- 29 www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
- 30 www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
- 31 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
- 32 www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
- 33 www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
- 34 https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
- 35 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
- 36 www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
- 37 www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
- 38 www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
- 39 www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
- 40 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
- 41 www.bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm
- 42 www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
- 43 www.mla.org/map\_single
- 44 www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
- 45 <u>www.zillow.com</u>
- 46 www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx

# **A Profile of Land Use**

**Gila County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

## 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 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
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

### 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



ernation System (GSI) inclo. Two pri

Page 1

## Land Ownership

What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 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	3,661,32
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	398,20
National Scenic River	0	289,61
National Scenic Area	0	230,45
Primitive Area	0	173,76
National Volcanic Monument	0	167,42
Special Management Area	0	164,70
Protection Area	0	45,05
Recreation Management Area	0	43,90
National Scenic and Wildlife Area	0	39,17
Scenic Recreation Area	0	12,64
National Botanical Area	0	8,25
National Scenic and Research Area	0	6,63
National Historic Area	0	6,54
orest Service Lands	55.5%	8.4%
Unspecified Designated Area Type	47.2%	6.49
National Wilderness	8.2%	1.6%
National Monument	0.0%	0.29
National Recreation Area	0.0%	0.19
National Game Refuge	0.0%	0.19
National Wild River	0.1%	0.09
National Recreation River	0.0%	0.09
National Scenic River	0.0%	0.09
National Scenic Area	0.0%	0.09
Primitive Area	0.0%	0.09
National Volcanic Monument	0.0%	0.09
Special Management Area	0.0%	0.0%
Protection Area	0.0%	0.05
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%	0.09
National Scenic and Research Area	0.0%	0.09
National Historic Area	0.0%	0.0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the different types of Forest Service lands?

## 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? These data allow the user to see the range and scale of Forest Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forest Service lands have special designations that may affect management considerations. Different types of designation may impact the economic value and uses of associated lands. ethods

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/statf/lar/2009/lar08index.html<sup>49</sup>.

Forest Service Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at: fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

Study Guide

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



•Туре А вТуре В КТуре С

Gila County, AZ

It are the different types of federal lands? at do we measure on this page? This page describes the size (in across) and share of federal judic! lands managed for various purposes under differing statutory authorin For purposes of the social, federal public lands have been defined below as Type A, B, or C in order to more easily distinguish lands according to primary or common uses and/or conservation functions, achivities, permitted transportation uses, and whether they have a special destraintic of the howing C-argorization alarchi).

Type A lands tend to have more managerial and commercial use restrictions than Type C lands, represent smaller proportions of total land management areas (non-ph type A lands), and have a designation stim, here easily changed than Type B lands. In most other respects and the start of the

As more popularly described: Type A lands are areas having uncommon bio-physical and/or cultural character worth preserving; Type B lands are areas with limited development and motorized transportation worth preserving; and Type C lands are areas where the landscape may be altered within the objectives and quidelines of multiple use.

hoods The classifications effered on this page are not absolute categories. They are categories of relative degrees of management priority, categorized by land designation. Lands such as Wildeness and National Monuments, for example, are generably more likely to or 0 and managed for conservation and restration, worr hough there may exist teacefulors (a) as a Wildeness area or 0 and gas development in a National Normanne, Texes Service and ELM lands whole designations such as Wildeness or National Normanne are more likely to also commercial advices a quint, priorities materials, owen hough there are explored.

Land defined as either Type A. B. or C includes areas managed by the National Park Sarvice, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another the Sarvice and Face Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers). These Bureau of Realizations, address and Bureau of Realizations are not team of the Amy Carpet of Engineers and tool of a general experime of a second and a second and any assessment and and an ana managed by take agencies and tool generament are not included in this classification are not team of the advect of agency approved. A served: The amount of average in particular team by the and types may not be the only includer of quality. For example, Wild and Sor Rear managed by a second and and an advection of a second and advection of a second advection of advection of a second advection of a second advection of a second advection of a second advection of ad

See also: Lorah, P. and R. Southwick. 2003. "Environmental Protection, Population Change, and Economic Development in the Rural Western United Stater' Population and Environment. 24(3): 255-272, and Holmes, P. and W. Hecox. 2002. "Does Wilderness Impoverbin Rural Areas?" International Journal of Wolferness. 10(3): 34-39.

For an analysis on the effect on local economies, in particular on resource-based industries, from Wilderness designations, see: Duffy-Deno, K. T. 1998. "The Effect of Foderal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." Journal of Regional Science. 39(1): 109-136.

For the results of a national survey of residents in counties with Wilderness, see: Rudzitis, G. and H.E. Johansen. 1991. "How Imp Wilderness? Results from a United States Survey." Environmental Management. 15(2): 227-233.

For analysis of the role of transportation in high-amenity areas, see: Rasker, R., P.H. Gude, J.A. Gude, J. van den Noort. 2009. "The Economic Importance of Air Travel in High-Amenity Rural Areas." Journal of Rural Studies. 25(2009): 343-353.

a So

Raker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207: U.S. Gedogical Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3 Study Guide

Data Sources: Rasker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207; U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas: Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3







# **Data Sources & Methods**

## **Data Sources**

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.
- USDA, Forest Service
   Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
   <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html</u>
- Protected Areas Database v 1.3 2012 U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006
   National Aeronautics and Space Administration
   <a href="http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm">http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm</a>

## **Methods**

## 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.

## For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
- 2 gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- 3 www.nhd.usgs.gov
- 4 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html
- 5 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm
- 6 headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
- 7 http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- 8 <u>www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php</u>

# **A Profile of Federal Land Payments**

**Gila County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

## 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 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	1
What are rederariand payments:	1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated	2
to unrestricted and restricted uses?	3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? How important are federal land payments to state and local governments	4
(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



What are federal land payments?

**Federal Land Payments** 

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## hat are federal land payments

## What do we measure on this page? This page describes all federal land payment

tat do we measure on this page? This page describes all federal large hayments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin. <u>Federal and payments</u>: These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. Payments are funded by federal appropriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) is based on a maximum per-agropyment reduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. <u>Forest Service Revenues Sharing</u>: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for com/t tradis and local schools. 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 through the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California (0 & C) grant lands. <u>USEVXS Raluga</u>, these payments sine a portion of receipts from National Wildlie Reluge and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located. Executed States and they are located. Executed States and the states are provided to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may afters, at their discrition, a portion of revenues with the local governments where insplates were generated. Executed Terminal Value: The resources and the locate Internet where insplates were generated. Executed Terminal Value: The relevant bit the local posteriments where insplates were generated.

### hy is it important?

y is a important? State and local government 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 presence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of local government thremun in rural counties with large ledenal 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 detrait revenue haring programs. PILT was instead to basilitize and increase federal and payments to courd governments. Nore recently, the Recure Rurd Schools and Community SetDetermination Act of 2000 (1983) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several major concerns around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment lowel, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several field and payments directly in the structure set of the structure of the set of the structure second to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the structure of the set of the eceipt-based programs e uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization A 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget cor are creating uncertainly for the future of both. ion Act of

### thods

thtods Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments. Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are instaively insignificant at the idental 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 local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant ontision in states that share a portion of royaties with local governments. Federal mineral royatiles made up 68% of lederal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.

toyational 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 Mountian Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M.T.
Gorte, Ross W. M. Lynne Com, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Congressional Research Station, Bergori EL, Socky Manutan, Research Station,
tops and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socieconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.
For data on federal and ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.

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 Managament, 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.;
Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to state and local gover nts This page describes how federal land payments are distributed to state and local governments nents by geography of orig

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

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments by		
Geography of Origin (\$)	5,042,314	2,787,139,550
State Government	0	2,005,231,997
County Government	3,932,424	616,271,004
Local School Districts	734,888	113,488,835
RACs	367,444	33,302,236
Grazing Districts	7,557	12,684,340
Percent of Total		
State Government	0.0%	71.9%
County Government	78.0%	22.1%
Local School Districts	14.6%	4.1%
RACs	7.3%	1.2%
Grazing Districts	0.1%	0.5%



made up the largest percent of federal land payments in Gila Co AZ (78%), and State Governmer made up the smallest (0%).

60% 40% 20% 0% -Gila County, AZ

> Grazing Districts RACs Grazing Districts
>  IRACs
>  ILocal School Districts
>  ICounty Government

U.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 Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to state and local govern

What do we measure on this page? This page describes how federal land payments are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origin.

by 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 sample, PLIT is deviced to occurry government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments decline, the PLIT formula ensures that county government payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments, While PLIT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalities, BLI hreenue sharing payments) are still linked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and governors have a different set of expectations and incentives to tobby for particular outcomes on public lands fram do county commissioners or school officials.

nents?

thods State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) lederal mineral royalises and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and lederal statute (see note about data limitations). <u>Country Government Distributions:</u> Consist of (1) PILT: (2) portions of Forest Service apprents including Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR5) Title 1 and Title III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW S Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discriptional state and the III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Title 1, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

# Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Distibutions: Consist of SRS Title II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on public and projects on the national krost or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advise and ecommendations to the forest Service on the development and implementation of spacial projects on Ideal lands as authorized under the Becure Rula Schools Act and Community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 people expression retents and areas of expertise, who were clabectarely to improve working relationships among community methems and national loss the component of the species advisor of clabectarely to improve working relationships among community methems and national loss the class of the species of the clabectarely of the improve working relationships among community.

<u>Grazing District Distributions</u>: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. <u>Data Limitations</u>: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states made discretionary distributions of inviend regulaties and score BLM payments, and these data may not be

Additional Resources An Inquiry into Selected Appends 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, USDN Forest Service, Missoud, 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 importa jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics or glose-hei<sup>10</sup>. ortance (in terms of

### Data Sources

ia 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/spe-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distribut school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payme ed to the state

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

	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments to County		
Government (\$)	3,932,424	616,271,004
Unrestricted	3,197,536	457,219,872
Restricted-County Roads	734,888	143,265,915
Restricted-Special County Projects	0	15,785,217
Percent of Total		
Unrestricted	81.3%	74.2%
Restricted-County Roads	18.7%	23.2%
Restricted-Special County Projects	0.0%	2.6%



100%

80%

-Restricted-County Roads ----- Restricted-Special County Projects

## Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Governments by Permitted Use, FY 2013

 In FY 2013, unrestricted federal land payments were the largest type of payment to the county government in Gila County AZ (81.3%), and restricted-special county projects restricted-special county were the smallest (0%).

60% 40% 20% 0% Gila County, AZ

> Restricted-Special County Projects Restricted-County Roads Unrestricted

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 Wallington Bevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www. hadvaterescontraics.org/sp-hdt

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses?

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

### Vhy is it important?

(s) is important?
County governments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For exemple, counties must maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with public lands. Several federal land payment programs, particularly those from the Forest Service, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

----

sist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal min

<u>interinted</u>: Consist of (1) PLIT, (2) U.S. Fish and virusing service results in the service of the service

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 vailable)

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

### Data S Sources

Ia Sources US. 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/ops-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How important are federal land payments to state and local gov nts This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state gove nent gene

### deral Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)

	Gila County, AZ	
Total General Revenue	65,199	na
Taxes	20,960	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	32,237	na
Total Charges	4,054	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	7,947	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	2,494	3,312,736
Percent of Total		
laxes	32.1%	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	49.4%	na
Total Charges	6.2%	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	12.2%	na

### Federal Land Payments per FY, Percent of Total General Government Revenue, Gila County AZ 4.5% 4.0% 3.5% 2.5% 2.0% 1.5% 1.0% 0.5% 0.0% 3.82% 2.56% 2.47% 0.79% #N/A

1992

3.82%

1987

## Federal Land Payments, Percent of Total General Gover Revenue, FY 2007

1997

2002

2007

In FY 2007, federal land payments as a percent of total general government revenue in Gila County AZ was 3.8%.

From FY 1987 to FY 2007, federal land payments grew from 0.8 to 3.8 percent of total general government revenue, an increase of 386 percent.

4.5% 4.0% 3.5% 2.5% 2.0% 1.5% 1.0% 0.0% Gila County, AZ U.S.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liau of Taxee (PLUT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Services Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2008 Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Frish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resour Networks Washington, D.C.; Additional Sources and methods available at www. Bavdaterescomics orgiges-hd

### udy Guide and Supplemental Information

### w important are federal land payments to state and local governments?

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 (FV) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. Interaction Table: Census of Government county financial statistics are based on a national 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 for the latest year.

Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax. <u>Intergovernmental Revenue</u>: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including Ideral education, health care, and transportation assistance to state governments, and state assistance to local governments. <u>Tatal Charges</u>: Charges imposed for providing ourrent services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges. <u>All Other (Missioneus</u>): All other general government revenue from their own iscurces.

## y is it important?

() In important is 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 revenue stream. Counties must dependent on federal land payments are a effected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For these counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.

thods
Regarding Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the federal FV beginning October 1 and ending September 31. Federal land payments reported for the current FY are often distributed to counties during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opaments authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opaments subnotzed and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the Census of Government FV 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2008 are compared to Local government revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be undersported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

<u>Census of Governments Data Limitations</u>: (1) county linancial statistics may not match local government linancial reports for three main reasons; (a) The Genus of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and duals government) entities). This may differ from the way to governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) different reporting periods between the Genus of Governments financial year and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of the Genus and Y 2007, block the recomments from the Way to an introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of Governments way FY 2007, block the recomments from the SMS and PILT, and (3) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other source of county revenue.

### dditional Resources

ULUS. Censis Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census gov/govs/estimatel<sup>(2)</sup>. 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/gova<sup>(2)</sup>. Schuster, Ervin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May

Schlader, Ermit Scharten and Schuler Schuler and Schuler Schul

### Data Sources

ta OULIVES 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 Apriculture. 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 Wildle 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 Wildle 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.hashvatersconnics.org/ep-bdt





### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

## What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)?

## 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 compensate 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 Dase payment' that is reduced by the amount of revenue sharing payments and is subject to appouldance;

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 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 full payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Vhy is it important? As county payments became more important to local government after WWII (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-war housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PLT increased and stabilized payments by funding counties from congressional appropriations rather than directly from commodity receipts. PLT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local government services, but can be used at the direction of county commissiones 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/nbc/index.cfm<sup>(4)</sup>.

Schuster, Ervin 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 U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.



What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing? 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)



Title I Title II Title III 25% Fund Forest Grasslands Special Acts

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

### udy Guide and Supplemental Information hat is Forest Service Re nue Sharing'

## What do we measure on this page?

This pa cribes Ec . ue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act

This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR), 25K, https://dx.and.forest/Grasslands. U.S. Forest Service <u>25 Percent Funct</u>: The <u>25K</u> Fund, established in 1908, shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with schools and function of the sale of schools and function of the schools and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services. The <u>Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act</u> d 2000 (SRS) or Public Lan Vio-303: SRS was senacted in FX 2001 to provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counting affected by the decline in revenue from timber harvests 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 schoots. States determine the split between these two services, and some states is the counties decide.
 Title I - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committees (RACs) at the community level help make specifing determinations and monitor project progress.
 Title II - these symmets 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 wildline protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the 25% Fund and SRS2 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. <u>Forest Grasslands</u>: 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.

### hy is it important?

USES memory battering is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royslites are distributed to states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when timber harvesto on the National Ferests increased sharply in response to post-was housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shifted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it. Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owi" 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 sharing in three fundament ways: SRS (1) does county payments from National Forest needpts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewards through Titel II funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment quily concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title 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 to expire. II SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the 25% Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on public land.

### dditional Resources

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determ tion Act payments available at: fs.usda.gov/pts/ 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 Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt Study Guide

## **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is BLM Revenue Sharing?

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

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

-	and the second	
	Gila County, AZ	U.S.
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
Title 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%
Title II	0.0%	5.0%



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

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

Vhat is BLM Revenue Sharing?

What do we measure on this page? 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. <u>Proceeds of Sales</u>: These include receipts from the sale of land and materials. <u>Include regarder</u> Act: These include OI and Gas Right of Way lases nervenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do not include regarders workshet 10.

payments see worksneet to. Taylor Charina Apt. 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. Funds are restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predetor contrd, noisous weed programs) in cooperation with BLM of livestock organizations. • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the • Section 5 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the Act.

Nuc. 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 California 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 SaliDetermination Act. Amounts include Title I, Title II, and Title III payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report for definitions and information on the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sali-Determination Act).

Vhy is it important? The BLM is the nation's targest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adjacent commu Similarly, the non-tanable status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide services to county residents, and pro public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in I property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT). dents, and provide overnments in lieu of

xthod 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. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 report i used. To arrive at distribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table 3-1 of BLM Public Land Statistics) was used. Some environ is filley. In addition, some data are usefund directly from states. Distribution statistics charated from the state or local government are related to the provides FY's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2006 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2006.)

### dditional Resources

BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics web blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html<sup>(6)</sup>.

Information about the Taylor Grazing Act is available at: blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html(7).

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-hdt



## **Federal Land Payment Programs**

### What are Federal Mineral Royalties?

This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to st and local gove

Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

	Gila County, AZ	U.S
al Federal Royalty	0	2,001,309,48
Royalties	0	1,784,591,30
Coal	0	353,201,18
Natural Gas	0	498,654,39
Gas Plan Products	0	141,034,61
Oil	0	693,515,90
Other	0	98,185,21
Non-Royalty Revenue	0	216,482,99
Rents	0	22,126,37
Bonus	0	330,986,89
Other Revenues	0	-136,630,27
Geothermal	0	3,659,32
GOMESA	0	235,18
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties	0	235,18
GOMESA crcent of Total Royalties Coal	0 na	235,18 89.29 17.69
GOMESA rcent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas	0 na na	235,18 89.29 17.69 24.99
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products	0 na na na na	235,18 89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09
GOMESA rccent of Total Royalies Ceal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil	0 na na na na na	235,18 89.2° 17.6° 24.9° 7.0° 34.7°
GOMESA rrcent of Total Royalties Ceal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other	0 na na na na na	235,18 89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09 34.77 4.99
GOMESA incent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue	0 na na na na na na	235,18 89,29 17,69 2,4,99 7,09 34,79 4,99 10,88
GOMESA rrcent of Total Royalties Coal Coal Sas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents	0 na na na na na na na	235,18 89,22 17,69 24,99 7,09 34,77 4,99 10,89 1,18
GOMESA incent of Total Royalities Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus	0 na na na na na na na na na	235,18 89,29 17,66 24,99 7,00 34,79 4,99 10,68 1,19 16,55
GOMESA incrent of Total Koyalities Coal Matural Gas Gas Plan Products Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues	0 na na na na na na na na na na	235,18 89,22 17,66 24,97 7,07 34,77 4,99 10,88 1,119 16,59 5,688
GOMESA incent of Total Royalities Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues Geschermal	0 na na na na na na na na na na na na na	235,18 89,22 17,68 24,99 7,00 34,77 4,99 10,89 1,11 16,55 6,88 0,22

## I his table shows federal royalties disbursed directly to state and local governments. States may share a por with counties. These state "pass through" disbursements are not reported here. See 'Additional Resources'.



udy Guide and Supplemental Information

### Vhat are Federal Mineral Royalties?

### What do we measure on this page?

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for This page describes the compone the region.

Royalties, rents, and borus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49% of revenue is returned to states and 51% is retained by the folderal government). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on tederal lands and a share of royalties from dishone difficult in the Gut difficult of the shared of the difficult ocurry governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of folderal mineral royalities within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or eccommically impacted by mineral divergement for planning, construction/maintenance of public teditions, and provision of public aevice).

<u>Boyalities</u>: Royality payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royality may be an established minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royality rate increases by steps as the average production on the less increases. A sliding-scale royality rate is based on average production and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat: Seathermat is and statuted directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Contamined the state of the state and the state state and the state state and the state state and the state state state and their eligible political studentions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the GOMESA the counties where the activity takes place.

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. Borusses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Boruses represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease. <u>Other Revenues</u>: A disfusement that is not a royally ren, or borus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments, gas storage fees, estimated payments, recoupments, and fees for sand and gravel used for beach restoration.

## hv is it important?

y is it important / Minent royates 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. Royally revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed to provide an ongoing public benefit from the depletion of non-revensible resources owned by the public.

### thods

Ithods Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royalty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalies were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25 percent of the state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of origin and state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of these data. Headwates Economics Incides a list of state distribution policy. Inits to data, and contract information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Mintods and Resources document. http://headwates.conomics.org/whytwi-pocretinty/buddeEPS-HDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf.

### Additional Resources

attional Kesources
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 contax information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government
Financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPSHDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf<sup>100</sup>.

For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at: ary.pdf

Data Sources U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

# Data Sources & Methods

## **Data Sources**

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

• U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- U.S. Bureau of Land Management U.S. Department of Interior <u>www.blm.gov</u> Tel. 202-208-3801
- U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture <u>www.fs.fed.us</u> Tel. 800-832-1355

<u>www.onrr.gov</u> Tel. 303-231-3078

U.S. Department of Interior

## **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

## For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 <u>headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt</u>
- 2 www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
- 3 <u>www.census.gov/govs/</u>
- 4 www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
- 5 <u>www.fs.usda.gov/pts/</u>
- 6 www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html
- 7 www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
- 8 <u>www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html</u>
- 9 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
- 11 www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf

# **A Profile of Demographics**

**Maricopa County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

## 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.



**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.
# **Table of Contents**

Demographics How has population changed? What is the age and gender distribution of the population? What is the racial makeup of the population? What is the Hispanic makeup of the population? What is the tribal makeup of the population?	Page 1 2-3 4 5 6-7
Employment What occupations and industries are present? What are the characteristics of labor participation? What are commuting patterns?	8 9 10
Income How is income distributed? What are poverty levels? What are the components of household earnings?	11 12-13 14
Social Characteristics What are education and enrollment levels? What languages are spoken?	15 16
Housing What are the main housing characteristics? How affordable is housing?	17 18
Benchmarks How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
Data Sources & Methods	20
Links to Additional Resources	21

## 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%.

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

### How has population changed?

This page describes the total population and change in total population

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau, Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section the Savdy Guide text.

#### Population, 2000-2013\*

	Maricopa 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.		



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		
	Maricopa County, AZ	
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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How has population changed?

### What do we measure on this page?

w - w - ποιοιομία - μι το μαζμξε f This page describes the total population and change in total population. Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decemial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

#### /hy is this important?

Is uns important ( his report covers a broad range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and home wmensiha, it is the only EPS-HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These include cites, owns, and census designated places, Américan Indian, Nataka native, and native Hawai areas, congressional districts, and county

automation in addition to its usefulness for social research, the information throughout this report is valuable for public land managers and others in identifying whether the selected geographies contain minorities and people who are economically and/or socially disadvantaged. This is important because Executive Order (1998, Februar) 11, 1194 states that "acak federal agency what make achieving environmental alle to programs, policies, and achieves on minority opulations and low-income polautions." (see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and achieves on minority topulations and low-income polautions. "(see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and achieves on minority topulations and low-income polautions." nces)

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/isocially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management actions requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minority individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or any othen register health effects from cumulative or multiple adverse adverses to environmental hazards), and disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or naive populations).

Iethods The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). 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).

For populations of 65.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographice, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this proport are 5-year ACS estimates. Kores of han 16 or 3-year estimates, here 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographice, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographice since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for conse-geograp comparisons. The disadvantage is that multilyair estimates cannot be used to describe any parallelity are in the period, only what the average value is over the full period. For thready, state and figure titles show the latest year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to clarify that the data represent average characterization over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables. **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; ORANCE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with the dota) indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; another domographics report at a leagn groupped space. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the bless provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

#### Additional Resources sible pub

An indi on on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see: census gov/acs/wwwihethodology/methodology\_main/<sup>10</sup>. census gov/acs/wwwDownloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyotData2009.pdf <sup>10</sup>.

### Data Sources

tal Solurose U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Burseu, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Burseu, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C. Study Guide

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 rider

### 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	1 024 249	162 247 412

Change in Median Age, 2000-2013\*

Age & Gender Distribution Coefficients of Variation

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

35.3 5.7% 

35.0

33.0



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.

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.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 is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes population distribution This page describes population dis ion 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

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of refines, 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 many counties, the largest segment of the opculation is in the Baby Boarder generation (people board to between 1946 and 1964). The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

37.3

thoos Data in his report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Cansus 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 2006 forwup 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 > 40%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a forch, 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 meaningful involvement of all people regardless of mace, 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<sup>16</sup>.

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/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

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: stateoftheusa.org<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

am H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistrib demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: aoa.go root/aging\_statistics/index.aspx

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/ <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: county-healthrankings.org/ (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.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population? This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age dis with age categories separated into

### Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013\*

		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%
25.44	16 69/	40.00/
30-44	13.378	13.0%
45-64	19.8%	23.8%



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.

rige a contact biothbation and onling	e, obemelents of variation	
	2000	2009-
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 Variat	tion	
	2000	2009*
Under 18	0%	0%
18-34	0%	0%
35-44	0%	0%
45-64	0%	0%
CE and supp	0%	0%

Study Guide and Supplemental Information What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page excitose the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age of the age groups.

#### hy is it important?

VIS It Important? For public land agency, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retined population, or soon-ba-enteid oppopulation, 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 minors or young adults.

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

#### ods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with none dot) indicates be and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%; if data have consistently low accuracy the a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. en 12

dditional Resources The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at: The non-profit Population Reference prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010 1138.pdf

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 gow/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx<sup>1(4)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regional 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 Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st 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.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html <sup>(15)</sup>. 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.

What is the racial makeup of the population?

cribes the number of people who self-ide ntify as belonging to a particular race This page de

Race: Race is a set-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or maces with which they most closely identify The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicky.

#### Population by Race, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, AZ	
Total Population	3,889,161	311,536,594
White alone	3,137,012	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	199,310	39,167,010
American Indian alone	72,913	2,540,309
Asian alone	138,405	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	7,790	526,347
Some other race alone	221,937	14,746,054
Two or more races	111,794	8,732,333
Percent of Total		
White alone	80.7%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	5.1%	12.6%
American Indian alone	1.9%	0.8%
Asian alone	3.6%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0.2%	0.2%
Some other race alone	5.7%	4.7%

Two or more races 2.9% 2.8%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average
the method in the bit and the bit and the file average. cs during this period

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Maricopa County AZ, 2013\*



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

Population by Race, Coefficients of variation		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
White alone	0%	0%
Black or African 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		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
White alone	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	1%	0%
American Indian alone	0%	0%
Asian alone	0%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0%	0%
Some other race	2%	0%
Two or more races	2%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

Vhat is the racial makeup of the populati

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people ple who self-identify 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 identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race

and athnicity. Race Alexe Categories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureaw, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawalan or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Nather, "Alast" and "Native Hausilan or Other Posicilo Islander" race categories desorbed above. Respondents providing write-in ertites such as multitotal, invent, internatio, or a Happinol Latino group (for example, Mexican, Pluento Rican, or Culban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category. <u>Two or Mace Races</u>: People may have chosen to provide two or more race response. Providing multiple write-in responses, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

ny is it important?

deral agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this inform omote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act. tion to

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 nacial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic group are inportant for putting into effect a nature of federal statutes (i.e., envirosing billingual election naise whether Mong Rights Act; monting and entroring equal employment opportunities under the CNH Rights Act; Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local povernments to in programs and meeting (i.e., evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinessment 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, broady referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 128as. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whethe there is a potential environmental justice issue. For public land ma

ods

Annue. Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elevelwere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with non edot) indicates be 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with non dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numming anothe demographics report at large geographic scalar.

dditional Resources For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and eth (1997), see: whitehouse gov/omb/fedfeg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>.

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 Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/isf/pages/in

The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measurecfamerica.org/acenturyapart.<sup>(19)</sup>

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

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

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.

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Maxican," Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those indicate that the year of ther Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino" Origin can be viewed as the hertiage, unclanality group, langea, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spansh, Hispanic, or Latino or yeb or dary taxos.

#### Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	3,889,161	311,536,594
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	1,155,592	51,786,591
Not Hispanic or Latino	2,733,569	259,750,003
White alone	2,264,665	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	188,113	38,093,998
American Indian alone	59,522	2,061,752
Asian alone	135,912	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	7,462	488,646
Some other race	5,019	606,356
Two or more races	72,876	6,387,422

Percent of Total		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	29.7%	16.6%
Not Hispanic or Latino	70.3%	83.4%
White alone	58.2%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	4.8%	12.2%
American Indian alone	1.5%	0.7%
Asian alone	3.5%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.2%	0.2%
Some other race	0.1%	0.2%
<b>T</b>	1.00/	0.40/

Two or more races 1.9% 2.1%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average acteristics during this period.







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

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S
tal Population	0%	05
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	09
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%	11
Some other race	10%	1
Two or more races	3%	0
ercent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.
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 record	3%	0

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people who self-identity as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural destination, and Hispanics can be of any race.

Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal goverr race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. nent considers

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mevican," "Puerto Rikan," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino". Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, inseque, or country of bith of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Hispanicas ere one of the tastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-dentified 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 200 and 2010, Hispanica accounded for ver one-hald of the trackin'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 imposition on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many feeder programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decomial census (i.e., promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial dispatities in health and environmental riskly and "Data or ethnic groups are important for puting from fields a name of decked astauce (i.e., and/orcing hingual electron nate) under the Voing Highs Act, monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act, Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments (i.e., and/miting local governments (i.e., and/miting under the Voing Act and a start the Voing Act and a start the Voing Act and a start the Public Health Act, evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act,"

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.

Iditional 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/fedreg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>.

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/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/r

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.pdf <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf <sup>[21]</sup>.

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

### **Demographics** What is the tribal makeup of the population?

This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are member of a principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 thrites or Satectad American Indian categories: Apache, Blackfeet, Cheverse, Chicksaw, Chipyens, Chickaw, Chipyens, Angel, Chinkaw, Tagui, Yimay, and Al 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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

### 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	64,905	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes	'444	108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	5,719	363,000
Percent of Total Total Native American	1.9%	0.8%
American Indian Tribes	1.7%	0.6%
Alaska Native Tribes	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Specified Tribes	0.1%	0.1%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual s characteristics during this period.	urveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are rep	presentative of average

In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the population that self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native (1.9%) and the U.S. had the lowest (0.8%).

Native American Population, Percent of Total, Maricopa County AZ, 2013\*



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 15 Total Population Total Native American 0% 2% 2% 29% 0% 0% 0% American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes Non-Specified Tribe 4% 1% Percent of Total, Coeffi ients of Variation U.S. Total Native American 0% 0% 0% 0% American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes Non-Specified Tribes 0% 0%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general ter with one or more other races. , the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or

<u>American Indian</u>: 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. Cansus data are available for 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categorizer, Sapeha, Bladsketo, Cherokeo, Cheyeme, Chickawa, Chipewa, Chotawa, Coville, Comanche, Cree, Creek. Crow, Delaware, Houma, Ioquids, Kiowa, Lumbee, Manorine, Navajo, Csage, Chawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatom, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shortone, Suor, Tohoro O'Otam, Ute, Yalama, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al Arber.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hy is it important?

V is it important ( Different groups depole may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native titbes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current is to be land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

# thoos 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%. Ideat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

ethods

Additional Resources

An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance un National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq12 Environmental Justice: Guidance under the rces/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>. The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs ret and contacts are available at: bia.gov/index.htm <sup>(22)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.org/index.html <sup>(23)</sup>.

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

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Ammore other races. an Indian and Alaska Native alo ation with a

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013

Region

	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
Blackfeet	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	714	68,171
Menominee	-22	8,259
Navajo	26,377	305,552
Osage	<b>"0</b>	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

Anterical induit of Audoa rative; 5,719 363,000
To 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.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in comb 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 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categories, Roden, Bladcket, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasw, Chipewa, Chockaw, Colvile, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, toquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menorinee, Navajo, Casge, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shochone, Siux, Tohomo Odotham, Ute Aviaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al cher.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native,' or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### hv is it important?

V in important?
With the people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, belefs, 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 and/or current te to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

#### Methods

thoos 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

Iditional 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 relations. See: fs.led.us/spft/tribalrelations/index.shtml <sup>(24)</sup>.

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

Study Guid

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

anencan indian & Alaska Native Population,	Neisera County AZ	115
Intel Description	Maricopa County, AZ	0.8
Total Nativo American	20%	07
American Indian Tribes: Specified	2/8	09
Anerican Indian Tribes, Specified	16%	29
Blackfeet	38%	39
Cherokee	16%	19
Chevenne	75%	69
Chickasaw	31%	39
Chippewa	25%	19
Choctaw	29%	19
Colville	49%	59
Comanche	53%	69
Cree	103%	119
Creek	49%	29
Crow	na	59
Delaware	63%	79
Houma	na	69
Iroquois	37%	29
Kiowa	38%	79
Lumbee	100%	19
Menominee	99%	49
Navajo	5%	19
Osage	na	65
Ottawa	75%	79
Paiute	44%	49
Pima	7%	49
Potawatomi	41%	35
Pueblo	13%	25
Puget Sound Salish	99%	49
Seminole	58%	45
Shoshone	59%	55
Sioux	24%	15
Tohono O'Odham	15%	55
Ute	45%	65
Yakama	56%	55
Yaqui	12%	55
Yuman	13%	6
All other tribes	10%	19
American Indian; Not Specified	22%	35
Alaska Native Tribes; Specified	29%	19
Alaska Athabaskan	70%	49
Aleut	59%	55
Eskimo	50%	19
l lingit-Haida	49%	49
All other tribes	101%	65
Alaska Native; Not Specified	80%	69

# Employment

What occupations and industries are present?

#### 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

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	1,734,641	141,864,697
Management, professional, & related	634,518	51,341,226
Service	318,017	25,645,065
Sales and office	476,093	34,957,520
Farming, fishing, and forestry	4,488	1,030,881
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	139,271	11,832,435
Production, transportation, & material moving	162,254	17,057,570
Percent of Total		
Management, professional, & related	36.6%	36.2%
Service	18.3%	18.1%
Sales and office	27.4%	24.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	0.3%	0.7%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	8.0%	8.3%
Production, transportation, & material moving	9.4%	12.0%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve	eys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	epresentative of average

# The data in this table are calculated by a characteristics during this period. Employment by Industry, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	1,734,641	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	10,746	2,731,302
Construction	116,069	8,864,481
Manufacturing	139,514	14,867,423
Wholesale trade	47,134	3,937,876
Retail trade	211,807	16,415,217
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	88,809	7,010,637
Information	34,154	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	165,175	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	222,834	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	367,711	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	170,914	13,262,892
Other services, except public administration	83,247	7,043,003
Public administration	76,527	7,034,048
Percent of Total		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	0.6%	1.9%
Construction	6.7%	6.2%
Manufacturing	8.0%	10.5%
Wholesale trade	2.7%	2.8%
Retail trade	12.2%	11.6%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	5.1%	4.9%
Information	2.0%	2.2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	9.5%	6.7%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	12.8%	10.8%
Education, health care, & social assistance	21.2%	23.2%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	9.9%	9.3%
Other services, except public administration	4.8%	5.0%
BALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL		E 00/

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

## Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Variation U.S. Civilian employed population > 16 years Management, professional, & related Service 0% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% 0% 1% 1% 1% 9% 1% Sales and office Farming, fishing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint., & repair Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, transportation, & Marelaid moving Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation Management, professional, & related Service Sales and office Farming, sching, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, transportation, & Marelaid moving Employment by Industry, Coefficients of M 0% 1% 1% 0% 2% 1% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% s of Var Civilian employed population > 16 years Agriculture, forestry, fahing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mg Education, headh care, & sciola assistance Arts, ententian, ree., accomodation, & bod Other services, except public assistance ity, AZ U.S. 0% 5% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 1% 1% 2% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Other services, except public administration 0% Public administration Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation 1% Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 10% 1% 2% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% Manufacturing Whicewale trade Real trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and Insurance, and real estate Prof. scientific, mgmt, admt, & waste many Education, heath ace, & social assistem Activation and trade area, & social assistem Arts, enternain, rec., acconcision, & soci Other services, aceque public administration Public administration

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

Vhat occupations and industries are present?

# What do we measure on this page? 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: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classifi-with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry. Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

#### hy is it Important?

y 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 relativity the eccorrowy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors. Employment by occupation dises additional information that desc people to its a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-ted by working to a onliving time, an entitie, or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while by industry describes where people work. ribes what tions are stries (for example, ma

# Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates bet 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 truning another demographics report at a larger acgraphic scale.

thods

dditional Resources The Census Bureau pr

u provides a definition of SOCS: census.gov/hhes/www/ioind

Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.gov/soc/

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: bis.gow/cor/<sup>(27)</sup>.

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

The head requestions are backed or yields and back provided. Body Participation Characteristics, 2013'          Departicipation Characteristics, 2013'       Image: Construction of the construction of t	is page describes workers by weaks worker	and usual hours	ka por wook	
application Characteristics, 2013*         opulation 1s to 64       2500.667       204.340.0         WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:       1.392.152       112.330.3         WOrked 201 to 28 weeks       202.005       12.046.4         WOrked 10 to 28 weeks       202.005       10.225.1         Did nd work       662.036       10.182.51         HOURS WORKED PER WEEK       1.488.097       116.42.2         Worked 10 to 28 weeks       305.27       204.353         HOURS WORKED PER WEEK       346.07       7.334.4         Worked 10 to 14 hours per week       622.366       51.389         Mean usual hours week ends       32.6       38         Verkend 10 to 14 hours per week       55.7%       50.6         Worked 50 to 52 weeks       55.7%       50.6         Worked 10 to 28 weeks       1.0.1%       10.6         Worked 10 to 28 weeks       1.0.1%       10.6         Worked 10 to 48 weeks       1.0.1%       10.6         Worked 10 to 14 hours per week       13.4%       14.0         HOUR WORKED PER YEAR:       20.1%       20.6         Worked 10 to 14 hours per week       13.4%       14.0         HOUR WORKED PER YEAR:       20.1%       20.6         Worked 15 to 34	lis page describes workers by weeks worked per year	and usual nours wor	ks per week.	
Matcage County, A2         U           Qualitation 16 to 64         2:500.667         2:40.4007           Witersk WORKED PER YEAR:         1:382.152         1:12.330.33           Worked 27 to 49 weeks         2:200.667         2:40.4007           HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:         6:82.330         1:13.84           HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:         6:82.330         1:16.42.42           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         3:35.227         2:9.45.52           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         3:35.227         2:9.45.52           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         3:35.227         2:9.45.52           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         3:36.5.27         2:9.45.52           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         3:6.5.27         2:9.45.52           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         3:6.5.27         2:9.45.52           Worked 20 to 52 weeks         5:0.5         5:0.5           Worked 30 to 52 weeks         5:0.5         5:0.5           Worked 30 to 52 weeks         1:0.1%         1:0.6           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         2:0.1%         2:0.5           HOURS WORKED PER WEEK         2:0.5         2:0.5           Worked 15 to 34 hours per week         2:0.75         2:0.75           Worked 15 to 34 hou	abor Participation Characteristics, 2013	17		
Set Start 19 Set 10 - 19 Se		Mar	icopa County, AZ	U.
In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010       Using 2010         In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ       Using 2010       Using 2010       Using 2010       Us	WEEKS WORKED DED VEAD		2,500,667	204,340,9
Worked 27 be 49 weeks     22.2476     21.446.4       Worked 16 28 weeks     202.000     12.646.4       Worked 35 or more hours per week     652.336     651.339.9       HOURS WORKED PER VEEK     14.438.097     116.424.22       Worked 35 or more hours per week     74.407     7.324.4       Did not work     652.336     61.318.9       Mercent of Total     35.227     29.653.2       Worked 25 to 54 hours per week     74.407     7.324.4       Did not work     652.366     61.318.9       Mercent of Total     36.33     36.33       Worked 25 to 64 weeks     10.1%     10.6       Worked 35 or more hours per week     57.7%     50.0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     57.5%     57.0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     37.5%     57.0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     3.7.5%     57.0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     3.7.5%     57.0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     3.7.5%     57.0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     3.0%     36.30       Did not work     2.6.1%     2.6.1%     2.6.1%       Worked 35 or more hours per week     3.7.5%     57.0       Worked 16 to 14 hours per week     3.0%     36.30       Did not work     2.6.1	Worked 50 to 52 weeks		1 392 152	112 330 3
Worked 1b 28 weeks     202,203     19,225.1       Did not work     623,363     11,138.9       HOURS WORKED PER WEEK     335,227     29,453.2       Worked 3b 03 for more hours per week     336,227     29,453.2       Worked 1b 14 hours per week     74,407     73,324.4       Did not work     662,366     61,138.9       Procent of Total     ************************************	Worked 27 to 49 weeks		252.676	21.646.4
Did not work     662,336     61,138,90       HOURS WORKED PER VEEK     1,438,007     116,642,22       Worked 35 or more hours per week     1,438,007     116,642,22       Worked 15 v3 hours per week     74,407     7,324,4       Did not work     622,636     61,138,9       Mere utual hours per week     74,407     7,324,4       Did not work     622,636     51,38,9       Mere utual hours worked to workers     36,8     38       Second 17 total     9     9       Worked 27 to 49 weeks     10,1%     106       Worked 27 to 49 weeks     8,1%     94       Did not work     26,3%     57,0%       Worked 35 or more hours per week     57,7%     57,0       Worked 35 or more hours per week     3,7%     36,0       Did not work     26,1%     26,0%       Vorked 35 or more hours per week     3,7%     36,0       Did not work     2,0,1%     26,0%       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     20,1%     20,0%       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     0,1%     0,1%       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     0,1%     0,1%       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     0,1%     0,1%       • Norked 16 to 25 weeks per year (6,5%), and the U.S. had the l	Worked 1 to 26 weeks		202,903	19,225,1
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:       1438.097       116.42.2         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       335.227       29.945.2         Worked 15 to 14 hours per week       74.407       7.324.4         Did not work       652.266       61.188.9         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       74.407       7.324.4         Did not work       652.266       61.188.9         Vertext 10 Total       Weeks       55.7%       55.0         Worked 50 to 52 weeks       55.7%       55.0         Worked 10 to 28 weeks       6.1%       0.4         Old not work       26.1%       25.0         HOURS WORKED PER WEEK       77.5%       57.0         Worked 10 to 28 weeks       6.7.5%       57.0         Worked 10 to 28 weeks       0.4.1%       26.1%         HOURS WORKED PER WEEK       0.4.1%       26.1%         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       13.4%       14.4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       13.4%       14.4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       13.4%       14.4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       13.4%       14.4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       13.4%       14.4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       13.4%       14.4 <td>Did not work</td> <td></td> <td>652,936</td> <td>51,138,9</td>	Did not work		652,936	51,138,9
Worked 35 or more hours per week       1,438,097       116,423         Worked 15 v3 hours per week       74,407       7,324,4         Did not work       62,363       61,138,9         Mere utual hours worked for workers       36,8       1,38         Precent of Total       9       9         Worked 20 be 50 weeks       55,7%       55,0         Worked 20 be 50 weeks       10,1%       106         Worked 20 be 50 weeks       8,1%       9,4         Dold not work       26,3%       25,0%         Worked 35 or more hours per week       57,5%       57,0         Worked 35 or more hours per week       57,5%       57,0%         Worked 35 or more hours per week       3,3%       13,4%         PUORS WORKED PER VEEK       50       50         Worked 35 or more hours per week       3,3%       14,4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       3,3%       14,4         Worked 15 to 34 hours per week       3,0%       36         Did not work       26,1%       200       201,4       200         A2 hour the highest estimated percent of people hat worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55,7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57,0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (67,0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (77,0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (77,0%), and the U.S. had the lowest	HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:			
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     335,227     29,345,3       Worked 10 14 hours per week     74,407     7,324,4       Did not work     662,266     61,184,9       Vertext 10 Total     9       WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:     50,000       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     55,7%     55,00       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     65,7%     50,000       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     67,7%     50,000       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     6,1%     04,000       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     6,7%     57,0%       HOURS WORKED PER WEEK     77,0%     57,0%       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     6,1%     04,000       UNING 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13,4%     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     14,4     14,4       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	Worked 35 or more hours per week		1,438,097	116,424,23
Worked 1b 14 hours per week     74.407     7.324.4       Did not work     622.636     61.138.9       Werent of Total     38.6     38.8       Werked 2D 65 weeks     55.7%     55.0       Worked 2D 65 weeks     10.1%     10.6       Worked 2D 7 b 40 weeks     10.1%     10.6       Worked 3D 65 weeks     13.4%     44.4       Dolt not work     26.3%     57.0       Worked 3D of Sa weeks     13.4%     14.4       Worked 3D of Sa hours per week     57.7%     57.0       Worked 3D of Sa hours per week     3.7%     36.6       Did not work     26.1%     26.0       Worked 1D to 14 hours per week     3.0%     36.6       Did not work     26.1%     26.0       The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2008-2013 and are representative of average     Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2008-2013 and are representative of average     Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     Weeks Worked 2D to 52 weeks     Worked 1 to 26 weeks       • Worked 3D to 52 weeks per year (5.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (7.7%), and the U.S. had th	Worked 15 to 34 hours per week		335,227	29,453,2
bit not work     662.936     61,136.91       Ween usual worked for workers     36.8     38       Percent of Total     9       Weeks Worked DFEr YEAR:     55.7%     55.0%       Worked 20 to 52 weeks     10.1%     10.6       Worked 10 to 26 weeks     8.1%     9.4       Old not work     26.1%     25.0       HOURS WORKED PER WEEK     57.5%     57.0       Worked 10 to 26 weeks     8.1%     9.4       Worked 10 to 10 work     26.1%     25.0       HOURS WORKED PER WEEK     57.5%     57.0       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     13.4%     14.4       Worked 15 to 34 nours per week     13.4%     14.4       Worked 10 to 14 hours per week     26.0%     26.0%       The dual bandward work of the VS.     26.0%     26.0%       In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ     20.0%     20.0%       In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ     U.S.     Worked 11 to 26 weeks       Worked 27 to 49 weeks     Worked 21 to 26 weeks     Worked 21 to 26 weeks       Worked 35 or more hours per week (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowert (67.7%), and the U.S. had the lowert (77.7%), and the U.S. had the lo	Worked 1 to 14 hours per week		74,407	7,324,41
Inter 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 rds weeks (67.0%).     30.0     30       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 rds weeks (67.0%).     57.0%     57.0%       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 rds weeks (67.0%).     Worked 11 to 28 weeks     Worked 12 of 28 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 rds 28 weeks per year (65.0%).     *Worked 11 to 28 weeks     Worked 11 to 28 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 rds 28 weeks per year (67.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (77.0%).     *Worked 11 to 28 weeks     *Worked 11 to 28 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 rds 28 weeks per year (67.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (77.0%).     *Worked 11 to 28 weeks     *Worked 11 to 28 weeks       • Vorked 27 to 49 weeks (97.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (77.0%).     *Utorked 27 to 49 weeks •Worked 20 to 52 weeks     *Utorked 21 to 28 weeks •Worked 20 to 52 weeks       • Vorked 27 to 49 weeks (97.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (97.0%).     *Utorked 27 to 49 weeks •Worked 20 to 52 weeks     *Utorked 21 to 28 weeks •Worked 20 to 52 weeks       • Vorked 28 to 40% of	Did not work		652,936	51,138,9
* In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ       US         * Outside 35 or more hours per week (15,0%), and the US. had the lowers (15,0%), and the US. had the lowers (15,0%), and the US. had the lowers (15,0%).       *Ude Add the US (15,0%), and the US. had the lowers (15,0%), and the US. had the lowers (15,0%).	Mean usual hours worked for workers		38.6	38
WEEKS WORKED PER VEAR:       55.7%       55.0         Worked 27 to 49 weeks       10.1%       10.6         Worked 27 to 49 weeks       10.1%       10.6         Worked 27 to 49 weeks       26.1%       24.0         Did not work       26.1%       24.0         Worked 35 or more hours per week       57.5%       57.0         Worked 36 or more hours per week       57.5%       57.0         To date 11 to 14 hours per week       26.1%       26.0         Worked 15 us 1 hours per week       26.1%       25.0         The date 11 this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2000-2013 and are representative of average       26.1%       25.0         The date 11 this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2000-2013 and are representative of average       26.1%       20.0         A1 hours Worked ber 42 calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2000-2013 and are representative of average       26.0%       20.5%         Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       U.S.       20.0%         Stick 07.6%       Matricopa County, AZ       U.S.       20.0%       20.5%         * In the 2008-2013 period, Matricopa County, AZ       U.S.       20.0%       20.0%       20.0%       20.0%         * Off dat tha worked 35 or mo	ercent of Total			
Worked 20 to 52 weeks     65.7%     65.0       Worked 10 to 28 weeks     10.1%     10.6       Worked 11 to 28 weeks     8.1%     0.4       Did not work     26.1%     52.0       HOURS WORKED PER Visition week     7.75%     57.0       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     3.3%     13.4%       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     3.3%     26.1%       Did not work     26.1%     20.0       Worked 15 to 34 hours per week     3.0%     3.6       Did not work     26.1%     20.0       The data in his table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average haracteristics during this period.     Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       • In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*     U.S.       • Spring that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (55.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (75.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (75.0%).     Worked 10 20 weeks     Worked 10 20 weeks	WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:			
Worked 27 to 49 weeks     10.1%     10.6       Worked 10 28 weeks     8.1%     9.4       Did not work     26.1%     26.0%       Worked 35 or more hours per week     51.5%     57.5%       Worked 35 or more hours per week     52.5%     57.6%       Did not work     26.1%     26.1%       The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average     26.1%       The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average     26.1%       * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     Weeks Worked 0 per Year, 2013*     Weeks Worked 0 per Year, 2013*       * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks       * On the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks       * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ     Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks       *Worked 27 to 49 week     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks       *Worked 35 or more hours per week     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 20 to 52 weeks       *Worked 27 to 49 week     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks       *Worked 35 or more hours per week     *Worked 1 to 26 weeks     *Worked 20 to 52 weeks       *Worked 1 to 26, worked 35 or more hours per week (07.5	Worked 50 to 52 weeks		55.7%	55.0
Worked 1 to 26 weeks     8.1%     04       Did not work     26.1%     20.0       HOURS WORKED PER WEEK     5.7%     57.0       Worked to 14 bioss per week     3.3%     26.3       Worked 10 14 hours per week     3.0%     26.5       Did not work     20.1%     25.0       The data in his table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average thanktoristics during this period.     Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       • In the 2009-2013 period, Matricopa County, AZ     Weeks Worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (65.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (65.0%).     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period, Matricopa County, AZ     U.S.     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks       • Worked 32 to 49 weeks     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks     • Worked 20 to 52 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period, Matricopa County, AZ     U.S.     • Worked 21 to 26 weeks       • Worked 32 to 49 weeks     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks     • Worked 21 to 26 weeks       • Worked 35 or more hours per week (07.5%), and the U.S. had the lowert (07.0%).     • Worked 32 to 49 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 35 or more hours per week (07.5%), and the U.S. had the lowert (07.0%).     • Worked 21 to 49 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • W	Worked 27 to 49 weeks		10.1%	10.6
<ul> <li>Did not work</li> <li>26.1%</li> <li>26.1%</li> <li>26.4%</li> <li>26.4%</li> <li>26.4%</li> <li>27.4%</li> <li>26.4%</li> <li>27.4%</li> <li>26.4%</li> <li>27.4%</li> <li>27.4%</li></ul>	Worked 1 to 26 weeks		8.1%	9.4
HOURS WURKED PER WEEK:     575%     576       Worked 15 0 4 hours per week     575%     576       Worked 15 0 4 hours per week     3.0%     3.8       Did of werk lower per week     2.0.1%     2.6       The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average transferrations of average (5.7%, and the U.S. had the lowest (5.0%).     Weeks Worked 21 to 24 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ     U.S.     Worked 1 to 26 weeks       • Worked 27 to 49 weeks     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks     • Worked 21 to 26 weeks       • Worked 35 or more hours per week (5.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).     • U.S.       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ     U.S.       • Worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).     • Worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%).	Did not work		26.1%	25.0
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ</li> <li>In</li></ul>	HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:		E7 E0/	67.0
Worked 1 to 1 of 100 a private     3.0%     1.3 a Division       United work     2.1 %     2.6 %       Division work     2.1 %     2.6 %       The deta in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average anacteristics during this period.     Weeks Worked per Year, 2013*       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ bod be highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (55.0%).     • Worked 27 to 49 weeks     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ     U.S.     • Worked 27 to 49 weeks     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ had the lowest (55.0%).     • Worked 32 to 49 weeks     • Worked 1 to 26 weeks       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ     U.S.       • In the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ     U.S.       • Or the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ     • U.S.       • Or the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ     • U.S.       • Or the 2009-2013 period. Maircogae County, AZ     • U.S.       • Worked 32 to 49 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks       • Worked 50 to 52 weeks     • Worked 50 to 52 weeks	Worked 35 of more nours per week		12.4%	57.0
Dut not work     26.0 %     25.0 %       The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average     Week Worked per Year, 2013*       * In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.7%), and the U.S. had the lowe	Worked 1 to 14 hours per week		3.0%	36
The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average banderistics during this period. Weeks Worked per Year, 2013* Weeks Worked per Year, 2013* Weeks Worked per Year, 2013* Weeks Worked per Year, 2013* Using Strain	Did not work		26.1%	25.0
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of poor (65.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (55.0%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work Worked 21 to 26 weeks Worked 50 to 52 weeks</li> <li>Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 50 to 52 weeks</li> <li>Hours Worked per Week, 2013*</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work give to the lowest (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.5%).</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work give to the lowest (57.5%).</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work give to the lowest (57.5%).</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work give to the lowest (57.5%).</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work give to the lowest (57.5%).</li> </ul>		80%		
<ul> <li>A.Z. bud the highest estimated percent of proper har work of 50 to 52 weeks per year (85,7%), and the U.S. hud the lowest (85,7%), and the U.S. hud the lowest (85,7%), and the U.S. hud the lowest (87,7%), and the U.S. hud the lowest (87,7%).</li> </ul>	In the 2009-2012 period. Maricena County	60%		
<ul> <li>Pacepte that worked 50 bit 52 weeks per year (65.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest (65.0%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ</li> <li>U.S.</li> <li>Did not work (57.6%), and the U.S. had the lowest (67.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (67.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (67.0%).</li> </ul>	AZ had the highest estimated percent of	40%		
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ hours Worked 50 to 52 weeks</li> <li>Worked 27 to 49 weeks</li> <li>Worked 50 to 52 weeks</li> <li< td=""><td>people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year</td><td>20%</td><td></td><td></td></li<></ul>	people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year	20%		
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per work (07.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (07.0%).</li> <li>Statistical percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per work (07.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (07.0%).</li> </ul>	(55.7%), and the U.S. had the lowest	0% +	Haricopa County AZ	
*Did not work *Worked 27 to 49 weeks *Worked 50 to 52 weeks Hours Worked 50 to 52 weeks Hours Worked per Week, 2013* Hours Worked 28 to 52 weeks Hours Worked per Week, 2013* Hours Worked 28 to 52 weeks Hours Worked 29 to 49 weeks *Worked 19 to 26 weeks *Worked 29 to 49 weeks *Worked 19 to 26 weeks *Worked	(55.0%).		NAURARIA NA RUBY AV	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest action to period. Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> <li>Shad the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> <li>Shad the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> </ul>	(55.0%).			0.0.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period. Matricopa County, AZ but the U.S. had the lowest (\$7.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (\$7.0%).</li> <li>Warkson S. and the U.S. had the lowest (\$7.5%) and the U.S. had the lowest (\$7.5%).</li> </ul>	(55.0%).			0.0.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had he highest estimated percent of period. Maricopa County, AZ had he highest estimated percent of period. (67 5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (67 0%).</li> <li>Watropa County, AZ U.S.</li> <li>S Hours/Week</li></ul>	(55.0%).	⊠Did not w	ork IIIV 7 to 49 weeks IIV	orked 1 to 26 weeks
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per works (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> <li>Barrier (57.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> </ul>	(55.0%).	⊗Did not w ■Worked 2	ork EW 7 to 49 weeks Weeks	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that works 35 or more hours per week (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> <li>Maricopa County, AZ U.S.</li> <li>S35 Hours/Week</li></ul>	(55.0%).	⊗Did not w ∎Worked 2 100%	ork EW 7 to 49 weeks Wee Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
In the 2009-2013 period. Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per works (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).     Maricopa County, AZ U.S.     S-35 Hours/Week ■15-34 Hours/Week ■1-14 Hours/Week ©Did not work	(55.0%).	⊗Did not w ■Worked 2 100% 80%	ork EW 7 to 49 weeks W Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks forked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
A2 had the highest estimated percent of 407% 407% 407% 407% 407% 407% 407% 407%	(55.0%).	⊗Did not w ■Worked 2 100% 80%	ork EW 7 to 49 weeks W Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks forked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).     20%	(55.0%).  In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County,	*Did not w Worked 2 100% 80% 60%	ork EW 7 to 49 weeks W Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
(S7.0%), and the lowest (S7.0%). Maricopa County, AZ U.S.	<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>∞Did not w</li> <li>■Worked 2</li> <li>100%</li> <li>80%</li> <li>60%</li> <li>40%</li> </ul>	rk IV 7 to 49 weeks V Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
Maricopa County, AZ U.S.      S35 Hours/Week ■15-34 Hours/Week ■1-14 Hours/Week xDid not work	<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that works al Sor more hours per</li> </ul>	80% 80% 40% 20%	ork EW 7 to 49 weeks Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
■>35 Hours/Week ■1-34 Hours/Week ■1-14 Hours/Week %Did not work	<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, A2 had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per weak (57 5%), and the U.S. had the lowest</li> </ul>		ork IV 7 to 49 weeks W Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
	<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, A2 had the highest estimated parcent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).</li> </ul>	8Did not w ■Worked 2 100% 80% 40% 20% 0%	ork IV 7 to 49 weeks IV Hours Worked per Wee	orked 1 to 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013*
	<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, A2 had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (07 5%), and the U.S. had the lowest (\$7.0%).</li> </ul>	Did not w     Worked 2     100%     60%     40%     0%     0%	vk V to 49 weeks V V Hours Worked per Wee	US: Orked 10 26 weeks orked 50 to 52 weeks k, 2013* U.S.

	mancopa County, AL	
Population 16 to 64	0%	0%
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	0%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	1%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	1%	0%
Did not work	1%	0%
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:		
Worked 35 or more hours per week	0%	0%
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	1%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	2%	0%
Did not work	1%	0%
Mean usual hours worked for workers	0%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	0%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	1%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	1%	0%
Did not work	0%	0%
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:		
Worked 35 or more hours per week	0%	0%
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	1%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	2%	0%
Did not work	0%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the characteristics of labor participation?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

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".

#### /hy is it important?

One, it to be hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, intravitantia to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have considered been among the lowest of the industrial datases 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 how say to remain active in the workplice but due to treat works at all shedule. Advances is computer texthologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more fielde hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, burism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods ele concriming stability, the vast major (or part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time 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, 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 his may explain failing wages or rates of employment has observe population change (see the Scooconcin Kleasures report for changes in wages, employment, and population change the second sec

#### hods

sthods 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 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/pdf/G0612501.pdf <sup>(28)</sup>.

## For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.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.

		Employment
What are commuting patterns?		
This page describes workers who do not work from home	by place of work and by travel time to work.	
Commuting Characteristics, 2013*		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Workers 16 years and over	1 705 638	139 786 639

-	Maricona County AZ	US
Workers 16 years and over	1.705.638	139,786,639
PLACE OF WORK		
Worked in county of residence	1.665.369	101.321.530
Worked outside county of residence	40.269	38,465,109
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK		
Less than 10 minutes	162.527	18.023.639
10 to 14 minutes	205,191	19,150,654
15 to 19 minutes	242,633	20,753,054
20 to 24 minutes	259,745	19,796,414
25 to 29 minutes	117,493	8,189,640
30 to 34 minutes	274,304	18,220,851
35 to 39 minutes	51,171	3,673,571
40 to 44 minutes	74,649	4,920,004
45 to 59 minutes	127,802	10,154,523
60 or more minutes	91,212	10,857,904
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	25	26
Percent of Total		
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	97.6%	72.5%
Worked outside county of residence	2.4%	27.5%
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	9.5%	12.9%
10 to 14 minutes	12.0%	13.7%
15 to 19 minutes	14.2%	14.8%
20 to 24 minutes	15.2%	14.2%
25 to 29 minutes	6.9%	5.9%
30 to 34 minutes	16.1%	13.0%
35 to 39 minutes	3.0%	2.6%
40 to 44 minutes	4.4%	3.5%
45 to 59 minutes	7.5%	7.3%
AA	E 20/	7.00/

53% 53% 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.

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 percent of people that worked outside the county of residence (27.5%), and Maricopa County, AZ had the lowest (2.4%).



Worked outside county of residence Worked in county of residence

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are commuting patterns?

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 eaving, for the oily of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worker 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 necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job coportunities 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 sever facilities without an adequate source of revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

thoos 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 numing 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 Perspectives 2(2), encudad gov/Publications/RDPR0/P697/RDP697/RDP697 epd<sup>(10)</sup>.

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

	Maricopa County, AZ	
orkers 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%	C
60 or more minutes	2%	C
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	0%	0
rcent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	0%	C
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%	C
20 to 24 minutes	1%	0
25 to 29 minutes	2%	C
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

		Income
How is income distributed?		
This page describes the distribution of household incom	e.	
Household Income Distribution, 2013*		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$27,256	\$28,155
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$53,596	\$53,046
Total Households	1,411,727	115,610,216
Less than \$10,000	95,990	8,380,364
\$10,000 to \$14,999	64,115	6,214,548
\$15,000 to \$24,999	144,974	12,468,604
\$25,000 to \$34,999	150,256	11,929,761
\$35,000 to \$49,999	203,272	15,723,148
\$50,000 to \$74,999	260,943	20,744,045
\$75,000 to \$99,999	175,620	14,107,031
\$100,000 to \$149,999	188,605	14,858,239
\$150,000 to \$199,999	66,447	5,651,848
\$200.000 or more	61 505	5 532 628

+····		
\$200,000 or more	61,505	5,532,628
Gini Coefficient <sup>A</sup>	0.46	0.47
Percent of Total		
Less than \$10,000	6.8%	7.2%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	4.5%	5.4%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	10.3%	10.8%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	10.6%	10.3%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	14.4%	13.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18.5%	17.9%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	12.4%	12.2%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	13.4%	12.9%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	4.7%	4.9%
\$200,000 or more	4.4%	4.8%

Average and a second se



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

Household Income Distribution, Coefficients	of Variation	
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Per-Capita Income	0%	0%
Median Household Income^ (2013) \$s	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%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information How is income distributed?

### What do we measure on this page?

 Date of we measure on this page?

 This page describes the distribution of household income.

 Per Capita Income.
 Total personal income divided by total population of an area.

 Household 1: household induced and the people who courgu a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
 Gini Coefficient; provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 represents perfect inequality. The were the Gini coefficient; the more quality the income distribution.

 Learner Quarks quarks arguing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect intequality. Every point on the Learner curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom \_% of households have \_% of all income."

</tabular

#### hv is it important?

y is it important / For public land magers, 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 geographics helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing encounts hardthp. uld

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 fagure that shows a propriorinal jurge number of households at both enterme inclates a segregriph characterization by Thaves' and Thave-not

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 mixidualis and households. ned

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run Account protocol and the second secon

#### ethods

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 Durve and the Gain 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Iditional Resources The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-me inequality. McLaughin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf <sup>(31)</sup>. metro income le

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/Bernanke/20070206a.htm <sup>(3)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09W/IZGhzazhxaDRIMjUz225nMjdkZzY&hl:

#### Data Sources

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

### Income What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line

Powerty: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "bolw the poverty beaut".

### 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 poverty	113,890	8,666,630
Percent of Total		
People Below Poverty	16.7%	15.4%

 Tarilles below porty
 16.7%
 15.4%

 Families below porty
 12.2%
 11.3%

 \*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.
 14.2%

•	In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County,
	AZ had the highest estimated percent of
	individuals living below poverty (16.7%),
	and the U.S. had the lowest (15.4%).

In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County AZ had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty (12.2%), and the U.S. had the lowest (11.3%).



People Below Poverty Families below poverty

#### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
People	16.7%	15.4%
Under 18 years	23.9%	21.6%
65 years and older	7.6%	9.4%
Families	12.2%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	19.1%	17.8%
Married couple families	7.0%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	11.1%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	29.1%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	36.6%	40.0%

-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.

Data Sources: U.S. 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 County, 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%

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of iduals and families living below the poverty line.

Eamily: 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 Budget's Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of informe 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 threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

### y 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 teacors. First people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed activities or public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience dispropriorities/limits and advance effects.

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 important because aggregate poverty rates (or example, families below poverty) may hide some important formation (or example, the poverty rate is drivid) embedde with children).

#### lethods

thoos 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

Intronal 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, gov/topics/tvrai-economy-population/tural-poverty-well-being.aspx<sup>(56)</sup>. For more info

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: www.npc.umich.edu/poverty<sup>(36)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement at 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 as available at eps polycompliance(eff

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

## Income

### What are poverty levels?

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<sup>\*</sup>, 2013\*

	mancopa County, Az	0.5.
otal 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
II Ethnicities in Poverty		
	000 050	12 507 866
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	332,253	12,001,000
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	332,253 306,980	34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in	332,253 306,980 poverty)	34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) ercent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Block or African Amorican alone	332,253 306,980 poverty) 73.0% 7.6%	34,155,567 60.5%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) ercent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indina clarea	342,253 306,980 poverty) 73.0% 7.6% 2.4%	34,155,567 60.5% 21.8%
Hispanic or Latino (dri any rice) Not Hispanic or Latino (dri any race) ercent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone American Indian alone	342,253 306,960 poverty) 73.0% 7.6% 3.1% 2.7%	60.5% 21.8%
Hispanic of Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) ercent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Nutric Neurille & Other Desitis in alone	332,253 306,980 poverty) 73,0% 7,6% 3,1% 2,7% 0,00%	60.5% 21.8% 1.5%
Hispanic of Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) tercent of Total (Total = All Individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Adam alone Native Hawaiian & Oth Pacific Is, alone Native Hawaiian & Oth Pacific Is, alone	332,253 306,990 poverty) 73,0% 7,6% 3,1% 2,7% 0,2%	34,155,567 60,5% 21,8% 1,5% 4,0% 0,2%
Hepanic of Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in White alone Black or African American slone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaiian & Oth Pacific Is, alone Some other race	332,253 306,880 73,0% 7,7% 3,1% 2,7% 0,2% 10,2%	4,155,567 34,155,567 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 8.3%
Hispanic of Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) tercent of Total (Total = All Individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Native Hawaiian & Oth Pacific Is. alone Some other race Two or more races	332,253 poverty) 73,0% 7,0% 3,1% 2,7% 0,2% 10,2% 10,2% 3,1%	60.5% 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6%
Hepanic of Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) lercent of Total (Total = All Individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hewaiian & Oth.Pacfic Is. alone Some other race Two or more race Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	332,253 336,680 73,0% 7,5% 3,1% 2,7% 0,2% 10,2% 3,1% 5,20%	1.155,567 34,155,567 21.8% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6% 26.8%

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.

### Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty~, 2013\*

	mancopa County, AZ	
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%	10.6%

-Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that

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

	Maricopa County, AZ	
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%	0%
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 Ethnic	city, 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%
	40/	

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? 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 deat-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: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their give lower [sever] level."

### /hy is it important?

V is it important? For public land magners, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the contact of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

THOUS The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their ball family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of heiled children under 15 present (see below for poverty) releaf thresholds.

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local vinations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at census, goothers/wwwpoerty/dathreshold/reskum<sup>100</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

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 University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: nor.umich.deuterach/ethnicity<sup>100</sup>.

The U.S. Cansus Bureau briefing on "Powerty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: census, gov/pounditor/scdeen/distation/sclowarea.three/spoundies/powera.three/

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

	Income
What are the components of household earnings?	
This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source.	

### Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

characteristics during this period.

	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 <sup>^</sup>		
Labor earnings	79.2%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	26.8%	28.9%
Potiromont incomo	16 79/	17.7%

 
 Retirement income
 16.7%
 ...

 Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
 3.2%
 ...

 Cash public assistance income
 2.3%
 ...

 Food Samp/SNAP
 ...
 ...

 A Total may add to more than 100% due to households receiving more than 1 source 0 mcome.
 ...
 ...

 A Total may add to more than 100% due to households receiving more than 1 source 0 mcome.
 ...
 ...

 M Total may add to be are calculated by AGS using annual surveys conducted during 2000-2013 and are representative of average
 ...
 ...
 17.7% 4.9% 2.8% 12.4%



### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

	Maricopa County, AZ	0.5.
Mean earnings	\$73,525	\$75,017
Mean Social Security income	\$18,526	\$17,189
Mean retirement income	\$24,516	\$23,589
Mean Supplemental Security Income	\$9,591	\$9,152
Mean cash public assistance income	\$3,495	\$3,808

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

	Maricona County AZ	US
Total households:	0%	0%
Labor earnings	0%	0%
Social Security (SS)	0%	0%
Retirement income	1%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	2%	0%
Cash public assistance income	2%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	1%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Labor earnings	0%	0%
Social Security (SS)	0%	0%
Retirement income	1%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	2%	0%
Cash public assistance income	3%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	1%	0%
Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, C	Coefficients of Variation	
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S
Mean earnings	0%	0%
Mean Social Security income	1%	0%
Mean retirement income	1%	0%
Mean Supplemental Security Income	3%	0%
Mean cash public assistance income	4%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the components of household earnings?

#### What do we measure on this page? This page describes household ea ngs by source

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Ratirament income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to 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 item.

#### ethods

HOUS 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 BDLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest funning another demographics report at a larger georganic scade.

### Why is this important?

Vis 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 reflement and Social Socium<sup>1</sup>. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of referee (reflement) payments), other measures for example, SSI or Food Sampa) are an indication of a concome hardship.

#### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_doc tation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

#### Data Sources

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

	Social Cha	racteristics
What are education and enrollment levels?		
This page describes educational attainment and schoo	ol enrollment.	
Educational Attainment, 2013*		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S
Total Population 25 yrs or older	2 497 802	206 587 852
No high school degree	339.269	28.887.721
High school graduate	2.158.533	177,700,131
Associates degree	207,240	16,135,795
Bachelor's degree or higher	744,412	59,583,138
Bachelor's degree	479,256	37,286,246
Graduate or professional	265,156	22,296,892
Percent of Total		
No high school degree	13.6%	14.0%
High school graduate	86.4%	86.0%
Associates degree	8.3%	7.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher	29.8%	28.8%
Bachelor's degree	19.2%	18.0%
Graduate or professional	10.6%	10.8%
<ul> <li>The data in this table are calculated by ACS using an characteristics during this period.</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of</li> </ul>	nual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re Educational Attainment, 2013* 35% 29.8%	presentative of average 28.8%
people over the age of 25 with a bachelor's	30%	300000
In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school decree	20% 15% 10% 5% 0% Maricopa County, AZ	14.0%
(14.0%), and Maricopa County, AZ had the lowest (13.6%). School Enrollment, 2013*	No high school degree Bachelor's c	legree or higher
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S
otal Population over 3 years old:	3,726,118	299,795,523
Enrolled in school:	1,071,338	82,624,806
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	51,383	5,011,192
Enrolled in kindergarten	55,090	4,208,394
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	225,708	16,286,543
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	223,628	16,510,313
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	225,277	17,153,559
Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	237,393	19,333,036
Graduate or protessional school	52,859	4,121,769
Not enrolled in school	2,654,780	217,170,717
Percent of Total		
Enrolled in school:	28.8%	27.6%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	1.4%	1.7%
Enrolled in kindergarten	1.5%	1.4%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	6.1%	5.4%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	6.0%	5.5%
		6 300
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	6.0%	5.7%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	6.0% 6.4%	5.7%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school	6.0% 6.4% 1.4%	5.7% 6.4% 1.4%

Not enrolled in school 71.2% 72.4% Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

### Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

	Maricopa County, AZ	0.8.
Total Population 25 yrs or older	0%	0%
No high school degree	1%	0%
High school graduate	0%	0%
Associates degree	1%	0%
Bachelor's degree or higher	0%	0%
Bachelor's degree	1%	0%
Graduate or professional	1%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
No high school degree	1%	0%
High school graduate	0%	0%
Associates degree	1%	0%
Bachelor's degree or higher	0%	0%
Bachelor's degree	1%	0%
Graduate or professional	1%	0%
School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation		
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population over 3 years old:	0%	0%
Enrolled in school:	0%	0%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	2%	0%
Enrolled in kindergarten	2%	0%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	1%	0%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	1%	0%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	1%	0%
Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	1%	0%
Graduate or professional school	2%	0%
Not enrolled in school	0%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Enrolled in school:	0%	0%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	0%	0%
Enrolled in kindergarten	0%	0%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	1%	0%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	1%	0%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	1%	0%
Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	1%	0%
Graduate or professional school	4%	0%
Not enrolled in school	0%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are education and enrollment levels? What do we measure on this page? This page describes levels of educational attainment.

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.

<u>School Errollment</u>: 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.

hy is it important? Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and lack of education is closely linked to poverty. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during economic 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 might experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication and outrach efforts could be tailored of different addresces.

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 growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

thods 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 support unning another demographics report at a larger egospathic scale.

Additional Resources For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemployment rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.gov/emp/ep\_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.gov/prod/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 Ec vol. 34, New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

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

# **Social Characteristics**

# What languages are spoken?

This page mea sures 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.

### Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	3,610,510	291,484,482
Speak only English	2,661,566	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	948,944	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	733,629	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	88,805	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	84,079	9,539,099
Other languages	42,431	2,626,244
Speak English less than "very well"	359,920	25,148,900
Percent of Total		
Speak only English	73.7%	79.3%
Speak a language other than English	26.3%	20.7%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	20.3%	12.9%
Other Indo-European languages	2.5%	3.7%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	2.3%	3.3%
Other languages	1.2%	0.9%
Speak English less than "very well"	10.0%	8.6%

The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are represe characteristics during this period. ntative of average

Percent of Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



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

# Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

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 Indo-European languages	5%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	3%	0%
Other languages	5%	0%
Speak English less than "very well"	1%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What languages are spoken? 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 manages who are trying to communicate with otizens of communities adjacent to public lands, it is important to know whether a significant production of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation may need to be conducted in multiple languages.

TROS 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 numary another demographics report at a large regorganic 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: mix.org/map\_single<sup>143</sup>.

0



# Housing

What are the main housing characteristics?

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built

#### Housing Characteristics, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, 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	7149	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 earlier	137,854	39,488,483
Median year structure built*	1989	1976
Percent of Total		
Occupancy	05.00/	07.5%
Verent	03.0%	67.3%
Vacant	2.9%	2.0/6
For rent	3.0%	2.4%
Rented, not occupied	0.0%	0.3%
Pol sale only	1.6%	1.3%
Sold, not occupied	0.7%	0.5%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	4.4%	3.9%
Por migrant workers	0.0%	0.0%
Veer Built	3.0%	3.9%
Tear Built	0.5%	0.001
Built 2005 of later	0.5%	0.6%
Built 2000 to 2004	23.276	14.770
Built 1990 to 1999	21.3%	13.9%
Built 1980 to 1989	19.3%	13.9%
Built 1970 to 1979	17.8%	15.9%
Duilt 1900 to 1909 Built 1950 as padies	7.4%	11.1%
Duilt 1959 Of Balliel	8.4%	29.9%

Built 1960 of earlier Andreas and Andreas Andr

# In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing (14.4%), and the U.S. had the lowest (12.5%).

and the control



■Occupied SVacant

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

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Total Housing Units	0%	0%
Occupied	0%	0%
Vacant	1%	1%
For rent	2%	1%
Rented, not occupied	5%	1%
For sale only	3%	1%
Sold, not occupied	6%	1%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	2%	0%
For migrant workers	42%	2%
Other vacant	3%	1%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	5%	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	0%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	1%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	1%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	1%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	1%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	1%	0%
Median year structure built	0%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Occupancy		
Occupied	0%	0%
Vacant	2%	1%
For rent	3%	0%
Rented, not occupied	0%	0%
For sale only	3%	0%
Sold, not occupied	9%	0%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	1%	0%
For migrant workers	0%	0%
Other vacant	2%	2%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	0%	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	0%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	1%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	1%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	1%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	1%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	1%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the main housing characteristics?

What do we measure on this page? This bace describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

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 vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other 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,

#### hv is it important?

y to a mulportaint r 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 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 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 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant for public lands managers in the context of the wildland-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

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 nunning another demographics report a la larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_docr ntation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

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

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

### Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Owner-occupied housing units with a		
mortgage	650,604	49,820,840
Monthly cost <15% of household income	114,632	9,215,740
Monthly cost >30% of household income	238,706	17,636,343
Specified renter-occupied units	528,865	40,534,516
Gross rent <15% of household income	54,956	4,355,942
Gross rent >30% of household income	253,260	19,581,493
Median monthly mortgage cost*	\$1,528	\$1,540
Median gross rent <sup>A</sup>	\$943	\$904

### Percent of Total

Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost >30% of household income Gross rent <15% of household income 35.4% 10.7% 36.7% Gross rent >0% of household income Gross rent >0% of household income A Median monthy mortgage cost and median gross rent are not available for metrolin - The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted durin characteristics during this period. 47.9% 48.3% non-metro or regional aggregations. ng 2009-2013 and are representative of average

# Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\* 60% 50% 30% 20% 47.9%

36.7%

Maricopa County, AZ

Maricopa County, AZ

- In the 2009-2013 period, Maricopa County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of owner-occupied household where greater than 30% of household income was spent on mortgage costs (36.7%), 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 than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (K43%), and Maricopa County, AZ had the lowest (47.9%).
- 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 gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$943), and the U.S. had the lowest (\$904).



Median monthly mortgage cost^ Median gross rent^

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	
	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Owner-occupied housing units with a		
mortgage	0.5%	0.3%
Monthly 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 <sup>*</sup>	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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# How affordable is housing?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

upied 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

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.

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 acconomic handship is whether housing is alfordable. This page measures housing alfordability in terms of the share of housing 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 alfordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for highly alfordable.

48.3%

35.4%

IIS

U.S.

Iethods
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
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%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report as 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/ahs.html <sup>(44)</sup>.

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 affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: realtor.org/research/research/research/nousinginx<sup>(46)</sup>.

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

# **Benchmarks**

How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? hic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United State This page co

Indi	cators	Maricopa County AZ	U.S.	Maricopa County AZ vs. U.S.
	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	26.6%	10.7%	
s	Median Age (2013*)	35.0	37.3	
aphic	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	80.7%	74.0%	
mogr	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	29.7%	16.6%	-
ă	Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013*)	1.9%	0.8%	
	Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*)	27.8%	30.6%	
	Median Household Income (2013*)	\$53,596	\$53,046	
	Per Capita Income (2013*)	\$27,256	\$28,155	
eme	Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)	16.7%	15.4%	
Inco	Percent Families Below Poverty (2013*)	12.2%	11.3%	
	Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*)	43.5%	46.6%	
	Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income (2013*)	17.1%	20.2%	1
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*)	13.6%	14.0%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*)	29.8%	28.8%	
ture	Percent Population That Speak English Less Than Very Well' (2013*)	10.0%	8.6%	
Struc	Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*)	4.4%	3.9%	
	Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*)	36.7%	35.4%	
	Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*)	47.9%	48.3%	

\* 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. The Maricopa County AZ is most different from the U.S. in Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013\*), Percent Population American 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	US		
Population Growth (% 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%		
Median Family Income (2009*)	0.3%	0.1%		
Per Capita Income (2009*)	0.3%	0.2%		
Percent Individuals Below Poverty (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%		

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? What do we measure on this page? 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 self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and

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 threshold, then the family or unrelated individual is classified as being factors the power level."

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been bom between 1946-1964. The reported percent of population that are 'baby boomers' has some associated error since ACS generally reports age classes in 5-year increments (55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, etc.).

Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reintoursement.

Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer; tabo union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (3) periodic receipts from annulities and insurance; and (4) regular income from IRA and Keogh plans. It does not include Social Security income.

/hy 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 from the U.S.

It also offers an at-splance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a geography has an odder population, relatively unaflocatable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indicators can help uplic land manages intently groups of people and aspects of hadding that can all with bureach and consideration of whether the impacts of land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on disadvantaged people or places.

NOGS The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure from the region by the figure from the U.S.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor 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 as larger geographic scale.

Median Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability

#### Data Sources U.S. De

International Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

# **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceg1297.pdf
- 2 <u>www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\_main/</u>
- 3 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
- 4 <u>www.epa.gov/compliance/ej</u>
- 5 www.stateoftheusa.org
- 6 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
- 7 www.frey-demographer.org
- 8 <u>www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx</u>
- 9 www.census.gov/popest/
- 10 www.countyhealthrankings.org/
- 11 www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
- 12 www.census.gov/population/age/
- 13 www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
- 14 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
- 15 <u>www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html</u>
- 16 <u>www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\_1997standards</u>
- 17 www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
- 18 http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- 19 www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
- 20 www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\_cspan\_hispanics.pdf
- 21 www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf
- 22 www.bia.gov/index.htm
- 23 www.indians.org/index.html
- 24 www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
- 25 www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
- 26 www.bls.gov/soc/
- 27 www.bls.gov/oco/
- 28 www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
- 29 www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
- 30 www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
- 31 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
- 32 www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
- 33 www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
- 34 https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
- 35 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
- 36 www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
- 37 www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
- 38 www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
- 39 www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
- 40 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
- 41 www.bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm
- 42 www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
- 43 www.mla.org/map\_single
- 44 www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
- 45 <u>www.zillow.com</u>
- 46 www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx

# **A Profile of Land Use**

**Maricopa County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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
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

### 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



lemation System (GSI) looks. Two primary GSE o

# Land Ownership

What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 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 Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the different types of Forest Service lands?

# 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? These data allow the user to see the range and scale of Forest Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forest Service lands have special designations that may affect management considerations. Different types of designation may impact the economic value and uses of associated lands. ethods

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

Additional Resources A copy of the most recent Forest Service Land Areas Report, including detailed tables, is available at:ts:fed.us/land/statf/lar/2009/lar08index.html<sup>49</sup>.

Forest Service Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at: fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

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



It are the different types of federal lands? at do we measure on this page? This page describes the size (in across) and share of federal judic! lands managed for various purposes under differing statutory authorin For purposes of the social, federal public lands have been defined below as Type A, B, or C in order to more easily distinguish lands according to primary or common uses and/or conservation functions, achivities, permitted transportation uses, and whether they have a special destraintic of the howing C-argorization alarchi).

Type A loads tend to have note managelial and communications on metations that Type C loads, represent an matter proportion of load lend. Type B loads are shared by the MA loads, and the majoritation that the study shared by the Type B loads. Type I loads the study and the type B loads are shared to the the study of loads are shared to the study. The study of loads are shared to the study.

As more popularly described: Type A lands are areas having uncommon bio-physical and/or cultural character worth preserving; Type B lands are areas with limited development and motorized transportation worth preserving; and Type C lands are areas where the landscape may be altered within the objectives and quidelines of multiple use.

(i) it important for it important some proce of foreir public lands, such as National Parks and Wildemess, have been shown to be associated with above memory economic syndk. While here dassizationary bemanshess do not guarantee economic growth, when combined with other fractors, such as an educated workforce and access to major markets via airports, they have been shown to be statistically significant predictors of growth.

hoods The classifications effered on this page are not absolute categories. They are categories of relative degrees of management priority, categorized by land designation. Lands such as Wildeness and National Monuments, for example, are generably more likely to or 0 and managed for conservation and restration, worr hough there may exist teacefulors (a) as a Wildeness area or 0 and gas development in a National Normanne, Texes Service and ELM lands whole designations such as Wildeness or National Normanne are more likely to also commercial advices ca, juniting them havered junctions, prior are exception.

Land defined as either Type A. B. or C includes areas managed by the National Park Sarvice, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another the Sarvice and Face Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers). These Bureau of Realizations, address and Bureau of Realizations are not team of the Amy Carpet of Engineers and tool of a generative start and a service and the Carpet administration and a more attending of agency approach and an around another and a service and the fore agency approach and a provide only for comparative purposes. Asswell: The amount of average in particular but bytes may not be the only includer of quality. For example, Wild and Sor Reins managed bytes and order and and around and and the Amy Carpet administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not explored on the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and a service administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are not team of team of the Amount and another administration are not team of the Amount and another administration are nother ad

Initional Resources Studies, articles and literature reviews on the economic contribution of protected public lands are available from: headwaterseconomics.org/protected/ands.php<sup>48</sup>.

See also: Lorah, P. and R. Southwick. 2003. "Environmental Protection, Population Change, and Economic Development in the Rural Western United Stater' Population and Environment. 24(3): 255-272, and Holmes, P. and W. Hecox. 2002. "Does Wilderness Impoverbin Rural Areas?" International Journal of Wolferness. 10(3): 34-39.

For an analysis on the effect on local economies, in particular on resource-based industries, from Wilderness designations, see: Duffy-Deno, K. T. 1998. "The Effect of Foderal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." Journal of Regional Science. 39(1): 109-136.

For the results of a national survey of residents in counties with Wilderness, see: Rudzitis, G. and H.E. Johansen. 1991. "How Imp Wilderness? Results from a United States Survey." Environmental Management. 15(2): 227-233.

For analysis of the role of transportation in high-amenity areas, see: Rasker, R., P.H. Gude, J.A. Gude, J. van den Noort. 2009. "The Economic Importance of Air Travel in High-Amenity Rural Areas." Journal of Rural Studies. 25(2009): 343-353.

Data Sources: Rasker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207; U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas: Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3

90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 20% 10% 0%

Maricopa County, Al

•Туре А вТуре В КТуре С

The U.S. has the largest share of Type A land (40.3%), and Maricopa County, AZ has the smallest (33.7%).

The U.S. has the largest share of Type B land (10.3%), and Maricopa County, AZ has the smallest (3.2%).

Maricopa County, AZ has the largest share of Type C land (63.1%), and the U.S. has the smallest (49.4%)

#### a So

Raker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207: U.S. Gedogical Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3 Study Guide







# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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.
- USDA, Forest Service
   Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
   <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html</u>
- Protected Areas Database v 1.3 2012 U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006
   National Aeronautics and Space Administration
   <a href="http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm">http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm</a>

# **Methods**

## 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
- 2 gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- 3 www.nhd.usgs.gov
- 4 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html
- 5 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm
- 6 headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
- 7 http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- 8 <u>www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php</u>

# **A Profile of Federal Land Payments**

**Maricopa County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015
# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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	1
What are rederariand payments:	1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated	2
to unrestricted and restricted uses?	3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? How important are federal land payments to state and local governments	4
(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



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

What are federal land payments?

Total Federal Land Payments by         2,787           Geography of Origin (\$)         3,503,210         2,787           PIL T         2,781,482         393           Forest Service Payments         504,802         300           BLM Payments         216,567         66           USFVS Refuge Payments         0         16,007           Forest Service Payments         0         2,007	,139,550 ,256,089 ,058,822 ,579,030
Geography of Origin (5)         3,503,210         2,787           PILT         2,781,842         369           Forest Service Payments         504,802         306           BLM Payments         216,567         66           USFVVS Refuge Payments         0         121           Federal Mineral Royalties         0         2,001	,139,550 ,256,089 ,058,822 ,579,030
PILT         2,781,842         393           Forest Service Payments         504,802         300           BLM Payments         216,567         66           USFWS Refuge Payments         0         12           Federal Mineral Royattes         0         2,001	,256,089 ,058,822 .579.030
Forest Service Payments         504,802         300           BLM Payments         216,567         66           USFWS Refuge Payments         0         11           Federal Mineral Royalties         0         2,001	,058,822
BLM Payments         216,567         64           USFWS Refuge Payments         0         15           Federal Mineral Royalties         0         2,000	.579.030
USFWS Refuge Payments         0         15           Federal Mineral Royalties         0         2,001	
Federal Mineral Royalties 0 2,001	,936,122
	,309,488
Percent of Total	
PILT 79.4%	14.3%
Forest Service Payments 14.4%	11.0%
BLM Payments 6.2%	2.4%
USFWS Refuge Payments 0.0%	0.6%
Federal Mineral Royalties 0.0%	



Fed. Mineral Royalties FWS Payments BLM Payments FS Payme PILT

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

# hat are federal land payments

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. <u>Federal land payments</u>. These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. Fayments are funded by Idental appropriations (e.g., PILD) and from receipts received by federal agencies from activities on federal public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals). <u>Payments</u> in Law of <u>Taxes</u> (PILL). These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is based on a maximum per-acre payment reduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. <u>Forest Service Revenue Sharing</u>. These are payments based on USPS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools. 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 through the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California (0 & C) grant lands. <u>USEVXS Raluga</u>, these payments sine a portion of receipts from National Wildlie Reluge and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located. Executed States and they are located. Executed States and they are located in the state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may afters, at their discretion, a portion of revenues with the local governments where insplates were generated. Executed Texture 2012; Privers to the federal facual year with the body governments where insplates were generated.

### hy is it important?

y is it important? State and local government 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 presence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of local government 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 beginning in 1977 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of dedrail revenue larking programs. PILT was intended to stallatize and increase technal and payments to courd youvernments. Note recently, the Secure Kural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments into commercial receipts. SRS received horad support because it addressed several major coversma around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment lived, and the increase technal decella fuel and payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment with every stored to courties by Initing Idential and payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment with any store technal store payment and the store technal programs. Second Store technal store techn eceipt-based programs e uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization A 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget cor are creating uncertaining for the future of both. ion Act of

### thods

thtods Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments. Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively inagrificant at the deteral 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 importent to specific local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant to the specific local governments with significant. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant on the US. In FFY 2008.

Volitional 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 Mountian Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missaula, M.C. and March Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Corgressional Research Swarte Report R130335.
Transfo Indeal land payments are doaled by text of constrained by extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Scolecocronic Measures report and other industry specific reports at
headwatersacconomics.org/ops-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwatersacconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.

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 Menagement, 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.;
Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments?

# What do we measure on this page? This page describes how federal land payments

nts are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origin.

by 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 sample, PLIT is derived to ocurry government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments decline, the PLIT formula ensures that county government payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments, While PLIT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalities, BLI hreenue sharing payments) are still linked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and governors have a different set of expectations and incentives to tobby for particular outcomes on public lands fram do county commissioners or school officials.

thods State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) lederal mineral royalises and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and lederal statute (see note about data limitations). <u>Country Government Distributions:</u> Consist of (1) PILT: (2) portions of Forest Service apprents including Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR5) Title 1 and Title III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW S Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discriptional state and the III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: 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 put land projects on the national forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provide advice and recommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of spoilal projects on letteral allows as authorized under the Secure Rauf Schools Act and Community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 propie representing value interests and allows of operaties, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national lorest and and schools act and community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 propie representing value interests and allows of operaties, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national lorest and and schools act and the second school and the second scho

<u>Grazing District Distributions</u>: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. <u>Data Limitations</u>: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states made discretionary distributions of inviend regulaties and score 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 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 importal jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at ortance (in terms of headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt<sup>(1)</sup>

#### Data Sources

ia 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/spe-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distribut school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payme ed to the state

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

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments to County		
Government (\$)	3,206,770	616,271,004
Unrestricted	2,956,893	457,219,872
Restricted-County Roads	214,541	143,265,915
Restricted-Special County Projects	35,336	15,785,217
Percent of Total		
Unrestricted	92.2%	74.2%
Restricted-County Roads	6.7%	23.2%
Restricted-Special County Projects	1.1%	2.6%



100%

80%

# Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Governments by Permitted Use, FY 2013

In FY 2013, unrestricted federal land payments were the largest type of payment to the county government in Maricopa County AZ (92.2%), and restricted-special county projects were the smallest (1.1%).

60% 40% 20% 0% Maricopa County, AZ

Restricted-Special County Projects Restricted-County Roads Unrestricted

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 Wallington Bevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www. hadvaterescontraics.org/sp-hdt

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses?

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

### Vhy is it important?

(s) is important?
County governments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For exemple, counties must maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with public lands. Several federal land payment programs, particularly those from the Forest Service, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

sist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal min

Interditcied: Consist of (1) PLIT, [2] U.S. Fish and virusing Service results in the service results of (1) PLIT, [2] U.S. Fish and virusing Service results and the service service 25% setticited-County Reads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Trile I, (2) Forest Service 25% and (3) Forest Service OV payments (between 1933 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law mandates payments be used roomry reads and public schools. Each state determines how to split funds between he two services. setticited-Specific County Projects: Consist of (1) SRS Trill III India that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, ch as Filewise Communities projects, reimbursement for emergency services provided on federal land, and developing community wildlife

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 ailable)

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, Missould, 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. Congr

#### Data S Sources

Ia Sources US. 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/sep-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How important are federal land payments to state and local gov nts This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state gove nent gene

#### deral Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S.
Total General Revenue	2,321,964	na
Taxes	781,192	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	1,190,505	na
Total Charges	65,336	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	284,931	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	2,332	3,312,736
Percent of Total		
Taxes	33.6%	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	51.3%	na
Total Charges	2.8%	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	12.3%	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	0.1%	na







0.0% na 0.0% Maricopa County, AZ U.S.

0.10%

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liau of Taxee (PLUT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Services Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2008 Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Frish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resour Newnus. Washington, D.C.; Additional Sources and methods available at www. headvaterscommics orgiges-hd

0.1%

0.1% 0.1% 0.1%

0.0%

## udy Guide and Supplemental Information

### w important are federal land payments to state and local governments?

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 (FV) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. Interaction Table: Census of Government county financial statistics are based on a national 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 for the latest year.

Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax. <u>Intergovernmental Revenue</u>: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including Ideral education, health care, and transportation assistance to state governments, and state assistance to local governments. <u>Tatal Charges</u>: Charges imposed for providing ourrent services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges. <u>All Other (Missioneus</u>): All other general government revenue from their own iscurces.

#### v is it important?

() In important is 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 revenue stream. Counties must dependent on federal land payments are a effected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For these counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.

thods
Regarding Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the federal FV beginning October 1 and ending September 31. Federal land payments reported for the current FY are often distributed to counties during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opagements authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opagements authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the Census of Government FV 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2005 are compared to Local government revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be undersported 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).

<u>Census of Governments Data Limitations</u>: (1) county linancial statistics may not match local government linancial reports for three main reasons; (a) The Genus of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and quasi-government) entities). This may differ from the way to governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) different reporting periods between the Genus of Governments financial year and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of the different and governments was a Governments for SMS? and PLT, and (3) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other source of country revenue.

### dditional Resources

ULUS. Censis Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census gov/govs/estimatel<sup>(2)</sup>. 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/gova<sup>(2)</sup>. Schuster, Ervin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May

Schliden, Ermit Schwarzen, Schuler Schwarzen, Annahysis of the Secure Rural School and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 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

ta OULIVES 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 Apriculture. 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 Wildle 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 Wildle 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.hashwatersconnics.org/ep-bdt





### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)?

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 compensate 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 Dase payment' that is reduced by the amount of revenue sharing payments and is subject to appouldance;

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 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 full payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Vhy is it important? As county payments became more important to local government after WWII (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-war housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PLT increased and stabilized payments by funding counties from congressional appropriations rather than directly from commodity receipts. PLT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local government services, but can be used at the direction of county commissiones 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/nbc/index.cfm<sup>(4)</sup>.

Schuster, Ervin 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 U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing? 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)



Title I Title II Title III 25% Fund Forest Grasslands Special Acts

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

#### udy Guide and Supplemental Information hat is Forest Service Re nue Sharing'

# What do we measure on this page?

This pa cribes Ec . ue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act

This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR), 25K, https://dx.and.forest/Grasslands. U.S. Forest Service <u>25 Percent Func</u>: The <u>25K</u> Fund, established in 1908, shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with schools and fund schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services. The <u>Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act</u> d 2000 (SRS) or Public Lan Vio-303: SRS was enacted in FX 2001 to provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counting affected by the decline in revenue from timber harvests on federal lands. SRS was reauthorized for a single year in 2007, and again in 2008 for a period of lour 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 schoots. States determine the split between these two services, and some states is the counties decide.
 Title I - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committees (RACs) at the community level help make specifing determinations and monitor project progress.
 Title II - these spayments 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 wildline protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the 25% Fund and SRS2 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. <u>Forest Grasslands</u>: 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. 577g), payments associated with the Quinault Special Management Area in Washington (PL. 100-638, 102 Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quarts from the Quachita National Forest in Arbanas (842, 300 Not State), and the Arbanas (Stat. 3327) and the Arbanas (Stat. 374). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment (75% of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Cance Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receipts from the Outnault Special Management Area with both PoUnault Indian The and with the State of Washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quarts from the Outachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (rather than being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkanas counties with Outachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

#### hy is it important?

USES memory battering is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royslites are distributed to states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when timber harvesto on the National Ferests increased sharply in response to post-was housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shifted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it. Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owi" 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 sharing in three fundament ways: SRS (1) does county payments from National Forest needpts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewards through Titel II funds that pay for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment quily concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title 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 to expire. It SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the 25% Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on public land.

#### dditional Resources

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determ tion Act payments available at: fs.usda.gov/pts/ 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 Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt Study Guide

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is BLM Revenue Sharing?

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

### 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
Title I	0	33,685,617
Title 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%
Title I	0.0%	50.6%
Title II	0.0%	5.0%
Title 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.head rseconomics.org/eps-hdt

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information Vhat is BLM Revenue Sharing?

What do we measure on this page? 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. <u>Proceeds of Sales</u>: These include receipts from the sale of land and materials. <u>Include regarder</u> Act: These include OI and Gas Right of Way lases nervenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do not include regarders workshet 10.

payments see worksneet to. Tavide Chairund Auf, 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. Funds are restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predetor contrd, noisous weed programs) in cooperation with BLM of livestock organizations. • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the Act.

Nuc. 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 California Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (0&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell-Determination Act. Amounts include Tate I, Tatle II, and Tatle III payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report for definitions and information on the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell-Determination Act).

Vhy is it important? The BLM is the nation's targest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adjacent commu Similarly, the non-transitie status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide services to county residents, and pro public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in I property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT). dents, and provide overnments in lieu of

#### hods

NHods B.M. data on this page are from BLM FRD 196 and FRD 198 reports. The FRD 196 reports reseipts by younty and state of origin while the FRD 198 reports actual distribution amounts to state and local governments. FRD 198 per of the short available for some years, so the FRD 196 per of used. To mine a distribution mounts from receipt, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipt (Table 3-14 BLM Public Land Statistici) was used. Some error in likely. In addition, some data are obtained directly from states. Distribution statistics datained from the state or local government are reliated to the province FY's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2008 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2009.)

### dditional Resources

BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics web blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html<sup>(6)</sup>.

Information about the Taylor Grazing Act is available at: blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html(7).

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-hdt



# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What are Federal Mineral Royalties?

This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governm

	Maricopa County, AZ	U.S
tal Federal Royalty	0	2,001,309,48
Royalties	0	1,784,591,30
Coal	0	353,201,18
Natural Gas	0	498,654,39
Gas Plan Products	0	141,034,61
Oil	0	693,515,90
Other	0	98,185,21
Non-Royalty Revenue	0	216,482,99
Rents	0	22,126,37
Bonus	0	330,986,89
Other Revenues	0	-136,630,27
Geothermal	0	3,659,32
GOMESA	0	235 18
Royalties	na	89.2%
Coal	na	17.69
Natural Gas	na	24.99
Gas Plan Products	na	7.0%
Oil	na	34.79
Other	na	4.99
Non-Royalty Revenue	na	10.89
Rents	na	1.19
Bonus	na	16.5%
Other Revenues	na	-6.8%
Geothermal	na	0.2%

### Federal Mineral Royalty Distributions per FY. Maricopa County AZ (sg \$0.0 Thousands (2013 \$0.0 \$0.0 \$0.0 \$0.0 \$0.0 In FY 2013, oil royalties were the largest component of federal mineral royalties in the U.S. (34.7%), and other were the smallest (4.9%). Components of Federal Mineral Royalty Distril 100% 80% 60% 40% 20% -20% InFY 2013, bonus were the largest component of federal mineral non-royalty revenue in the U.S. (16.5%), and other revenues were the smalles (-6.8%). Maricopa County, AZ U.S. Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Non-Royalty Revenue Other Revenues ■ Oil ■ Bonus Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

udy Guide and Supplemental Information

Vhat are Federal Mineral Royalties?

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

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for This page describes the compon the region.

Royalties, rents, and borus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49% of revenue is returned to states and 51% is retained by the folderal government). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on tederal lands and a share of royalties from dishone difficult in the Gut difficult of the shared of the difficult ocurry governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of folderal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or eccommically impacted by mineral divergement for planning, construction/maintenance of public testifies, and provision of public aevice).

<u>Boyalities</u>: Royality payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royality may be an established minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royality rate increases by steps as the average production on the less increases. A sliding-scale royality rate is based on average production and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat: Seathermat is and statuted directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Contamined the state of the state and the state state and the state state and the state state and the state state state and their eligible political studentions receiving revenues from the GOMESA Teo Scatte Alabama, Louisaina, 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. Bonuess: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Bonuess represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease. <u>Other Revenues</u>: A disfusement that is not a royally ren, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments, gas storage fees, estimated payments, recoupments, and fees for sand and gravel used for beach restoration.

# hv is it important?

y is it important / Minent royates 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. Royally revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed to provide an ongoing public benefit from the depletion of non-revensible resources owned by the public.

### thods

Ithods Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royalty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalies were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25 percent of the state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with the county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of origin and state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with the county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of here data. Headwater Economics Incides a list of state distribution policy, linits to data, and contract information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Mintods and Resources document. http://headwates.conomics.org/whytiw-pocretinty/buddeEPS-HDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf.

#### Additional Resources

attional Kesources
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 contax information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government
Financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPSHDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf<sup>100</sup>.

For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at: onrr.gov/Stats/odf/oncs/n/nesarv.ordf<sup>11</sup> ary.pdf<sup>(</sup>

Data Sources U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

# Data Sources & Methods

# **Data Sources**

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

• U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- U.S. Bureau of Land Management U.S. Department of Interior <u>www.blm.gov</u> Tel. 202-208-3801
- U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture <u>www.fs.fed.us</u> Tel. 800-832-1355

<u>www.onrr.gov</u> Tel. 303-231-3078

U.S. Department of Interior

# **Methods**

# 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 <u>headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt</u>
- 2 www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
- 3 <u>www.census.gov/govs/</u>
- 4 www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
- 5 <u>www.fs.usda.gov/pts/</u>
- 6 www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html
- 7 www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
- 8 <u>www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html</u>
- 9 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
- 11 www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf

# **A Profile of Demographics**

**Pinal County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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.



**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.

# **Table of Contents**

Demographics How has population changed? What is the age and gender distribution of the population? What is the racial makeup of the population? What is the Hispanic makeup of the population? What is the tribal makeup of the population?	Page 1 2-3 4 5 6-7
Employment What occupations and industries are present? What are the characteristics of labor participation? What are commuting patterns?	8 9 10
Income How is income distributed? What are poverty levels? What are the components of household earnings?	11 12-13 14
Social Characteristics What are education and enrollment levels? What languages are spoken?	15 16
Housing What are the main housing characteristics? How affordable is housing?	17 18
Benchmarks How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
Data Sources & Methods	20
Links to Additional Resources	21

# 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%.

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

## How has population changed?

This page describes the total population and change in total population

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau, Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section the Savdy Guide text.

### Population, 2000-2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Population (2013*)	379,128	311,536,594
Population (2000)	179,727	281,421,906
Population Change (2000-2013*)	199,401	30,114,688
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	110.9%	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.		



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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How has population changed?

### What do we measure on this page?

w - w - ποιοιομία - μι πια μαμμε τ This page describes the total population and change in total population. Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decemial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

#### /hy is this important?

/ Is this important? This report covers a break range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and ownership. Is is the only EPS-HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These in in thoms, and census designated places. American Indian, Makan antive, and narwe Hawiai areas, compressional distributis, and county there. cation, and home 5. These include cities.

automation in addition to its usefulness for social research, the information throughout this report is valuable for public land managers and others in identifying whether the selected geographies contain minorities and people who are economically and/or socially disadvantaged. This is important because Executive Order (1998, Februar) 11, 1194 states that "acak federal agency what make achieving environmental alle to programs, policies, and achieves on minority opulations and low-income polautions." (see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and achieves on minority topulations and low-income polautions. "(see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is to programs, policies, and achieves on minority topulations and low-income polautions." stice acts of report nces)

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/isocially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management actions requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minotify individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as body); and infirmity, illness, or any other negative health effects from cumulative or multiple devices exposures to environmental hazards), and disproprioritately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or naive populations).

#### ethods

LINUS The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). 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 unit 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).

For populations of 65.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographies, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this proport are 5-year ACS estimates. Knows 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-geograp comparisons. The disadvantage is that multilyar estimates cannot be used to describe any particularly year in the partice. Any that the average value is over the full period. For threvely, table and figure titles show the lated year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to darily that the data represent average characterization over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables. **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; ORANCE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with the dota) indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; another domographics report at a leagn groupped space. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the bless provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

#### Additional Resources ible publ

An indi on on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see: census gov/acs/wwwihethodology/methodology\_main/<sup>10</sup>. census gov/acs/wwwDownloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyotData2009.pdf <sup>10</sup>.

### Data Sources

ta 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. Study Cuide

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 rider

### 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 Malo	109 220	152 247 412

Change in Median Age, 2000-2013\*

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

35.3 5.7% Median Ape / 2000)

Addian Ape / 2000

Addian Ape

36.1 37.1



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.

der Distribution Coofficients of V

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0.0%	0.0%
Under 5 years	0.4%	0.0%
5 to 9 years	2.0%	0.1%
10 to 14 years	2.2%	0.1%
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%	0.1%
45 to 49 years	0.6%	0.0%
50 to 54 years	0.9%	0.0%
55 to 59 years	2.5%	0.1%
60 to 64 years	2.7%	0.1%
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%	0.1%
85 years and over	6.7%	0.1%
Total Female	0.2%	0.0%
Total Male	0.2%	0.0%
Median Age^ (2013*)	0.3%	0.2%
Median Age^ (2000)	0.0%	0.0%
Median Age % Change	12.2%	3.0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes population distribution tion by age and gender, and the change in median age. This page describes population dist

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

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of refines, 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 many counties, the largest segment of the oppulation is in the Baby Boarner generation (people boarnets) motiversities (19-6). The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

37.3

thoos Data in his report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Cansus 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 2006 forwup 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 > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a peort, we suggest running another demographics report a la larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, coor, 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<sup>14</sup>.

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/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

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: stateoftheusa.org<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistrib and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: aca.gov/aceroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx<sup>(8)</sup>.

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/ <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: county-healthrankings.org/ (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.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population? This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age dist five age groups. with age categories separated into

### Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 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 table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average cha 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 and Chang	e, coefficients of variation	
	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%	2%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Varia	tion	
	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 is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 ca five age groups.

### hy is it important?

VIS It Important? For public land aspects, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retined population, or soon-ba-enteid oppopulation, 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 minors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the reterement of the "Baby Boomen" generation (those 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 demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

#### ods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with none dot) indicates be and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%; if data have consistently low accuracy the a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. ween 12

dditional Resources The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at: The non-profit Population Reference prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010p 1138.pdf

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 gow/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx <sup>(44)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regional 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 Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st 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.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html <sup>(15)</sup>. 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.

What is the racial makeup of the population?

cribes the number of people who self-ide ntify as belonging to a particular race This page de

Race: Race is a set-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or maces with which they most closely identify The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicky.

### Population by Race, 2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	
Total Population	379,128	311,536,594
White alone	298,828	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	17,847	39,167,010
American Indian alone	19,784	2,540,309
Asian alone	6,052	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	1,707	526,347
Some other race alone	24,064	14,746,054
Two or more races	10,846	8,732,333
Percent of Total		
White alone	78.8%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	4.7%	12.6%
American Indian alone	5.2%	0.8%
Asian alone	1.6%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0.5%	0.2%
Some other race alone	6.3%	4.7%

Two or more races 2.9% 2.8%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average
the method in the bin and the method of the bin and the second of the bin and cs during this period

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Pinal County AZ, 2013\*



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

Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
0%	0%
0%	0%
2%	0%
2%	0%
5%	0%
7%	1%
5%	0%
8%	1%
Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
0%	0%
1%	0%
2%	0%
4%	0%
14%	0%
6%	0%
8%	0%
	Pinal County, A2 0% 2% 2% 5% 5% 5% 8% Pinal County, A2 0% 0% 0% 1% 2% 4% 4% 4% 4%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### Vhat is the racial makeup of the populati

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people ple who self-identify 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 identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race

and athnicity. Race Alexe Categories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureau, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawalan or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Nather, "Alast" and "Native Hausilan or Other Posicilo Islander" race categories desorbed above. Respondents providing write-in ertites such as multitotal, invent, internatio, or a Happinol Latino group (for example, Mexican, Pluento Rican, or Culban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category. <u>Two or Mace Races</u>: People may have chosen to provide two or more race response. Providing multiple write-in responses, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

ny is it important?

deral agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this inform omote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act. tion to

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 nacial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic group are inportant for putting into effect a nature of federal statutes (i.e., envirosing billingual election naise whether Mong Rights Act; monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the CNH Rights Act; Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local povernments to programs and meeting landware equirements (i.e., learning agements of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act; evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community 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, broady referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 128as. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whethe there is a potential environmental justice issue. For public land ma

ods

Annue. Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elevelwere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with non edot) indicates be 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with non dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numming anothe demographics report at large geographic scalar.

dditional Resources For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ether (1997), see: whitehouse gov/omb/Hedreg\_1997/standards <sup>(re)</sup>.

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 Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/isf/pages/in

The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measurecfamerica.org/acenturyapart.<sup>(19)</sup>

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

U.S.

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

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.

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Maxican," Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those the indicate that the year "other Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino" Origin can be viewed as the hertiage, unclanding trouge, Ineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spansh, Hispanic, or Latino may be dary taxos.

#### Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	379,128	311,536,594
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	109,232	51,786,591
Not Hispanic or Latino	269,896	259,750,003
White alone	220,844	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	17,111	38,093,998
American Indian alone	18,400	2,061,752
Asian alone	5,750	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	1,515	488,646
Some other race	"467	606,356
Two or more races	5,809	6,387,422
Percent of Total		

Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	28.8%	16.6%
Not Hispanic or Latino	71.2%	83.4%
White alone	58.3%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	4.5%	12.2%
American Indian alone	4.9%	0.7%
Asian alone	1.5%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.4%	0.2%
Some other race	<b>``0.1%</b>	0.2%
Two or more record	1 69/	2.10/

Two or more races 1.5%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average ristics during this period



Pinal County, AZ

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.
tal 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%	C
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	6%	1
Some other race	51%	1
Two or more races	9%	(
ercent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Pinal County, AZ	U
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	(
Not Hispanic or Latino	0%	(
White alone	0%	(
Black or African American alone	1%	(
American Indian alone	1%	(
Asian alone	4%	(
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0%	(
Some other race	49%	(
	00/	

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people who self-identity as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural destination, and Hispanics can be of any race.

Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal gover race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. ent considers

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mevican," "Puerto Rikan," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino". Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, inseque, or country of bith of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Hispanicas ere one of the tastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-dentified as being religeance in 2010. The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by 2050. Between 200 and 2010, Hispanica accounded for ver one-haid of the trackin'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 imposition on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many feeder programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decomial census (i.e., promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial dispatities in health and environmental riskl) and "Data or ethnic groups are important for puting from fields a name of decked astauce (i.e., and/orcing hingual electron nate) under the Voing Highs Act, monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act, Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments (i.e., and/miting local governments (i.e., and/miting under the Voing Act and a start the Voing Act and a start the Voing Act and a start the Public Health Act, evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act,"

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.

Iditional 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/fedreg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>.

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/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces

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.pdf <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf <sup>[21]</sup>.

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

## **Demographics** What is the tribal makeup of the population?

This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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 thrites or Satected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackhet, Chervene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Short, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Short, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Short, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chipyene, Short, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Chipyene, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipyene, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chickasw, Sate Chipye

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	379,128	311,536,594
Total Native American	19,784	2,540,309
American Indian Tribes	18,782	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes	52	108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	'802	363,000
Percent of Total Total Native American	5.2%	0.8%
American Indian Tribes	5.0%	0.6%
Alaska Native Tribes	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Specified Tribes	0.2%	0.1%
* 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.		



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

American Indian & Alaska Native Populat	tion, Coefficients of Variation	
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
Total Native American	2%	0%
American Indian Tribes	2%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	43%	1%
Non-Specified Tribes	19%	1%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation	1	
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Native American	2%	0%
American Indian Tribes	2%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	0%	0%
Non-Specified Tribes	29%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### What is the tribal makeup of the population? What do we measure on this page?

, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in This page describes, in general ter with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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 03 tribes or Selected American Indian categorizer, Sapehe, Bladdeet, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasaw, Chipowa, Chockaw, Collie, Comanche, Cree, Creek. Crow, Delaware, Houma, Iroquosi, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navajo, Casge, Chawa, Pauke, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shoetone, Sixu, Tohomo O'Otham, Ule xiYaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al 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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hy is it important?

V is it important ( Different groups depole may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native titbes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current is to be land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

# thoos 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%. Ideat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

ethods

### 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.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>. The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs res and contacts are available at: bia.gov/index.htm <sup>(22)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.org/index.html <sup>(23)</sup>.

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

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Ammore other races. can Indian and Alaska Native alo nation with one o

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013

Region

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	379.128	311.536.594
Total Native American	19.784	2.540.309
American Indian Tribes; Specified	18,782	1,997,487
Apache	181	69,740
Blackfeet	<b>"0</b>	26,474
Cherokee	225	273,192
Cheyenne	<b>"0</b>	11,774
Chickasaw	28	22,917
Chippewa	-46	115,253
Choctaw	76	90,189
Colville	-10	8,182
Comanche	741	12,228
Cree	<b>"0</b>	2,191
Creek	-67	41,521
Crow	<b>"0</b>	11,424
Delaware	<b>"0</b>	7,471
Houma	<b>"0</b>	9,488
Iroquois	"261	45,639
Kiowa	<b>"0</b>	8,691
Lumbee	<b>"0</b>	68,171
Menominee	~25	8,259
Navajo	2,049	305,552
Osage	- 94	8,332
Ottawa	<b>"0</b>	7.026
Paiute		10,545
Pima	10,847	24,212
Potawatomi	<b>"0</b>	19,337
Pueblo	'109	71,029
Puget Sound Salish	<b>"0</b>	13,971
Seminole	~ <b>0</b>	13,987
Shoshone	<b>"0</b>	9,470
Sioux	29	124,383
Tohono O'Odham	2,432	20,343
Ute	4	8,629
Yakama	0	8,614
Yaqui	-399	19,942
Yuman	113	7,944
All other tribes	1,697	491,367
American Indian; Not Specified	148	60,370
Alaska Native Tribes; Specified	52	108,836
Alaska Atnabaskan	0	15,882
Aleut	0	11,709
ESKIMO Tilinait Unida	43	60,926
ningit-naida	9	15,622
All other tribes	0	4,697
Alaska Native; Not Specified	U	10,616
American Indian or Alaska Native;		

American Indian Or Alaba a native; 802 363,000 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.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general 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 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categories, Roden, Bladketer, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasw, Chipewa, Chockaw, Colvile, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, toquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menorinee, Navajo, Casge, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shotone, Siux, Tohomo Odotham, Ute Aviaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al cher.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### /hv is it important?

y is in important: Different groups people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, belefs, 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 and/or current to be the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

### Methods

thoos 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

Iditional 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 relations. See: fs.led.us/spft/tribalrelations/index.shtml <sup>(24)</sup>.

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

Study Guid

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%
Blackfeet	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%
Navajo	21%	1%
Osage	59%	6%
Ottawa	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; No	19%	1%

	Employment
What occupations and industries are present?	

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	133,164	141,864,697
Management, professional, & related	41,269	51,341,226
Service	27,458	25,645,065
Sales and office	33,429	34,957,520
Farming, fishing, and forestry	2,247	1,030,881
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	13,647	11,832,435
Production, transportation, & material moving	15,114	17,057,570
Percent of Total		
Management, professional, & related	31.0%	36.2%
Service	20.6%	18.1%
Sales and office	25.1%	24.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	1.7%	0.7%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	10.2%	8.3%
Production, transportation, & material moving	11.3%	12.0%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve	eys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average

# Employment by Industry, 2013

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	133,164	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	5,051	2,731,302
Construction	8,994	8,864,481
Manufacturing	13,149	14,867,423
Wholesale trade	2,616	3,937,876
Retail trade	16,216	16,415,217
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	6,286	7,010,637
Information	2,787	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	8,861	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	11,852	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	27,077	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	12,855	13,262,892
Other services, except public administration	5,469	7,043,003
Public administration	11,951	7,034,048
Percent of Total		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	3.8%	1.9%
Construction	6.8%	6.2%
Manufacturing	9.9%	10.5%
Wholesale trade	2.0%	2.8%
Retail trade	12.2%	11.6%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	4.7%	4.9%
Information	2.1%	2.2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	6.7%	6.7%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	8.9%	10.8%
Education, health care, & social assistance	20.3%	23.2%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	9.7%	9.3%
Other services, except public administration	4.1%	5.0%

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

# Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Variation U.S. Civilian employed population > 16 years Management, professional, & related Service 1% 2% 3% 3% 15% 5% 4% 0% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% Sales and office Farming, fishing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint., & repair Construction, extraction, maint. & repair Production, transportation, & mannial movin Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation Management, protessional, & related Service Sales and office Farming, fahing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, respontation, & mannial movin Employment by Industry, Coefficients of W 2% 3% 3% 14% 5% 4% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% ts of Vari Civilian employed population > 16 years Agriculture, forestry, fahing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mg Education, headh care, & sciola assistance Arts, ententian, ree., accomodation, & bod Other services, except public assistance nty, AZ U.S. 1% 9% 4% 10% 4% 6% 12% 6% 5% 3% 5% 5% 7% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Other services, except public administration 0% Public administration Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation 4% Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 10% 6% 9% 3% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 7% 4% Manufacturing Whicewale trade Real trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and Insurance, and real estate Prof. scientific, mgmt, admt, & waste mare Education, heath ace, & social assistem Activation and trade area, & social assistem Arts, enternain, rec., acconcision, & soci Other services, aceque public administration Public administration

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### Vhat occupations and industries are present?

What do we measure on this page? 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: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classifi-with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry.

Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

hy is it Important? y 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 relativity the eccorrowy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors. Employment by occupation dises additional information that desc people to its a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-ted by working to a onliving time, an entity or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while by industry describes where people work. ribes what tions are stries (for example, m

# thods Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor dod) indicates bet 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with no dods) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numbra prother demographics report at large geographic scale.

thods

dditional Resources The Census Bureau pr u provides a definition of SOCS: census.gov/hhes/www/ioind

Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.gov/soc/

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: bis.gow/cor/<sup>(27)</sup>.

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

		Employment
Vhat are the characteristics of labor participati	ion?	
his page describes workers by weeks worked per year	and usual hours works per week.	
abor Participation Characteristics, 2013	*	
• •	Pinal County, AZ	U.
opulation 16 to 64	233,405	204,340,91
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	107,634	112,330,37
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	20,738	21,646,42
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	18,385	19,225,13
LOURS WORKED BER WEEK-	00,040	51,136,90
Worked 35 or more hours per week	115 673	116 424 23
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	26.051	29.453.21
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	5,033	7,324,48
Did not work	86,648	51,138,98
Mean usual hours worked for workers	39.3	38
Percent of Total		
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	46.1%	55.0
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	8.9%	10.6
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	7.9%	9.4
Did not work	37.1%	25.0
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:		
Worked 35 or more hours per week	49.6%	57.0
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	11.2%	14.4
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	2.270	3.6
The data in this table are calculated by ACS using ann	ual surveys conducted during 2009-20	13 and are representative of average
haracteristics during this period.		per Year 2013*
	100% -	per real, 2010
	80%	000000
	60%	200000
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the</li> </ul>	40%	
highest estimated percent of people that	2007	
worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%),	20%	
and Pinal County, AZ had the lowest (46.1%)	0%	
(40.170).	Pinal County, A	2 0.5.
	S Did not work	Worked 1 to 26 weeks
	WORKED 27 TO 45 WEEKS	Worked 50 to 52 weeks
	Hours Worked p	er Week, 2013*
	100%	
	80%	
	60%	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the</li> </ul>	4097	
highest estimated percent of people that	40%	
worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%),	20%	
(49.6%).	0%	
	Pillar Coulity, A	2 0.0.
	>35 Hours/Week ■15-34 Hours/We	ek  1-14 Hours/Week  Did not work

	Pinal County, AZ	
Population 16 to 64	0%	0%
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	1%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	4%	0%
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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the characteristics of labor participation?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

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".

### /hy is it important?

One, it to be hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, it ranslams to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. 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 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 how say to remain active in the workplice but due to treat works at all schedule. Advances is computer texthologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more fielde hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, burism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods ele concriming stability, the vast majority of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time 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, 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 failing wages or rates of employment that outpace population change (see the Scooconcom Kleasures report for changes in wages, employment, and population change time).

#### ods

sthods 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 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/pdf/G0612501.pdf <sup>(28)</sup>.

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.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.

	Employment
What are commuting patterns? This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work.	
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		
PLACE OF WORK:	10.10/	70.5%
Worked in county of residence	49.4%	72.5%
Worked outside county of residence	50.6%	27.5%
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:	44.407	40.00
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%

BU or more minutes 10.9% 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, Pinal County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of people that worked outside the county of residence (50.6%), and the U.S. had the lowest (27.5%).



Worked outside county of residence Worked in county of residence

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.
kers 16 years and over	1%	0'
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%	0
10 to 14 minutes	5%	0
15 to 19 minutes	5%	0
20 to 24 minutes	5%	C
25 to 29 minutes	8%	C
30 to 34 minutes	4%	C
35 to 39 minutes	8%	C
40 to 44 minutes	5%	C
45 to 59 minutes	4%	C
60 or more minutes	4%	C
Mean travel time to work (minutes) cent of Total, Coefficients of Variation	2%	C
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	2%	C
Worked outside county of residence	2%	C
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	5%	C
10 to 14 minutes	5%	C
15 to 19 minutes	5%	C
20 to 24 minutes	4%	C
25 to 29 minutes	9%	C
30 to 34 minutes	4%	C
35 to 39 minutes	8%	C
40 to 44 minutes	6%	C
45 to 59 minutes	4%	0
60 or more minutes	4%	C

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are commuting patterns?

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 eaving, for the oily of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worker 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 necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job coportunities 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 sever facilities without an adequate source of revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

thoos 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 numing 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 Perspectives 2(2), encudad gov/Publications/RDPR0/P697/RDP697/RDP697 epd<sup>(10)</sup>.

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

		Income
How is income distributed?		
This page describes the distribution of household income	L.	
Household Income Distribution, 2013*		
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$20,910	\$28,155
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$50,027	\$53,046
Total Households	123,733	115,610,216
Less than \$10,000	8,666	8,380,364
\$10,000 to \$14,999	4,578	6,214,548
\$15,000 to \$24,999	13,424	12,468,604
\$25,000 to \$34,999	14,688	11,929,761
\$35,000 to \$49,999	20,472	15,723,148
\$50,000 to \$74,999	27,073	20,744,045
\$75,000 to \$99,999	16,247	14,107,031
\$100,000 to \$149,999	12,954	14,858,239
\$150,000 to \$199,999	3,705	5,651,848
\$200,000 or more	1,926	5,532,628
Gini Coefficient <sup>*</sup>	0.40	0.47
Percent of Total		
Less than \$10,000	7.0%	7.2%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	3.7%	5.4%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	10.8%	10.8%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	11.9%	10.3%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	16.5%	13.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	21.9%	17.9%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	13.1%	12.2%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	10.5%	12.9%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	3.0%	4.9%
\$200.000 or more	1.6%	4.8%

Automotion in the Median Household income and Gini Coefficient are not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations. 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.



	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
Per-Capita Income	1%	0%
Median Household Income^ (2013) \$s	1%	0%
Total Households	1%	0%
Less than \$10,000	5%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	6%	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	4%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	4%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	9%	0%
\$200,000 or more	10%	0%
Gini Coefficient	1%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Less than \$10,000	4%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	7%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	4%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	5%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	4%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	3%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	4%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	5%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	8%	0%
\$200.000 or more	12%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### How is income distributed? What do we measure on this page?

 Date of we measure on this page?

 This page describes the distribution of household income.

 Per Capita Income.
 Total personal income divided by total population of an area.

 Household 1: household induced and the people who courgu a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
 Gini Coefficient; provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 represents perfect inequality. The were the Gini coefficient; the more quality the income distribution.

 Learner Quarks quarks arguing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect intequality. Every point on the Learner curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom \_% of households have \_% of all income."

</tabular

### hv is it important?

y is it important? For public land mages, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionality high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographics helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-polation 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 fagure that shows a propriorinal jurge number of households at both enterme inclates a segregriph characterization by Thaves' and Thave-not

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 midviduals and households. ned

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run Account protocol and the second secon

#### thods

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 Durve and the Gain 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Iditional Resources The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-me inequality. McLaughin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf <sup>(31)</sup>. -metro income lev

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/Bernanke20070206a.htm <sup>(20)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09W/IZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl:

### Data Sources

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

## Income What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line

Powerty: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "bolw the poverty beaut".

### 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 poverty	9,757	8,666,630
Percent of Total		
People Below Poverty	15.6%	15.4%

Tamiles below povery 10 b7% 15.4% 11.3% 13.4\% 13.4\%

# In the 2009-2013 period, Pinal County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of individuals living below poverty (15.6%), and the U.S. had the lowest (15.4%).

In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty (11.3%), and Pinal County, AZ had the lowest (10.9%).



People Below Poverty Families below poverty

### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
People	15.6%	15.4%
Under 18 years	22.1%	21.6%
65 years and older	7.6%	9.4%
Families	10.9%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	17.1%	17.8%
Married couple families	6.1%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	'9.6%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	30.9%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	37.5%	40.0%

-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.

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 Famil	y Type, Coefficients of Variation	
	Pinal County, 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%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of iduals 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 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their plealow the pover | level."

### y 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 teacors. First, people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attituides as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed aztivities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience dispropriormally files and adverse effects.

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 important because aggregate poverty rates (for example, families below poverty) may hide some important information (for example, the poverty rate of carging embers with children).

#### lethods

thoos 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

Intronal Nesources For more information on rural poverty, see U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Briefing Room, "Rural Income, Poverty, and Weitlare: High Poverty Counties" available at ers.usda.gov/topics/tural-economy-population/rural-poverty-weil-being aspx <sup>(39)</sup>. For more info

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: www.npc.umich.edu/poverty<sup>(36)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement all glosophe 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 as available as tage so/compliance(eff

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

Income

### What are poverty levels?

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<sup>\*</sup>, 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 Hawaiian & 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 Ethnisities in Deventy		
All Ethnicities in Poverty		40 507 066
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	20,714	12,507,600
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	20,714 34,531	34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty)	20,714 34,531	34,155,567
All chinicatus in Color Calmo (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone	20,714 34,531 69.4%	34,155,567 60.5%
All clinicules in Poverty Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone Black or African American alone	20,714 34,531 69.4% '5.1%	60.5% 21.8%
All climitous in rovery Hispanic cl. taino (d any race) Not Hispanic cl. taino (d any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alore Black or African American alone American Indian alone	20,714 34,531 69.4% 5.1% 15.6%	60.5% 21.8%
All Clapanic or Latino (of my race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of my race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alone Black or Arican American alone American Indian atone Asian alone	20,714 34,531 69.4% '5.1% 15.6% '1.1%	12,307,866 34,155,567 60,5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0%
All climitous in roverty Hispanic c Liano (d any race) Not Hispanic c Liano (d any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alore Black or African American alone American Indina Jance Asian alone Native Hawaian & Oth Pacific Is. alone	20,714 34,531 69,4% 5.1% 15.6% '1.1% '0.4%	60.5% 21.8% 4.05% 20.2%
All Clapanic or Latino (of my race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of my race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alone Black or Arican American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaian & Oth Peolitic Is. alone Some other area	20,714 34,531 69.4% 5.1% 15.6% 1.1% <b>70.4%</b> 5.8%	12,507,866 34,155,567 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3%
All chimotes in roverty Hispanic cruitalio (da ny race) Not Hispanic cr Laino (da ny race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in poverty) White alore Black or African American alone American Indina Jance Asian alone Native Hawaian & Oth Pacific Is, alone Some other race Two or more races	20,714 34,531 69,4% 5,1% 15,6% 1,1% 70,4% 75,8% 7,8% 7,8%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6%
All Elizaparis di l'orano (d'any race) Not Hispanis di Lano (d'any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty) White alone Biak or Arican American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaian & Oth Pecific Is. alone Some ofher ano Tou or more races Two or more races	20,714 34,531 69.4% 5.1% 15.6% 11.1% 70.4% 5.8% 2.6% 37.5%	12,507,866 34,155,567 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6% 26.8%

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.

### Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty~, 2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	
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 Hawaiian & 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 calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
otal 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%	0%
Native Hawaiian & 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 Ethi	nicity, 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%
wo or more races alone	19%	1%
Hispanic or Latino alone	7%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? 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 deat-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: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their "below the poverty level".

### /hy is it important?

V is it important? For public land magners, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the contact of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

THOUS The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their ball family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of heiled children under 15 present (see below for poverty) releaf thresholds.

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local vinations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at census, goothers/wwwpoerty/dathreshold/reskum<sup>100</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

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 University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: nor.umich.deuterach/ethnicity<sup>100</sup>.

The U.S. Cansus Bureau briefing on "Powerty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: consus.gov/population/scdeen/distation/sclowarea.three/spopulation.

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

	Income
What are the components of household earnings?	
This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source.	

### Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

characteristics during this period.

	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 <sup>^</sup>		
Labor earnings	71.9%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	35.2%	28.9%
Retirement income	23.7%	17.7%

 
 Retirement income
 2.1 %
 1

 Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
 4.1 %
 4

 Cash public assistance income
 2.7 %
 2

 Food Samp/SMAP
 12.4 %
 1

 \* Total may add to more than 100% due to households receiving more than 1 source of income.
 11

 \* Total amount table are calculated by AGS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average
 17.7% 4.9% 2.8% 12.4%

Percent of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*



### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Mean earnings	\$60,338	\$75,017
Mean Social Security income	\$18,951	\$17,189
Mean retirement income	\$23,626	\$23,589
Mean Supplemental Security Income	\$9,726	\$9,152
Mean cash public assistance income	'\$4,178	\$3,808

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

	Pinal County AZ	us
Total households:	1%	0%
Labor earnings	1%	0%
Social Security (SS)	1%	0%
Retirement income	2%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	7%	0%
Cash public assistance income	8%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	4%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Labor earnings	1%	0%
Social Security (SS)	1%	0%
Retirement income	2%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	6%	0%
Cash public assistance income	9%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	4%	0%
Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, O	Coefficients of Variation	
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
Mean earnings	1%	0%
Mean Social Security income	2%	0%
Mean retirement income	4%	0%
Mean Supplemental Security Income	9%	0%
Mean cash public assistance income	18%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the components of household earnings?

#### What do we measure on this page? This page describes household ea ngs by source

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Ratirament income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to 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 item.

### ethods

HOUS 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 BDLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest funning another demographics report at a larger georganic scade.

# Why is this important?

Vis 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 reflement and Social Socium<sup>1</sup>. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of referee (reflement) payments), other measures for example, SSI or Food Sampa) are an indication of a concome hardship.

### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_doc tation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

#### Data Sources

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

	Social Ch	aracteristics
What are education and enrollment levels?		
This page describes educational attainment and school	l enrollment.	
Educational Attainment, 2013*		
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
Fotal Population 25 yrs or older	250,120	206,587,852
No high school degree	38,165	28,887,721
High school graduate	211,955	177,700,131
Associates degree	23,352	16,135,795
Bachelor's degree or higher	44,926	59,583,138
Bachelor's degree	29,527	37,286,246
Graduate or professional	15,399	22,296,892
Percent of Total		
No high school degree	15.3%	14.0%
High school graduate	84.7%	86.0%
Associates degree	9.3%	7.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher	18.0%	28.8%
Bachelor's degree	11.8%	18.0%
Graduate or professional	6.2%	10.8%
The data in this table are calculated by ACS using an haracteristics during this period.	nual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and an Educational Attainment 20	e representative of average
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the</li> </ul>	Eddodional Analiment, Ed	
highest estimated percent of people over	35%	28.8%
the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree or	269/	
nigher (28.8%), and Pinal County, AZ had	20% 18.0%	89999
the lowest (18.0%).	15%	14.0%
	10%	
	5%	
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Pinal County, AZ</li> </ul>	0%	200000
had the highest estimated percent of	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
school degree (15.2%), and the U.S. had		
the lowest (14.0%)		
	No high school degree Bachelo	r's dearee or higher
School Enrollment, 2013*		
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
otal Population over 3 years old:	363,190	299.795.523
Enrolled in school:	92,353	82,624.806
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	4,889	5,011,192
Enrolled in kindergarten	5.851	4.208.394
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	22.408	16.286.543
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	20.599	16.510.313
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	19,948	17,153,559
Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	15,949	19,333,036
Graduate or professional school	2,709	4,121,769
Not enrolled in school	270,837	217,170,717
Percent of Total		
Enrolled in school:	25.4%	27.6%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	1.3%	1.7%
Enrolled in kindergarten	4 £9/	1.4%
Fourthead in sounds if the sounds if	1.078	
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	6.2%	5.4%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	6.2% 5.7%	5.4% 5.5%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	6.2% 5.7% 5.5%	5.4% 5.5% 5.7%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	6.2% 5.7% 5.5% 4.4%	5.4% 5.5% 5.7% 6.4%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school	6.2% 5.7% 5.5% 4.4% 0.7%	5.4% 5.5% 5.7% 6.4% 1.4%

74.6%

0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are education and enrollment levels?

# Vhat do we measure on this page? This page describes levels of educational

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 school school sport school school and use the school, and not busining were not reported as enrolled in school.

### ny is it important?

V is it important? Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and tack of education is closely linked to povery. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer fees during economic downturms than other segregories. See Additional Resources Teolow for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geogra experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how ca and outreach efforts could be tailored to different audiences.

School enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age, access to educat and potential for future growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

thods 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 support numing andre demographics report at a larger experpaphic scale.

#### Additional Resources

For info tion on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemplo nt rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm (41).

U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings, at: census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf (42). ion on Earnings" in Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, eds., Handl ook of La

Card, David (1999). "The Causal Effect of Educa vol. 3A, New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

72.4%

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

Study Guid

# Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation Total Population 25 yrs or older No high school degree High school graduate Associates degree Bachelor's degree or higher Bachelor's degree Oraduate or podessional Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation U.S. 0% 2% 1% 4% 2% 3% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 4% Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation No high school degree High school graduate Bachelor's degree or higher Bachelor's degree Graduate or professional School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation 2% 1% 3% 2% 3% 4% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% School Enrollment, Coerricients of Variatic Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in orgade, yearde 14 Graduate or professional school Net enrolled in school: U.S. 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% IV. AZ 0% 1% 6% 3% 2% 2% 5% 11% 0% 0% recent of Total, Coefficients of Varia Enrolled in school: Enrolled in invisery school, preschool Enrolled in kindsrgarten Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Met enrolled in school 1% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 9% 8% 3% 2% 2% 4%

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

Not enrolled in school

Not enrolled in school

# **Social Characteristics**

# What languages are spoken?

This page mea asures 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.

# Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*

	Pinal County, AZ	
Population 5 yrs or older	351,135	291,484,482
Speak only English	274,245	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	76,890	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	63,461	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	'4,225	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	4,187	9,539,099
Other languages	5,017	2,626,244
Speak English less than "very well"	21,756	25,148,900
Percent of Total		
Speak only English	78.1%	79.3%
Speak a language other than English	21.9%	20.7%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	18.1%	12.9%
Other Indo-European languages	1.2%	3.7%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	1.2%	3.3%
Other languages	1.4%	0.9%
Speak English less than "very well"	6.2%	8.6%

Speak English ress that very well \* 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 Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



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

- Carolina et lleme Carolliniante et lle

	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%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What languages are spoken? 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.

/hy is it important? For puble land manages who are trying to communicate with obtains of communities adjacent to public lands, it is important to know w a significant proton of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implement may need to be conducted in multiple languages.

TROS 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%, it data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numary another demographics report at latinger 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 <sup>(43)</sup>.



# Housing

What are the main housing characteristics?

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	1,211	608,590
For seasonal, recreational, occasional us	16,870	5,122,778
For migrant workers	7132	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 earlier	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	<sup></sup> 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 earlier	5.8%	29.9%

Median year structure built is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations.
 "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.
 Horizon Concursory. Pinal Country A7

# 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%).

and the original



Cccupied Vacant

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
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 earlier	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		
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 earlier	4%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the main housing characteristics?

What do we measure on this page? This bace describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

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 vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other 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,

#### hv is it important?

y to a mulportaint r 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 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 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 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant for public lands managers in the context of the wildland-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

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 nunning another demographics report a la larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_docr ntation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

Data Sources U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
	Housing
How affordable is housing?	
This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.	

# Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

	Final County, AL	0.5.
Owner-occupied housing units with a		
mortgage	59,772	49,820,840
Monthly cost <15% of household income	9,423	9,215,740
Monthly cost >30% of household income	22,727	17,636,343
Specified renter-occupied units	31,656	40,534,516
Gross rent <15% of household income	3,149	4,355,942
Gross rent >30% of household income	14,001	19,581,493
Median monthly mortgage cost*	\$1,332	\$1,540
Median gross rent <sup>*</sup>	\$966	\$904

## Percent of Total

Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost >30% of household income Gross rent <15% of household income 15.8% 38.0% 9.9% 35.4% 10.7% 9.97% 1 44.2% 4 /non-metro or regional aggregations. ing 2009-2013 and are representative of average Gross rent >0% of household income Gross rent >0% of household income A Median monthy mortgage cost and median gross rent are not available for metrolin - The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted durin characteristics during this period. 48.3%

## Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\* 44.2%

- In the 2009-2013 period, Pinal County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of owner-occupied households where greater than 30% of household income was spent on mortgage costs (38.0%), 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 than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (48.3%), and Pinal County, AZ had the lowest (44.2%).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs for owner-occupied 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 gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$966), and the U.S. had the lowest (\$904).



48.3%

35.4%

Median Monthly Mortgage Costs and Gross Rent, 2013\*



Median monthly mortgage cost^ Median gross rent^

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

lousing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation			
	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.	
Owner-occupied housing units with a			
mortgage	1.6%	0.3%	
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 <sup>*</sup>	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%	

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# How affordable is housing?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

upied 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

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.

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 acconomic handship is whether housing is alfordable. This page measures housing alfordability in terms of the share of housing 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 alfordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for highly alfordable.

Iethods
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
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%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report as 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/ahs.html <sup>(44)</sup>.

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 affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: realtor.org/research/research/research/nousinginx<sup>(46)</sup>.

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

iis p	age compares key demographic, income, and social ind	icators from the region	on to the United Sta	ites.
dic	ators	Pinal County AZ	U.S.	Pinal County AZ vs. U.S.
F	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	110.9%	10.7%	
, '	Median Age (2013*)	36.1	37.3	
	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	78.8%	74.0%	
P	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	28.8%	16.6%	
6	Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native 2013*)	5.2%	0.8%	
F	Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*)	28.7%	30.6%	
'	Median Household Income (2013*)	\$50,027	\$53,046	
1	Per Capita Income (2013*)	\$20,910	\$28,155	
1	Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)	15.6%	15.4%	
	Percent Families Below Poverty (2013*)	10.9%	11.3%	
1	Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*)	59.0%	46.6%	
F (	Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income 2013*)	19.1%	20.2%	
8	Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*)	15.3%	14.0%	
F	Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*)	18.0%	28.8%	
	Percent Population That Speak English Less Than Very Well' (2013*)	6.2%	8.6%	
	Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*)	10.5%	3.9%	•
C H	Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*)	38.0%	35.4%	
F	Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*)	44.2%	48.3%	

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are repres characteristics during this period. The Pinal County AZ is most different from the U.S. in Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013\*), Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013\*), and Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013\*).

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

	Region	
Population Growth (% 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 (2009*)	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.
Per Capita Income (2009*)	1.2%	0.
Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*)	3.9%	0.
Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*)	5.0%	0.
Percent of Households with Retirement and Social	1.4%	0.
Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income	3.2%	0.
Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High	2.4%	0.
Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's	2.0%	0.
Percent Population That Speak English Less Than	3.9%	0.
Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*)	4.6%	0.
Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of	3.2%	0.
Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of	4.5%	0.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? What do we measure on this page? The page compare 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 self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and

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 threshold, then the family or our unrelated individual is dastellid as being facelow the poverty level.<sup>1</sup>

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been bom between 1946-1964. The reported percent of population that are 'baby boomers' has some associated error since ACS generally reports age classes in 5-year increments (55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, etc.).

Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimburnament.

Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer; labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

/hy 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 from the U.S.

It also offers an at-splance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a geography has an odder population, relatively unaflocatable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indicators can help uplic land manages intently groups of people and aspects of hadding that can all with bureach and consideration of whether the impacts of land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on disadvantaged people or places.

hods The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure from the region by the figure from the U.S.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor 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 as larger geographic scale.

Median Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability

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

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

# **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceg1297.pdf
- 2 <u>www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\_main/</u>
- 3 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
- 4 <u>www.epa.gov/compliance/ej</u>
- 5 www.stateoftheusa.org
- 6 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
- 7 www.frey-demographer.org
- 8 <u>www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx</u>
- 9 www.census.gov/popest/
- 10 www.countyhealthrankings.org/
- 11 www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
- 12 www.census.gov/population/age/
- 13 www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
- 14 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
- 15 <u>www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html</u>
- 16 <u>www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\_1997standards</u>
- 17 www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
- 18 http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- 19 www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
- 20 www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\_cspan\_hispanics.pdf
- 21 www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf
- 22 www.bia.gov/index.htm
- 23 www.indians.org/index.html
- 24 www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
- 25 www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
- 26 www.bls.gov/soc/
- 27 www.bls.gov/oco/
- 28 www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
- 29 www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
- 30 www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
- 31 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
- 32 www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
- 33 www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
- 34 https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
- 35 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
- 36 www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
- 37 www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
- 38 www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
- 39 www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
- 40 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
- 41 www.bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm
- 42 www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
- 43 www.mla.org/map\_single
- 44 www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
- 45 <u>www.zillow.com</u>
- 46 www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx

# **A Profile of Land Use**

**Pinal County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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
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

## 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



on the area of landing surversity. The data presented in this report area satisfated using ernation System (GSI) inclo. Two pri

# Land Ownership

What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 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 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	6.5%	8.4%
Unspecified Designated Area Type	4.5%	6.4%
National Wilderness	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 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 Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

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

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the different types of Forest Service lands?

# 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? These data allow the user to see the range and scale of Forest Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forest Service lands have special designations that may affect management considerations. Different types of designation may impact the economic value and uses of associated lands.

## ethods

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/statf/lar/2009/lar08index.html<sup>49</sup>.

Forest Service Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at: fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

Study Guide

Page 2



•Туре А вТуре В КТуре С

Lare the different types of federal lands? at do we measure on this page? This page describes the size (in across) and share of federal judic! lands managed for various purposes under differing statutory authorin For purposes of the social, federal public lands have been differing below as Type A, B, or C in order to more easily distinguish lands according to primary or common uses and/or conservation functions, achivities, permitted transportation uses, and whether they have a special destraintic of the howing C-argorization alarchi).

Type A loads tend to have note managelial and communications on metations that Type C loads, represent an matter proportion of load lend. Type B loads are shared to the second second

As more popularly described: Type A lands are areas having uncommon bio-physical and/or cultural character worth preserving; Type B lands are areas with limited development and motorized transportation worth preserving; and Type C lands are areas where the landscape may be altered within the objectives and quidelines of multiple use.

hoods The classifications effered on this page are not absolute categories. They are categories of relative degrees of management priority, categorized by land designation. Lands such as Wildeness and National Monuments, for example, are generably more likely to or 0 and managed for conservation and restration, worth locally then are gived is teceptions (a.g. a supervisity) more in all worth and gas development in a National Normanne, There Serves and EUM lands whole designations such as Wildeness or National Monument are more likely to also commercial advices aga, micing them haveredly, ower hough here are explored.

Land defined as either Type A. B. or C includes areas managed by the National Park Sarvice, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another the Sarvice and Face Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers). The second and a second and another administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) have a second and a second and another administent by a second administent by a second administent by a second administent by a second administent and a second and another administent by a second administent admin

See also: Lorah, P. and R. Southwick. 2003. "Environmental Protection, Population Change, and Economic Development in the Rural Western United States" Population and Environment. 24(3): 255-272; and Holmes, P. and W. Hecox. 2002. "Does Wilderness Impoverbin Rural Areas?" International Journal of Widerness. 10(3): 3439.

For an analysis on the effect on local economies, in particular on resource-based industries, from Wilderness designations, see: Duffy-Deno, K. T. 1998. "The Effect of Foderal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." Journal of Regional Science. 39(1): 109-136.

For the results of a national survey of residents in counties with Wilderness, see: Rudzitis, G. and H.E. Johansen. 1991. "How Imp Wilderness? Results from a United States Survey." Environmental Management. 15(2): 227-233.

For analysis of the role of transportation in high-amenity areas, see: Rasker, R., P.H. Gude, J.A. Gude, J. van den Noort. 2009. "The Economic Importance of Air Travel in High-Amenity Rural Areas." Journal of Rural Studies. 25(2009): 343-353.

### a So

Raker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207: U.S. Gedogical Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3 Study Guide

Data Sources: Rasker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207; U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas: Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3







# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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.
- USDA, Forest Service
   Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
   <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html</u>
- Protected Areas Database v 1.3 2012 U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006
   National Aeronautics and Space Administration
   <a href="http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm">http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm</a>

# **Methods**

## 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
- 2 gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- 3 www.nhd.usgs.gov
- 4 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html
- 5 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm
- 6 headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
- 7 http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- 8 <u>www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php</u>

# **A Profile of Federal Land Payments**

**Pinal County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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	1
What are rederariand payments:	1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated	2
to unrestricted and restricted uses?	3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? How important are federal land payments to state and local governments	4
(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



## What are federal land payments?

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

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments by		
Geography of Origin (\$)	1,668,592	2,787,139,550
PILT	1,153,625	397,256,089
Forest Service Payments	422,758	306,058,822
BLM Payments	92,210	66,579,030
USFWS Refuge Payments	0	15,936,122
Federal Mineral Royalties	0	2,001,309,488
Percent of Total		
PILT	69.1%	14.3%
Forest Service Payments	25.3%	11.0%
BLM Payments	5.5%	2.4%
USFWS Refuge Payments	0.0%	0.6%



Fed. Mineral Royalties FWS Payments BLM Payments FS Payme PILT

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information hat are federal land payments

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. <u>Ederal land payments</u>. These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. Payments are funded by idealia appropriations (e.g., PILT) and from receipts received by federal agencies from activities on federal public lands (e.g., timber, grazing, and minerals). <u>Payments</u> in Law of <u>Taxes</u> (PILT): These payments compensate county governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. PILT is based on a maximum per-scree payment neduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. <u>Forst Service Revenue Sharing</u>. These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for county roads and local schools. 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 through the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California (0 & C) grant lands. <u>USEVXS Raluga</u>, these payments sine a portion of receipts from National Wildlie Reluge and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located. Executed States and they are located. Executed States and the states are provided to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may afters, at their discrition, a portion of revenues with the local governments where insplates were generated. Executed Terminal Value: The resources and the locate Internet where insplates were generated. Executed Terminal Value: The relevant bit the local posteriments where insplates were generated.

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? State and local government 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 presence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of local government 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 beginning in 1977 in recognition of the volatility and inadequacy of dedrail revenue larking programs. PILT was intended to stallatize and increase technal and payments to courd youvernments. Note recently, the Secure Kural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS) decoupled USFS payments into commercial receipts. SRS received horad support because it addressed several major coversma around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment lived, and the increase technal decella fuel and payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment with every and the coverse provides to counties by Initing Idential fact payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment with every and the coverse provides to counties by Initing Idential Into a payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment with every and the coverse provides to counties by Initing Idential Into a payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment with and the counties provides to counties by Initing Idential Into a payments directly to around receipt-based programs—volatility, the payment to every the second second provides and the around the second provides and thea eceipt-based programs e uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization A 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget cor are creating uncertaining for the future of both. tion Act of

#### thods

thtods Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments. Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are relatively inagrificant at the deteral 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 importent to specific local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant to the specific local governments with significant. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant on the US. In FFY 2008.

Volitional 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 Mountian Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missaula, M.C. and March Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Corgressional Research Swarte Report R130335.
Transfo Indeal land payments are doaled by text of constrained by extraction on public lands. For more on the economic importance (in terms of
jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Scolecocronic Measures report and other industry specific reports at
headwatersacconomics.org/ops-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.
For data on federal land ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwatersacconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.

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 Menagement, 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.;
Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt



Grazing Districts RACs Local School Districts
 County Government

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments?

# What do we measure on this page? This page describes how federal land payments

nts are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origin.

by 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 sample, PLIT is deviced to occurry government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments decline, the PLIT formula ensures that county government payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments, While PLIT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalities, BLI hreenue sharing payments) are still linked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and governors have a different set of expectations and incentives to tobby for particular outcomes on public lands fram do county commissioners or school officials.

thods State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) lederal mineral royalities and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and lederal statute (see note about data limitations). County Government Distributions: Consist of (1) PILT (2) portions of Forest Service agreements including Secure Rural Schools and Community Salt-Determination Act (SRS) Title I and Tate III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USPWS Refuge revenue scharing; and (5) discentionary state government distributions of Ideral Imineet royalities where these data are available. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Title 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 put land projects on the national forest or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provide advice and recommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of spoilal projects on letteral allows as authorized under the Secure Rauf Schools Act and Community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 propie representing value interests and allows of operaties, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national lorest and and schools act and community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 propie representing value interests and allows of operaties, who work collaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national lorest and and schools act and the second school and the second scho

<u>Grazing District Distributions</u>: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. <u>Data Limitations</u>: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states made discretionary distributions of inviend regulaties and score 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 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 importa jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics or glose-hei<sup>10</sup>. ortance (in terms of

#### Data Sources

ia 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/spe-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distribut school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payme ed to the state

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

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments to County		
Government (\$)	1,408,344	616,271,004
Unrestricted	1,218,103	457,219,872
Restricted-County Roads	169,103	143,265,915
Restricted-Special County Projects	21,138	15,785,217
Percent of Total		
Unrestricted	86.5%	74.2%
Restricted-County Roads	12.0%	23.2%
Restricted-Special County Projects	1.5%	2.6%



100%

80%

# Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Governments by Permitted Use, FY 2013

In FY 2013, unrestricted federal land payments were the largest type of payment to the county government in Pinal County AZ (86.5%), and restricted-special county projects were the smallest (1.5%).

60% 40% 20% 0% Pinal County, AZ

> Restricted-Special County Projects Restricted-County Roads Unrestricted

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 Wallington Bevice, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www. hadvaterescontraics.org/sp-hdt

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses?

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

### Vhy is it important?

(s) is important?
County governments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For exemple, counties must maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with public lands. Several federal land payment programs, particularly those from the Forest Service, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

sist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal min Unrestr

<u>interinted</u>: Consist of (1) PLIT, (2) U.S. Fish and virusing service results in the service of the service

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 vailable)

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, Missould, 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. Congr

#### Data S Sources

Ia Sources US. 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/sps-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How important are federal land payments to state and local gov nts This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state gove nent gene

#### deral Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S.
Total General Revenue	382,866	na
Taxes	159,707	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	107,674	na
Total Charges	89,384	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	26,102	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	1,093	3,312,736
Percent of Total		
Taxes	41.7%	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	28.1%	na
Total Charges	23.3%	na
All Other (Missellaneous)	6.8%	na
All Other (Miscellareous)		110







na Pinal County, AZ U.S.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liau of Taxee (PLUT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Services Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2008 Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Frish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resour Newnus. Washington, D.C.; Additional Sources and methods available at www. headvaterscommics orgiges-hd

0.0%

## udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## w important are federal land payments to state and local governments?

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 (FV) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. Interaction Table: Census of Government county financial statistics are based on a national 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 for the latest year.

Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax. <u>Intergovernmental Revenue</u>: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including Ideral education, health care, and transportation assistance to state governments, and state assistance to local governments. <u>Tatal Charges</u>: Charges imposed for providing ourrent services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges. <u>All Other (Missioneus</u>): All other general government revenue from their own iscurces.

#### v is it important?

() In important is 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 revenue stream. Counties must dependent on federal land payments are a effected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For these counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.

thods
Regarding Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the federal FV beginning October 1 and ending September 31. Federal land payments reported for the current FY are often distributed to counties during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opaments authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opaments subnotzed and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the Census of Government FV 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2008 are compared to Local government revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be undersported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

<u>Census of Governments Data Limitations</u>: (1) county linancial statistics may not match local government linancial reports for three main reasons; (a) The Genus of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and duals government) entities). This may differ from the way to governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) different reporting periods between the Genus of Governments financial year and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of the Genus and Y 2007, block the recomments from the Way to an introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of Governments way FY 2007, block the recomments from the SMS and PILT, and (3) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other source of county revenue.

### dditional Resources

ULUS. Censis Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census gov/govs/estimatel<sup>(2)</sup>. 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/gova<sup>(2)</sup>. Schuster, Ervin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May

Schliden, Ermit Schwarten and Schuler Schwarten An Analysis of the Secure Rural School and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 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

ta OULIVES 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 Apriculture. 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 Wildle 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 Wildle 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.hashvatersconnics.org/ep-bdt





## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

## What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)?

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 compensate 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 reduced by the amount of revenue sharing payments and is subject to appulation 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 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 full payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Vhy is it important? As county payments became more important to local government after WWII (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-war housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PLT increased and stabilized payments by funding counties from congressional appropriations rather than directly from commodity receipts. PLT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local government services, but can be used at the direction of county commissiones 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/nbc/index.cfm<sup>(4)</sup>.

Schuster, Ervin 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 U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing?

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)



Title I Title II Title III 25% Fund Forest Grasslands Special Acts

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

#### udy Guide and Supplemental Information hat is Forest Service Re nue Sharing'

# What do we measure on this page?

This pa cribes Fo . ue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act

This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR), 25K, https://dx.and.forest/Grasslands. U.S. Forest Service <u>25 Percent Funct</u>: The <u>25K</u> Fund, established in 1908, shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with schools and function of the sale of schools and function of the schools and schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services. The <u>Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act</u> d 2000 (SRS) or Public Lan Vio-303: SRS was senacted in FX 2001 to provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counting affected by the decline in revenue from timber harvests 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 schoots. States determine the split between these two services, and some states is the counties decide.
 Title I - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committees (RACs) at the community level help make specific determinations and monitor project progress.
 Title II - these symmets 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 wildline protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the 25% Fund and SRS2 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. <u>Forest Grasslands</u>: 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. 577g), payments associated with the Quinault Special Management Area in Washington (PL. 100-638, 102 Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quarts from the Quachita National Forest in Arbanas (842, 300 Not State), and the Arbanas (842, 842 Not Stat. 1774). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment (75% of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Cance Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receipts from the Outnaukt Special Wanagement Area with both Poulinault Indian The and with the State of Washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quarts from the Outachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (rather than being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkanas counties with Outachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

#### hy is it important?

USES memory battering is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royslites are distributed to states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when timber harvesto on the National Ferests increased sharply in response to post-was housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shifted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it. Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owi" 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 sharing in three fundament ways: SRS (1) does county payments from National Forest needpts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewards through Titel II funds that pay' for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment quily concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title 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 to expire. II SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the 25% Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on public land.

#### dditional Resources

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determ tion Act payments available at: fs.usda.gov/pts/ 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 Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt Study Guide

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is BLM Revenue Sharing?

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

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

	and the second	
	Pinal County, 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
Title I	0	33,685,617
Title II	0	3,343,873
Title 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%
Title I	0.0%	50.6%
Title II	0.0%	5.0%
Title III	0.0%	3.0%



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

## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

# Vhat is BLM Revenue Sharing?

What do we measure on this page? 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. <u>Proceeds of Sales</u>: These include receipts from the sale of land and materials. <u>Include regarder</u> Act: These include OI and Gas Right of Way lases nervenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do not include regarders workshet 10.

payments see worksneet to. Taylor Charina Apt. 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. Funds are restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predetor contrd, noisous weed programs) in cooperation with BLM of livestock organizations. • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the • Section 5 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the Act.

Nuc. 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 California Land Grants: These include (1) the Oregon and California (0&C) land grant payment and (2) Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) payment administered by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell-Determination Act. Amounts include Tate I, Tatle II, and Tatle III payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report for definitions and information on the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sell-Determination Act).

Vhy is it important? The BLM is the nation's targest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adjacent commu Similarly, the non-tanable status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide services to county residents, and pro public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in I property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT). dents, and provide overnments in lieu of

xthod 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. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 report i used. To arrive at distribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table 3-1 of BLM Public Land Statistics) was used. Some environ is filley. In addition, some data are usefund directly from states. Distribution statistics charated from the state or local government are related to the provides FY's reported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2006 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2006.)

### dditional Resources

BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics web blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html<sup>(6)</sup>.

Information about the Taylor Grazing Act is available at: blm.gov/wv/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html<sup>(7)</sup>.

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-hdt



# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

## What are Federal Mineral Royalties?

This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local government

|--|

	Pinal County, AZ	U.S
tal Federal Royalty	0	2,001,309,48
Royalties	0	1,784,591,30
Coal	0	353,201,18
Natural Gas	0	498,654,39
Gas Plan Products	0	141,034,61
Oil	0	693,515,90
Other	0	98,185,21
Non-Royalty Revenue	0	216,482,99
Rents	0	22,126,37
Bonus	0	330,986,89
Other Revenues	0	-136,630,27
Geothermal	0	3,659,32
GOMESA	0	235.18
arcont of Lotal		
Rovalties	na	89.29
Royalties Coal	na	89.29
Royalties Coal Natural Gas	na na na	89.29 17.69 24.99
Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products	na na na	89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09
Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil	na na na na na	89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09 34.79
Royalites Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other	na na na na na na	89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09 34.79 4.99
Proent of Total Royatties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royatty Revenue	na na na na na na	89.29 17.69 24.99 7.00 34.79 4.99 10.89
PrCent Of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Othe Non-Royalty Revenue Rents	na na na na na na na	89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09 34.79 4.99 10.89 1.18
Profinition 1 local Royathies Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royatly Revenue Rents Bonus	na na na na na na na na	89.29 17.39 24.99 7.09 34.79 10.89 10.89 1.19 16.59
ercent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues	na na na na na na na na na	89.23 17.69 24.99 7.09 34.77 4.99 10.08 1.19 16.59 6.659
ercent of Total Royalities Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues Geethermal	na na na na na na na na na na na na na	89.23 17.63 24.99 7.09 34.79 4.99 10.89 1.19 16.55 -6.83 0.23

## I his table shows federal royalties disbursed directly to state and local governments. States may share a por with counties. These state "pass through" disbursements are not reported here. See 'Additional Resources'.



udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## Vhat are Federal Mineral Royalties?

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

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for This page describes the compone the region.

Royalties, rents, and borus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49% of revenue is returned to states and 51% is retained by the folderal government). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on tederal lands and a share of royalties from dishone difficult in the Gut difficult of the shared of the difficult ocurry governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of folderal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or eccommically impacted by mineral divergement for planning, construction/maintenance of public testifies, and provision of public aevice).

<u>Boyalities</u>: Royality payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royality may be an established minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royality rate increases by steps as the average production on the less increases. A sliding-scale royality rate is based on average production and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat: Seathermat is and statuted directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Contamined the state of the state and the state state and the state state and the state state and the state state state and their eligible political studentions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the GOMESA and the states and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA the Scatter and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA theorematic state and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA theorematic state and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA theorematic state and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA theorematic state and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA theorematic state and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA theorematic state and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from t

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. Borusses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Boruses represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease. <u>Other Revenues</u>: A disfusement that is not a royally ren, or borus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments, gas storage fees, estimated payments, recoupments, and fees for sand and gravel used for beach restoration.

# hv is it important?

y is it important / Minent royates 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. Royally revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed to provide an ongoing public benefit from the depletion of non-revensible resources owned by the public.

#### thods

Ithods Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royalty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalies were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25 percent of the state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of origin and state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of these data. Headwates Economics Incides a list of state distribution policy. Inits to data, and contract information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Mintods and Resources document. http://headwates.conomics.org/whytwi-pocretinty/loods/EPS-HDT Federal\_Land Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf.

#### Additional Resources

attional Kesources
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 contax information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government
Financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPSHDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf<sup>100</sup>.

For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at: ary.pdf

Data Sources U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

• U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- U.S. Bureau of Land Management U.S. Department of Interior <u>www.blm.gov</u> Tel. 202-208-3801
- U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture <u>www.fs.fed.us</u> Tel. 800-832-1355

<u>www.onrr.gov</u> Tel. 303-231-3078

U.S. Department of Interior

# **Methods**

# 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 <u>headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt</u>
- 2 www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
- 3 <u>www.census.gov/govs/</u>
- 4 www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
- 5 <u>www.fs.usda.gov/pts/</u>
- 6 www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html
- 7 www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
- 8 <u>www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html</u>
- 9 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
- 11 www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf

# **A Profile of Demographics**

Santa Cruz County AZ

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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.



**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.

# **Table of Contents**

Demographics How has population changed? What is the age and gender distribution of the population? What is the racial makeup of the population? What is the Hispanic makeup of the population? What is the tribal makeup of the population?	Page 1 2-3 4 5 6-7
Employment What occupations and industries are present? What are the characteristics of labor participation? What are commuting patterns?	8 9 10
Income How is income distributed? What are poverty levels? What are the components of household earnings?	11 12-13 14
Social Characteristics What are education and enrollment levels? What languages are spoken?	15 16
Housing What are the main housing characteristics? How affordable is housing?	17 18
Benchmarks How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
Data Sources & Methods	20
Links to Additional Resources	21

## 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%.

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

## **Demographics**

How has population changed?

This page describes the total population and change in total population

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau, Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section the Savdy Guide text.

### Population, 2000-2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.		
Population (2013*)	47,122	311,536,594		
Population (2000)	38,381	281,421,906		
Population Change (2000-2013*)	8,741	30,114,688		
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	22.8%	10.7%		
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average				

* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve	eys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of	average
characteristics during this period.		



From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, Santa Cruz County, AZ had the largest estimated relative change in population (22.8%), and the U.S. had the smallest (10.7%).



Percent Change in Population, 2000-2013\*

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				
	Santa Cruz County, AZ			
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%		

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### How has population changed? What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the total population and change in total population. This page describes the total population and change in total population. Note: with the unception of some 2000 Decemnial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Rad, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

#### /hy is this important?

/ Is this important? This report covers a broad range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and home ownership. It is the only EPS+HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These include dises, towns, and census designated places, American Indian, Atakan nahve, and naive Hawaii areas, congressional districts, and county

automation in addition to its usefulness for social research, the information throughout this report is valuable for public land managers and others in identifying whether the selected geographies contain minorities and people who are economically and/or socially disadvantaged. This is important because Executive Order (1998, Februar) (1) (1) 494 states that "ache forderal agency what landex achieves period and and the part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproprintionately high and adverse human health or environmental effe to programs, policies, and advives on minority populations and low-income populations." (see Additional Resources on Page 2 d the is the programs, policies, and advives on minority populations and low-income populations. nces)

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/isocially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management actions requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minority individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or any othen regative health effects from cumulative or multiple adverse adverses to environmental hazards), and disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or naive populations).

lethods The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). 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).

For populations of 65.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographice, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this proport are 5-year ACS estimates. Kores of han 16 or 3-year estimates, he 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographice, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographice since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cose-geograp comparisons. The disadvantage is that multilyair estimates cannot be used to describe any parallelity are in the period. only what the average value is over the full period. For thready, state and figure titles show the latest year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to clarify that the data represent average characterization over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables. **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; ORANCE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with the dota) indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; another domographics report at a leagn groupped space. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the bless provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

#### Additional Resources sible pub

An indi on on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see: census gov/acs/wwwihethodology/methodology\_main/<sup>10</sup>. census gov/acs/wwwDownloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyotData2009.pdf <sup>10</sup>.

### Data Sources

ta 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. Study Guide
What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 rider

### Age & Gender Distribution, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, 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\*) Median Age^ (2000)

35.3 5.7% Median Age \* (2004) Median Age \* (2004) A Median Age is not available for metro/hon-metro or regional aggregations. \* Media m his hale are actualated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

35.7 31.8



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.

der Distribution Coofficients of V

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0.0%	0.0%
Under 5 years	1.5%	0.0%
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%	0.1%
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	0.2%	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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes population distribution tion by age and gender, and the change in median age. This page describes population dis

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

### hy is it important?

y is it important? Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of refines, 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 many counties, the largest segment of the oppulation is in the Baby Boarner generation (people boarnets towers) the batter of 19-61. The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

thoos Data in his report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Cansus 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 2006 forwup 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 > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest huming another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, coor, 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<sup>14</sup>.

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/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

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: stateoftheusa.org<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistrib and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: root/aging\_statistics/index.aspx

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/ <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: county-healthrankings.org/ (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.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population? This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age dist ution, with age categories separated into

### Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013\*

Total Population	38,381	47,122
Under 18	12,913	14,108
18-34	7,867	9,115
35-44	5,508	5,623
45-64	7,979	11,725
65 and over	4,114	6,551
Percent of Total		
Under 18	33.6%	29.9%
18-34	20.5%	19.3%
35-44	14.4%	11.9%
45-64	20.8%	24.9%
65 and over	10.7%	13.9%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average cha 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 and Chang	ge, Coefficients of Variation	
	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 Varia	ition	
	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 is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 ca five age groups.

### hy is it important?

VIS It Important? For public land agency, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retined population, or soon-ba-enteid oppopulation. 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 minors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the reterement of the "Baby Boomer" generatio (those born between 1946 and 1964). As this generation enters reterement 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 demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

### ods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with noe dot) indicates bet and 40%, and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%, if data have consistently low accuracy thr a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. tween 12

dditional Resources The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at:

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups us.go

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.ndf <sup>(13)</sup> 1138.pdf

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 gow/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx <sup>(44)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regional 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 Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st 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.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html <sup>(15)</sup>. 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.

What is the racial makeup of the population? This page de

cribes the number of people who self-ide ntify as belonging to a particular race

Race: Race is a set-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or maces with which they most closely identify The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicky.

### Population by Race, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	
Total Population	47,122	311,536,594
White alone	35,147	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	259	39,167,010
American Indian alone	197	2,540,309
Asian alone	'329	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	"29	526,347
Some other race alone	10,368	14,746,054
Two or more races	1893	8,732,333
Percent of Total		
White alone	74.6%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	0.5%	12.6%
American Indian alone	0.2%	0.8%
Asian alone	0.7%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	"0.1%	0.2%
Some other race alone	22.0%	4.7%
Two or more races	1.9%	2.8%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annua	I surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and a	are representative of average

s during this pe

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Santa Cruz County AZ, 2013\*



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

Population by Race, Coefficients of Variation		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
White alone	3%	0%
Black or African American alone	33%	0%
American Indian alone	34%	0%
Asian alone	22%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	61%	1%
Some other race	9%	0%
Two or more races	23%	1%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
White alone	3%	0%
Black or African American alone	33%	0%
American Indian alone	30%	0%
Asian alone	26%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	99%	0%
Some other race	9%	0%
Two or more races	22%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### Vhat is the racial makeup of the populat

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people ple who self-identify 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 identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race

and athnicity. Race Alexe Categories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureau, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawalan or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Nather, "Alast" and "Native Hausilan or Other Posicilo Islander" race categories desorbed above. Respondents providing write-in ertites such as multitotal, invent, internatio, or a Happinol Latino group (for example, Mexican, Pluento Rican, or Culban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category. <u>Two or Mace Races</u>: People may have chosen to provide two or more race response. Phose how to more race response check boxes, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

ny is it important?

ederal agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this information to romote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Cwil Rights Act.

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 nacial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic group are inportant for putting into effect a nature of federal statutes (i.e., envirosing billingual election naise whether Mong Rights Act; monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the CNH Rights Act; Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local povernments to programs and meeting landware equirements (i.e., learning agements of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act; evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community 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, broady referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 128as. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whethe there is a potential environmental justice issue. For public land ma

### ods

Annue. Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elevelwere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with non edot) indicates be 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with non dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numming anothe demographics report at large geographic scalar.

Vd/dtional 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/federg\_1997/standards<sup>(16)</sup>.

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 Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/ist/bages/ind The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measureofamerica.org/acenturyapari <sup>(19)</sup>.

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

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

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.

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Maxican," Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those with indicate that the year of ther Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino" Origin can be viewed as the hertiage, unclanality group, langea, or country of birth of the person of the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spansh, Hispanic, or Latino may be dary taxos.

### Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	47,122	311,536,594
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	38,978	51,786,591
Not Hispanic or Latino	8,144	259,750,003
White alone	7,482	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	'141	38,093,998
American Indian alone	- 44	2,061,752
Asian alone	'329	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	29	488,646
Some other race	-22	606,356
Two or more races	-97	6,387,422
Percent of Total		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	82.7%	16.6%

Not Hispanic or Latino	17.3%	83.4%
White alone	15.9%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	<b>`0.3%</b>	12.2%
American Indian alone	70.1%	0.7%
Asian alone	'0.7%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	<sup></sup> 0.1%	0.2%
Some other race	"0.0%	0.2%
Two or more races	<sup></sup> 0.2%	2.1%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average istics during this period



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

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S
al 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	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%	C
rcent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	0
Not Hispanic or Latino	0%	C
White alone	0%	0
Black or African American alone	41%	C
American Indian alone	65%	C
Asian alone	26%	C
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	99%	C
Some other race	130%	0
Two or more record	59%	0

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people who self-identity as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural destination, and Hispanics can be of any race.

Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal gover race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. ent considers

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rikan," or "Duban" as well as those who indicate that they are "orther Spanich Hispanic, or Latino." Origin can be viewed as the hentage, androuting branes, or country of brind the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their armival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

### hy is it important?

y is it important? Hispanicas ere one of the tastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-dentified as being religeance in 2010. The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by 2050. Between 200 and 2010, Hispanica accounded for ver one-haid of the trackin'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 imposition on a population.

According to the Cansus 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 dispatises in health and environmental riskly and "Data on ethnic groups are important for puting into effect a number of federal statuse (i.e., enforcing intogrand environmental riskly) fights Act, monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civit Rights Act, Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments (i.e., enforcing intogrand and medical services under the Voing Highs Act, monitoring and Public Health Act, evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act."

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.

Iditional 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/fedreg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>.

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/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces

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.pdf <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf <sup>[21]</sup>.

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

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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 thrites or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackdet, Chervene, Chickasw, Chipyene, Short, Short, Short, Short, Short, Short, Short, Short, Chickasw, Chipyene, Chipyene, Falar, Finat, Shart, Sh

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013\*

In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of the population that self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native (0.8%) and Senta Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (0.2%).

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	47,122	311,536,594
Total Native American	'97	2,540,309
American Indian Tribes	'76	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes	<b>"0</b>	108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	20	363,000
Percent of Total Total Native American	°0.2%	0.8%
American Indian Tribes	'0.2%	0.6%
Alaska Native Tribes	<b>``0.0%</b>	0.0%
Non-Specified Tribes	<b>``0.0%</b>	0.1%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual su characteristics during this period.	rveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average



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

American Indian & Alaska Native Populati	on, Coefficients of Variation	
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
Total Native American	34%	0%
American Indian Tribes	38%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	na	1%
Non-Specified Tribes	76%	1%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Native American	30%	0%
American Indian Tribes	38%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	na	0%
Non-Specified Tribes	143%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? , the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in This page describes, in general ter with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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 03 tribes or Selected American Indian categorizer, Sapehe, Bladdeet, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasaw, Chipowa, Chockaw, Collie, Comanche, Cree, Creek. Crow, Delaware, Houma, Iroquosi, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navajo, Casge, Chawa, Pauke, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shoetone, Sixu, Tohomo O'Otham, Ule xiYaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al 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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hy is it important?

V is it important ( Different groups depole may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native titbes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current is to be land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

## thoos 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%. Ideat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

ethods

dditional 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.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>. The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs res and contacts are available at: bia.gov/index.htm <sup>(2)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.org/index.html <sup>(23)</sup>.

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

### **Demographics** Region

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Ammore other races. an Indian and Alaska Native ald nation with one o

### American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	47.122	311.536.594
Total Native American	'97	2.540.309
American Indian Tribes; Specified	'76	1,997,487
Apache	"5	69,740
Blackfeet	"0	26,474
Cherokee	21	273.192
Cheyenne	<b>"0</b>	11,774
Chickasaw	<b>"0</b>	22,917
Chippewa	"0	115,253
Choctaw	<b>"0</b>	90.189
Colville	"0	8,182
Comanche	<b>"0</b>	12.228
Cree	"0	2,191
Creek	<b>"0</b>	41.521
Crow	<b>"0</b>	11,424
Delaware	<b>"0</b>	7.471
Houma	"0	9,488
Iroquois	<b>"0</b>	45.639
Kiowa	<b>"0</b>	8,691
Lumbee	<b>"0</b>	68,171
Menominee	<b>"0</b>	8,259
Navajo	"4	305,552
Osage	<b>"0</b>	8,332
Ottawa	<b>"0</b>	7,026
Paiute	···0	10,545
Pima		24,212
Potawatomi	<b>"0</b>	19,337
Pueblo	<b>"0</b>	71,029
Puget Sound Salish	<b>"0</b>	13,971
Seminole	<b>"0</b>	13,987
Shoshone	<b>"0</b>	9,470
Sioux	<b>"0</b>	124,383
Tohono O'Odham	7	20,343
Ute	<b>"0</b>	8,629
Yakama	<b>"0</b>	8,614
Yaqui	- 35	19,942
Yuman	<b>"0</b>	7,944
All other tribes	710	491,367
American Indian; Not Specified	7	60,370
Alaska Native Tribes; Specified	<b>"0</b>	108,836
Alaska Athabaskan	<b>"0</b>	15,882
Aleut	<b>"0</b>	11,709
Eskimo	<b>"0</b>	60,926
Tlingit-Haida	<b>"0</b>	15,622
All other tribes	<b>"0</b>	4,697
Alaska Native; Not Specified	<b>~</b> 0	10,616
American Indian or Alaska Native;		
		000 000

Not Specified
 Not Spe

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general 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 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categories, Roden, Bladcket, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasw, Chipewa, Chockaw, Colvile, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, toquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menorinee, Navajo, Casge, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shochone, Siux, Tohomo Odotham, Ute Aviaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al cher.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

### hv is it important?

y is in important: Different groups people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, belefs, 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 and/or current to be the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately 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 (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

Iditional 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 relations. See: fs.led.us/spft/tribalrelations/index.shtml <sup>(24)</sup>.

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

Study Guid

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

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.:
al Population	0%	0'
Total Native American	34%	0'
American Indian Tribes; Specified	38%	0'
Apache	122%	2
Blackfeet	na	3'
Cherokee	81%	11
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
Kigwa	na	- 7
Lumbee	na	1
Menominee	na	4
Navaio	91%	1
Osage	na	6
Ottawa	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
Sinux	10	1
Tobana O'Odham	192%	
lite	102.70	6
Yakama	10	
Vacui	61%	5
Yuman	na	6
All other tribes	55%	1
American Indian: Not Specified	182%	3
Alaska Native Tribes: Specified		1
Alaska Athabaskan	na	4
Aleut	na	5
Eskimo	na	1
Tlingit-Heide		4
All other tribes	na	- 6
Alaska Native: Not Specified	10	6
	118	0

	Employment
What occupations and industries are present?	

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\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	17,334	141,864,697
Management, professional, & related	4,692	51,341,226
Service	3,023	25,645,065
Sales and office	5,800	34,957,520
Farming, fishing, and forestry	144	1,030,881
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	1,493	11,832,435
Production, transportation, & material movine	2,182	17,057,570
Percent of Total		
Management, professional, & related	27.1%	36.2%
Service	17.4%	18.1%
Sales and office	33.5%	24.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	'0.8%	0.7%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	8.6%	8.3%
Production, transportation, & material moving	12.6%	12.0%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual su	rveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average

### characteristics during this period. Employment by Industry, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	17,334	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	'421	2,731,302
Construction	717	8,864,481
Manufacturing	'912	14,867,423
Wholesale trade	1,643	3,937,876
Retail trade	3,348	16,415,217
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	1,307	7,010,637
Information	193	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	1507	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	1,384	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	3,302	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	1,327	13,262,892
Other services, except public administration	1697	7,043,003
Public administration	1,576	7,034,048
Percent of Total		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	'2.4%	1.9%
Construction	'4.1%	6.2%
Manufacturing	5.3%	10.5%
Wholesale trade	'9.5%	2.8%
Retail trade	19.3%	11.6%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	7.5%	4.9%
Information.		0.00/
momauon	1.1%	2.2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	1.1%	6.7%
Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	1.1% "2.9% "8.0%	6.7% 10.8%
Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr Education, health care, & social assistance	1.1% (2.9%) (8.0%) (19.0%)	6.7% 10.8% 23.2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt, admin., & waste mgr Education, health care, & social assistance Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	1.1% '2.9% '8.0% 19.0% '7.7%	6.7% 10.8% 23.2% 9.3%
Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr Education, health care, & social assistance Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food Other services, except public administration	1.1% (2.9% (8.0%) 19.0% (7.7%) (4.0%)	6.7% 10.8% 9.3% 5.0%

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

### Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Variation U.S. Civilian employed population > 16 years Management, professional, & related Service 2% 6% 6% 38% 13% 0% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% Sales and office Farming, fishing, and forestry Construction, extraction, maint., & repair Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, transportation, & manetal moving Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation Management, protessional, & related Service Sales and office Farming, sching, and torestry Construction, extraction, maint, & repair Production, transportation, & manetal moving Employment by Industry, Coefficients of M 6% 9% 6% 37% 13% 11% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% ts of Vari Civilian employed population > 16 years Agriculture, forestry, fahing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing Wholesale trade Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mg Education, headh care, & sciola assistance Arts, ententian, ree., accomodation, & bod Other services, except public assistance nty, AZ U.S. 2% 22% 19% 15% 9% 15% 30% 13% 13% 13% 13% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Other services, except public administration 0% Public administration Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation 14% Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin Construction Manufacturing 23% 19% 15% 9% 15% 33% 19% 13% 13% 13% 13% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Mandacturing Wholesale trade Reall Inde Transportation, warehousing, and utilities Information Finance and insurance, and real estate Prof., scientific, mgmt, admin, & waste mgre Education, heath area, & social assets mgre Education, heath area, associal assets mgre Holter services, except public administration Public administration

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### /hat occupations and industries are present?

What do we measure on this page? 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: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classifi-with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry. Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

y 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 relativity the eccorrowy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors. Employment by occupation dises additional information that desc people to its a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-people to a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and predestantal occupa-ted by working to a onliving time, an entity or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while by industry describes where people work. hy is it Important? stries (for example, ma

### thods thods Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with nor dod) indicates bet 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with no dods) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numbra prother demographics report at large geographic scale.

- dditional Resources The Census Bureau pr u provides a definition of SOCS: census.gov/hhes/www/ioind
- Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.gov/soc/ (26)
- The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: bis.gow/cor/<sup>(27)</sup>.

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

vnat are the characteristics of labor participati	ion?	
his page describes workers by weeks worked per year	and usual hours works per week.	
abor Participation Characteristics 2013	•	
, ,	Santa Caus Caust	
consistion 16 to 64	Sama Cruz County 28	075 204 340 9
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	13	296 112,330,3
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	2	748 21,646,42
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	2	683 19,225,1
LIG NOT WORKED BER WEEK-	9	348 51,138,91
Worked 35 or more hours per week	14	015 116 424 2
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	3	769 29.453.2
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week		943 7,324,44
Did not work	9	348 51,138,9
Mean usual hours worked for workers		38.3 38
Percent of Total		
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	47	.4% 55.0
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	9	.8% 10.6
Did not work	33	3% 25.0
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK		20.0
Worked 35 or more hours per week	49	.9% 57.0
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	13	.4% 14.4
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	3	.4% 3.6
Did not work	33	.3% 25.0
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%), and Santo Cruz Courts, 42 had the lownet</li> </ul>	60% 40% 20%	
(47.4%).	0% + Santa Cruz Co	unty, AZ U.S.
	⊗Did not work	Worked 1 to 26 weeks Worked 50 to 52 weeks
	Hours Work	ted per Week, 2013*
	Hours Work	ted per Week, 2013*
	Hours Work 80%	ked per Week, 2013*
In the 2009-2013 neriod, the U.S. bart the	Hours Work 100% 80% 60%	ed per Week, 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that</li> </ul>	Hours Work	s state
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or one hours per week (57,0%).</li> </ul>	Hours Work 100% 60% 40%	ed per Week, 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Sareta Cruz County, AZ had the lowest</li> </ul>	Hours Work 100% 60% 40% 20%	ted per Week, 2013*
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (49.5%).</li> </ul>	Hours Work 100% 80% 40% 20% 9% Santa Cruz Co	unty, AZ U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (49.5%).</li> </ul>	Hours Work 80% 40% 0% Santa Cruz Co santa Cruz Co	unty, AZ U.S.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (49.5%).</li> <li>atla Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Ce</li> </ul>	Hours Work 80% 40% 40% 5anta Cruz Co santa Cruz Co santa Cruz Co	unty, AZ U.S. Week 1-14 Hours/Week ©Did not work by Survey Office, Washington, D.C.
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (49.9%).</li> <li>ata Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Ce</li> </ul>	Bureau, American Commun	unty, AZ U.S. UVek # 1-14 Hours/Week %Did not work by Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

Population 16 to 64	0%	0%
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:		
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	3%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	9%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 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%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	17%	0%
Did not work	4%	0%
Mean usual hours worked for workers	1%	0%
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 1 to 26 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%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	16%	0%
Did not work	4%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the characteristics of labor participation?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

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".

### /hy is it important?

One, it to be hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, it ranslams to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. 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 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 how say to remain active in the workplice but due to treat works at all schedule. Advances is computer texthologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more fielde hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, burism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods ele concriming stability, the vast majority of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time 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, 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 his may explain failing wages or rates of employment has observe population change (see the Scooconcin Kleasures report for changes in wages, employment, and population change the second sec

### nods

shoods 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 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/pdf/G0612501.pdf <sup>(28)</sup>.

### For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.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.

		Employment
What are commuting patterns?		
This page describes workers who do not work from home by plac	e of work and by travel time to work.	
Demonstration Observation and a context		
Commuting Characteristics, 2013		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	
Workers 16 years and over	17,112	139,786,63
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	14,717	101,321,53
Worked outside county of residence	2,395	38,465,10
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	2,744	18,023,63
10 to 14 minutes	4,416	19,150,65
15 to 19 minutes	3,350	20,753,05
20 to 24 minutes	1,721	19,796,41
25 to 29 minutes	'780	8,189,6
30 to 34 minutes	1,179	18,220,8
35 to 39 minutes	'97	3,673,5
40 to 44 minutes	184	4,920,0
45 to 59 minutes	'565	10,154,5
60 or more minutes	1,035	10,857,9
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	20	:
Percent of Total		
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	86.0%	72.5
Worked outside county of residence	14.0%	27.5
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	16.0%	12.9
10 to 14 minutes	25.8%	13.7
15 to 19 minutes	19.6%	14.8
20 to 24 minutes	'10.1%	14.2
25 to 29 minutes	'4.6%	5.9
30 to 34 minutes	6.9%	13.0
35 to 39 minutes	0.6%	2.6
40 to 44 minutes	1.1%	3.5
45 to 59 minutes	'3.3%	7.3
60 or more minutes	6.0%	7.8

 15 to 19 minutes
 19.6%

 20 to 24 minutes
 10.1%

 25 to 28 minutes
 10.1%

 30 to 34 minutes
 10.6%

 35 to 38 minutes
 0.6%

 36 to 34 minutes
 0.6%

 36 to 36 minutes
 0.6%

 36 to 36 minutes
 0.6%

 36 to 36 minutes
 0.6%

 37 to 35 minutes
 0.6%

 36 to 36 minutes
 0.6%

 37 to 37 minutes
 30%

 50 or more minutes
 0.0%

 50 norm minutes
 0.0%

 50 additional model
 30%

 50 additional model
 30%

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 Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (14.0%).



Worked outside county of residence Worked in county of residence

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

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.8
orkers 16 years and over	2%	09
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	3%	09
Worked outside county of residence	11%	09
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	7%	05
10 to 14 minutes	7%	05
15 to 19 minutes	8%	05
20 to 24 minutes	14%	05
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'
ercent 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'

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are commuting patterns?

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 eaving, for the oily of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worker 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 necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job coportunities 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 sever facilities without an adequate source or revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

Intods 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 a la large geographic scale.

Additional Resources Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Perspectives 2(2), encudad gov/Publications/RDPR0/P697/RDP697/RDP697 epd.<sup>100</sup>.

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

		Income
How is income distributed?		
This page describes the distribution of household income.		
Household Income Distribution, 2013*		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$17,664	\$28,15
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$37,745	\$53,04
Total Households	15,078	115,610,21
Less than \$10,000	1,797	8,380,36
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1,305	6,214,54
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2,285	12,468,60
\$25,000 to \$34,999	1,673	11,929,76
\$35,000 to \$49,999	2,190	15,723,14
\$50,000 to \$74,999	2,446	20,744,04
\$75,000 to \$99,999	1,330	14,107,03
\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,428	14,858,23
\$150,000 to \$199,999	'307	5,651,84
\$200,000 or more	'317	5,532,62
Gini Coefficient <sup>*</sup>	0.48	0.4
Percent of Total		
Less than \$10,000	11.9%	7.29
\$10,000 to \$14,999	8.7%	5.49
\$15,000 to \$24,999	15.2%	10.89
\$25,000 to \$34,999	11.1%	10.39
\$35,000 to \$49,999	14.5%	13.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	16.2%	17.99
\$75,000 to \$99,999	8.8%	12.29
\$100,000 to \$149,999	9.5%	12.99
\$150,000 to \$199,999	2.0%	4.99
\$200,000 or more	2.1%	4.89



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

Household Income Distribution, Coefficient	s of Variation	
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Per-Capita Income	3%	0%
Median Household Income^ (2013) \$s	4%	0%
Total Households	1%	0%
Less than \$10,000	9%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	13%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	13%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	10%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	8%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	12%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	11%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	24%	0%
\$200,000 or more	28%	0%
Gini Coefficient	2%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Less than \$10,000	9%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	13%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	13%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	10%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	8%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	12%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	11%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	24%	0%
\$200,000 or more	29%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information How is income distributed?

### What do we measure on this page?

 Date of we measure on this page?

 This page describes the distribution of household income.

 Per Capita Income.
 Total personal income divided by total population of an area.

 Household 1: household induced and the people who courgu a housing unit as their usual place of residence.
 Gini Coefficient; provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 represents perfect inequality. The were the Gini coefficient; the more quality the income distribution.

 Learner Quarks quarks arguing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect intequality. Every point on the Learner curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom \_% of households have \_% of all income."

</tabular

### /hv is it important?

y is it important? For public land mages, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionality high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographics helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-polation 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 and of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpreted as the size of the middle class. A fagure that shows a propriorinal jurge number of households at both enterme inclates a segregriph characterization by Thaves' and Thave-not

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 midvisulas and households. ned

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run Account protocol and the second secon

### ethods

White 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 Gari 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Iditional Resources The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-me inequality. Macaphin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/uralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf <sup>(21)</sup>. metro income lev

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: federal reserve gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm <sup>(20)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=econedlink.php?lid=885&type=econedlink.php?lid=885&type=econedlink.org/li

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhx e were computed see: xaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=

### Data Sources

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

### Income What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line

Equarty: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverly below."

### Poverty, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
People	46,780	303,692,076
Families	11,376	76,744,358
People Below Poverty	12,285	46,663,433
Families below poverty	2,418	8,666,630
Percent of Total		
People Below Poverty	26.3%	15.4%

15.4% 11.3% tative of average 
 Families below poverly
 2.0.3%

 \* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are represented acting this period.

<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Santa Cruz County, AZ had the highest estimated</li> </ul>	Individuals and Families Be	elow Poverty, 2013*
percent of individuals living below poverty (26.3%), and the U.S. had the lowest	30% 26.3%	
(15.4%).	25% - 21.3%	
	20%	15.4%
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Santa Cruz</li> </ul>	15%	13.4%
County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty	10%	
(21.3%), and the U.S. had the lowest (11.3%).	5%	
	0%	
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.

People Below Poverty Families below poverty

### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
People	26.3%	15.4%
Under 18 years	35.2%	21.6%
65 years and older	19.3%	9.4%
Families	21.3%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	29.2%	17.8%
Married couple families	14.9%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	18.8%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	'42.3%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	'52.5%	40.0%

-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.

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

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%

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of iduals 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 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 threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as the power [seed."

### y 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 teacors. First, people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attituides as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed aztivities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience dispropriormally files and adverse effects.

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 important because aggregate poverty rates (for example, families below poverty) may hide some important information (for example, the poverty rate of a radige onther with children).

### lethods

thoos 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

Idmitional 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.gov/tbpics/ural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx<sup>(36)</sup>.

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: www.npc.umich.edu/poverty<sup>(36)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as the fait heatment and meaningful involvement all people regardless of race, color, national orgin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.<sup>1</sup> Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at eps polycompliancelet<sup>10</sup>.

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

Income

### What are poverty levels?

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<sup>\*</sup>, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, 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	<b>"0</b>	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
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	10,987 ~ <b>1,298</b>	12,507,866 34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone	10,987 	12,507,866 34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Black or African American alone	10,987 ~1,298 poverty) 67.2%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone	10,987 ~1,298 poverty) 67.2% ~0.2%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone	10,987 1,298 poverty) 67.2% 0.2% 0.2% 0.3%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0%
Hispanic or Latino (drany race) Not Hispanic or Latino (drany race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in White atone Black or African American atone American Indian atone Asian atone Native Havarian & Oth Pacific Is, atone	10,987 1,298 poverty) 67.2% 0.2% 0.2% 0.3% 0.3%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total - All Individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Havailian & Oth Pacific Is, alone Some other race	10.967 1,289 poverty) 67.2% 0.2% 0.2% 0.3% 0.3% 0.0% 0.3%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3%
Hispanic or Latino (drany race) Not Hispanic or Latino (drany race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in White alone Biako or African Aleneican alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaiian & Oth Pacific Is. alone Some other race Two or more races	10.987 1,288 poverty) 67.2% 0.2% 0.2% 0.2% 0.3% 1.0%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60,5% 21,8% 1.5% 4.0% 0,2% 8.3% 3.8%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total - All Individuals in White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Havailian & Oth Pacific Is, alone Some other race Two or more races Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	10,967 1,289 poverty) 67,2% 0,2% 0,2% 0,3% 0,3% 0,3% 0,3% 0,3% 9,3,4% 1,0% 8,9,4%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6% 2.8% 2.8% 2.8%

earning category by the total population. \* 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	
White alone	23.6%	12.5%
Black or African American alone	"9.7%	27.1%
American Indian alone	`25.0%	28.6%
Asian alone	<b>`9.5%</b>	12.5%
Native Hawaiian & Oceanic alone	<b>~0.0%</b>	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%

-Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that

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

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	
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 Ethni	icity, Coefficients of Variation	
	Santa Cruz County, 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%
No. I Provide Review and a second	100/	40/

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? 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 deat-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: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their "below the poverty level".

### /hy is it important?

V is it important? For public land magners, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the contact of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

THOUS The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their ball family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of heiled children under 15 present (see below for poverty) releaf thresholds.

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local vinations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at census, goothers/wwwpoerty/dathreshold/reskum<sup>100</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

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 University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: nor.umich.deuterach/ethnicity<sup>100</sup>.

The U.S. Cansus Bureau briefing on "Powerty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: census, gov/pounditor/scdeen/distation/sclowarea.three/spoundies/powera.three/

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

	Income
What are the components of household earnings?	
This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source.	

### Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

	Santa 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 <sup>^</sup>		
Labor earnings	78.0%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	31.0%	28.9%
Retirement income	14.2%	17.7%

 
 Retirement income
 14.2%
 11

 Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
 4.1%
 44

 Cash public assistance income
 3.6%
 2

 Food Samp/SMAP
 22.3%
 2

 \* Total may add to more than 100% due to households receiving more than 1 source of income.
 11

 \* Total amount table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average
 17.7% 4.9% 2.8% 12.4%



### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

characteristics during this period.

	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	\$8,247	\$9,152
Mean cash public assistance income	\$2,963	\$3,808

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

	Santa Cauz County AZ	119
Total bourseholds:	1%	0.3
Labor cominge	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%
Retirement 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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the components of household earnings?

### What do we measure on this page? This page describes household ea ngs by source

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Ratirament income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to Nexty 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 item.

### ethods

URUS 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.

### Why is this important?

Vis 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 reflement and Social Socium<sup>1</sup>. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of referee (referement payments), other measures for example, SSI or Food Sampa) are an indication of a concome hardship.

### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_doc tation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

### Data Sources

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

what are eudcation and enrollment levels?		
This page describes educational attainment and school	ol enrollment.	
Educational Attainment, 2013*		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.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 an characteristics during this period. In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the	inual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are n Educational Attainment, 2013*	epresentative of average
highest estimated percent of people over	35% 1	20.0%
the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree or	30% 27.5%	20.078
higher (28.8%), and Santa Cruz County.	25% 19.8%	
AZ had the lowest (19.8%).	20%	14.0%
	15%	11112
	10%	
In the 2009-2013 period. Santa Cruz	5%	
County, AZ had the highest estimated	0%	
percent of people over the age of 25 with	Santa Cruz County, AZ	0.8.
no high school degree (27,5%), and the		
U.S. had the lowest (14.0%)		
	No high school degree Bachelor's	degree or higher
School Enrollment, 2013*	No high school degree Bachelor's	degree or higher
School Enrollment, 2013*	No high school degree Bachelor's Septe Courty AZ	degree or higher
School Enrollment, 2013*	No high school degree Bachelor's Santa Cruz County, AZ 45.098	degree or higher U.S 299,795,523
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in school:	No high school degree Bachelor's Santa Cruz County, AZ 45,098 13,482	degree or higher U.S 299,795,523 82,624,806
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in nursery school.oreschool	No high school degree Bachelor's  Santa Cruz County, AZ  45,098  13,482  552	degree or higher U.S 299,795,523 82,624,800 5,011,192
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in school Enrolled in kinderarten	No high school degree Backelor's Backelor's Santa Cruz County, AZ 45,098 13,482 582 883	U.S 299,795,523 82,624,806 5,011,192 4,208,394
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in school: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in kinderparten Enrolled in kinderparten Enrolled in kinderparten	No high school degree BBachelor's BBachel	U.S 299,795,523 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,208,394 10,286,54
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in oursety school, preschool Errolled in nursety school, preschool Errolled in ranket 10 oracle 4 Errolled in grade 11 oracle 4	No high school degree  Nachelor's  Santa Cruz County, <i>NZ</i> 45,028  13,422  522  252  2,763  3,433	U.S 299,795,523 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,288,543 16,510,312
Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in Autore 2000 Enrolled in Autore 2000, preschool Enrolled in Autore 2000 Enrolled in Andrea 1100 preschool Enrolled in ander 1 to preschool	No high school degree     Backelor's      Santa Chuz County, AZ      45,088      13,482      632      63      2,763      363      365      36	degree or higher 299,795,523 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,510,313 16,510,313 17,153,555
School Errollment, 2013* Total Population ore 3 years old: Errolled in oursely school Errolled in oursely school Errolled in oursely school Errolled in grade 10 oracle 4 Errolled in grade 50 oracle 8 Errolled in grade 50 oracle 12 Errolled in gra	■No high school degree ■Bachelor's Stanta Cruz County, AZ 45,088 132 252 2783 2,783 3,826 1971	degree or higher 299,795,523 82,624,806 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,286,543 16,510,313 17,153,555 19,333,036
School Enrollment, 2013 <sup>3</sup> Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursary school, preschool Enrolled in nursary school, preschool Enrolled in andre 11 to andre 4 Enrolled in andre 51 to andre 4 Enrolled in andre 51 to andre 4 Enrolled in prade 5 to andre 2 Enrolled in collego, undergranulate yea Granduate or cordessional school	■No high school degree 18 88 delor's 1 Santa Cruz County AZ 15,008	degree or higher 299,785,522 82,624,806 5,011,192 4,208,394 16,280,543 16,7153,555 19,333,039 4,121,765
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population ore 3 years old: Errolled in oursely school, preschool Errolled in nursely school, preschool Errolled in narske 1 to grafe 4 Errolled in grade 5 to grafe 8 Errolled in grade 5 to grafe 12 Errolled in grade 5 to grafe 12 Errolled in school	■No high school degree      ■Bachelor's      Santa Cruz County, AZ      45,028      13,42      522      2763      2,763      3,626      1,971      244      3,616	US 209,705,522 82,624,800 5,011,19 4,208,394 16,6286,543 16,610,313 17,7155,555 19,333,038 4,121,76 217,170,717
School Enrollment, 2013 <sup>3</sup> Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in andre 1 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 1 Enrolled in prade 5 to grade 1 Enrolled in collego, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total	■No trigh school degra Santa Cruz County A2 45.088 45.083 45.083 63 63 63 64 63 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64	degree or higher 299,705,522 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,203,394 16,510,312 17,153,555 19,333,039 4,121,766 217,170,717
School Envolment, 2013*  Total Population over 3 years odc: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 6 Enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in school	■No tigh school degree      ■Bachelor's      Santa Cruz Countr, AZ      46,08      13,42      52      83      2,763      3,433      3,626      1,971      244      3,161      20,96	4egree or higher US 299.705.522 82.624.000 5.011.192 4.208.394 16.6246.342 16.610.313 17.153.555 19.333.036 4.121.765 217.117.171
School Enrollment, 2013 Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 6 Consolate or professional school Net enrolled in school Enrolled in school Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 7 Enrolled in grade 5 Enrolle	■No tigh school degra Santa Cruz Courty AZ 45,088 45,482 45,28 363 2,763 3,433 3,433 1,616 22,94 3,1816 2,356 2,45	degree or higher 299,795,522 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,203,394 16,510,312 17,153,555 19,333,036 4,121,765 217,170,717 22,76% 175
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in norsety school, preschool Errolled in narsety school, preschool Errolled in grade 51 to grade 4 Errolled in grade 51 to grade 4 Errolled in grade 51 to grade 8 Errolled in grade 50 to grade 12 Errolled in grade 51 to grade 4 Graduate or professional school Not errolled in school Errolled in in school	■No tigh school degree      ■Bachelor's      Santa Cruz Court, AZ      45,028      13,42      522      2763      2763      3,626      1,971      244      31,61      29,9%      13%      196      196      106      106      106      106      106      106      106      106      10      106      106      10      106      10      106      10      106      10      10      106      10	degree or higher US 299,795,522 82,624,800 5,011,192 4,200,344 16,208,544 16,208,544 16,208,545 19,333,039 4,121,760 217,7107,717 227,5% 1,2% 1,4%
School Enrollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 6 Enrolled in school Net enrolled in school En	■No tigh school degram 3 Bachelors (* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	degree or higher 200 705 522 82 624 900 5 011 192 4 203 394 16 6285 543 17, 153 555 19, 333 032 4, 121, 760 217, 717, 717 177 177 177 177 177 177 177
School Envollment, 2013* Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in rotsonal years old: Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in grade 51 to grade 4 Graduate or professional school Net errolled in in school Percent of Total Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in grade 11 to grade 4 Errolled in grade 51 to grade 8	■No tigh school degree	List 299.75,522 62.244,00 5.01,10 4.200,544 10,200,544 11,200,544 11,200,544 11,200,544 12,17,10 21,71,70,71 21,71,70,71 1,444 12,17,10 21,10 1,444 21,10 2,10 2,10 2,10 2,10 2,10 2,10 2,1
School Enrollment, 2013 Total Population over 3 years old. Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 1 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 6 Enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nurser 5 to grade 6 Enrolled in grade 12	■No tigh school degra Santa Cruz Courte, AZ 45,088 45,088 16,22 163 263 2,753 3,453 3,453 3,454 1,971 244 3,1616 29,9% 1,356 1,975 29,9% 1,356 1,975 20,9% 1,356	24gree or higher 200 756 5.2 2202 756 5.2 5.011 19 4.206 39 15.286 44 16.5510 31 17.15355 19.333,03 4.121,767 17.773 217,770 1.77 1.74 1.47 4.54 4.55 7.57 5.57 5.57 5.57 5.57 5
School Enrollment, 2013 Total Population over 3 years old: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in grade 10 prade 12 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in school Net enrolled in school Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in indehool Enrolled in grade 10 prade 4 Enrolled in grade 10 prade 10 prad	■No tigh school degar State Cruce A2.0 45.082 45.082 853 45.08 45	LIS 289,795,522 82,624,060 5,011,192 4,208,934 16,510,317 17,153,556 4,1510,317 17,153,556 4,1517 217,710,717 1,434 4,1517 217,710,717 1,444 5,457 5,475 5,4
School Errollment, 2013' Total Population over 3 years old: Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Errolled in school Errolled in school Errolled in nursery school, preschool Errolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Errolled In grade 5 to gr	■No tigh school degar Santa Chuc Courte, A2 46,088 1982 983 2,763 3,433 3,433 3,433 3,433 1,971 244 3,1,616 20,9% 1,13% 6,1% 2,0% 1,3% 1,9% 6,1% 0,5% 0,	degree or higher 113 200 705, 320 80, 604, 600 5, 011 199 4, 208, 394 16, 62, 86, 440 16, 228, 544 16, 62, 65, 10, 313 17, 153, 559 19, 333, 036 4, 127, 76 1, 7% 5, 5% 5, 5% 6, 5% 6, 14, 446 5, 5% 6, 14, 446 1, 45% 6, 14, 446 1, 45% 1, 45%

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

70.1%

### Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

Not enrolled in school

	Santa 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%
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	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 County, 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		
Enrolled in school:	2%	0%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	19%	0%
Enrolled 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%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are education and enrollment levels? Vhat do we measure on this page? This page describes levels of educational attainment.

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.

<u>School Errollment</u>: 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.

hy is it important? Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and lack of education is closely linked to poverty. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during economic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for most information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geographic areas might experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication and outrach efforts could be tailored of different addresces.

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 growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

thods 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 support tunning andher demographics report at a larger egospathic scale.

Additional Resources For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemployment rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.gov/emp/ep\_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.gov/prod/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 Ec vol. 34, New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

72.4%

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

### **Social Characteristics**

What languages are spoken?

This page me sures 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.

### Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S
opulation 5 yrs or older	43,508	291,484,482
Speak only English	10,034	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	33,474	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	33,141	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	"151	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	"154	9,539,099
Other languages	"28	2,626,244
	10.010	05 110 001
Speak English less than "very well"	13,842	25,148,900
Speak English less than "very well" ercent of Total Speak only English	23.1%	25,148,900
Speak English less than "very well" ercent of Total Speak only English Speak a language other than English	13,842 23.1% 76.9%	25,148,900 79.3% 20.7%
Speak English less than 'very well' ercent of Total Speak only English Speak a language other than English Spanish or Spanish Creole	13,842 23.1% 76.9% 76.2%	25,148,900 79.3% 20.7% 12.9%
Speak English less than "very well" ercent of Total Speak only English Speak a language other than English Spanish or Spanish Creole Other Indo-European languages	13,842 23.1% 76.9% 76.2% 70.3%	25,148,900 79.3% 20.7% 12.9% 3.7%
Speak English less than 'very well' procent of Total Speak only English Speak a language other than English Spaniah or Spanish Creole Other Indo-European languages Asian and Pacific Island Ianguages	13,842 23.1% 76.9% 76.2% 0.3% 0.4%	25,148,900 79.3% 20.7% 12.9% 3.7% 3.3%
Speak English less than 'very well' arcent of Total Speak only English Speak a language other than English Speak a language other than English Other Indo-European languages Asian and Pacific Island languages Other languages	13.842 23.1% 76.9% 76.2% 70.3% 70.4% 70.4%	25,148,900 79.3% 12.9% 3.7% 3.3% 0.9%

Percent of Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



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

### Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

Sania Gruz County, Az	0.5.
0%	0%
5%	0%
1%	0%
1%	0%
305%	0%
49%	0%
178%	1%
3%	0%
5%	0%
1%	0%
1%	0%
298%	0%
52%	0%
189%	0%
3%	0%
	Sana Cool: yaz 0% 5% 1% 1% 305% 49% 178% 3% 5% 1% 1% 28% 52% 189% 3%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What languages are spoken? 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 trying to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent 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 may need to be conducted in multiple languages.

TRODS 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%, it data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numary another demographics report at latinger 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: mix.org/map\_single <sup>(13)</sup>.



		Housing
What are the main housing characteristics?		
This page describes whether housing is occupied or vaca	nt, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year b	ouilt.
Housing Characteristics, 2013*		
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Housing Units	18,051	132,057,804
Occupied	15,078	115,610,216
Vacant	2,973	16,447,588
For rent	'518	3,230,123
Rented, not occupied	- 82	599,884
For sale only	'389	1,682,020
Sold, not occupied	105	608,590
For seasonal, recreational, occasional us	1,365	5,122,778
For migrant workers		34,233
Other vacant	'514	5,169,960
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	<b>"0</b>	771,765
Built 2000 to 2004	4,424	19,385,497
Built 1990 to 1999	3,739	18,390,124
Built 1980 to 1989	2,753	18,345,244
Built 1970 to 1979	3,022	21,042,566
Built 1960 to 1969	1,347	14,634,125
Built 1959 or earlier	2,766	39,488,483
Median year structure built^	1987	1976
Percent of Total		
Occupancy		
Occupied	83.5%	87.5%
Vacant	16.5%	12.5%
For rent	'2.9%	2.4%
Rented, not occupied	°0.5%	0.5%
For sale only	'2.2%	1.3%
Sold, not occupied	<b>``0.6%</b>	0.5%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	7.6%	3.9%
For migrant workers	<sup></sup> 0.0%	0.0%
Other vacant	'2.8%	3.9%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	<b>``0.0%</b>	0.6%
Built 2000 to 2004	24.5%	14.7%
Built 1990 to 1999	20.7%	13.9%
Built 1980 to 1989	15.3%	13.9%
Built 1970 to 1979	16.7%	15.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	7.5%	11.1%
Built 1959 or earlier	15.3%	29.9%
<sup>A</sup> Median year structure built is not available for metro/non * The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annua characteristics during this period.	-metro or regional aggregations. al surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are in Housing Occupancy, Santa Cruz	epresentative of average County AZ
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, Santa Cruz</li> </ul>	100%	
County, AZ had the highest estimated	80%	
percent of the vacant housing (16.5%), and	60%	
the U.S. had the lowest (12.5%)		

40% 20% 0% -Santa Cruz County, AZ U.S.

■Occupied ■Vacant

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

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S
Total Housing Units	0%	0%
Occupied	1%	0%
Vacant	7%	1%
For rent	20%	1%
Rented, not occupied	48%	1%
For sale only	28%	1%
Sold, not occupied	39%	1%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	11%	0%
For migrant workers	na	2%
Other vacant	18%	1%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	na	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	5%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	7%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	9%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	8%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	11%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	8%	0%
Median year structure built	0%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation	on	
Occupancy		
Occupied	1%	0%
Vacant	7%	1%
For rent	19%	0%
Rented, not occupied	54%	0%
For sale only	28%	0%
Sold, not occupied	42%	0%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	10%	0%
For migrant workers	na	0%
Other vacant	19%	2%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	na	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	5%	09
Built 1990 to 1999	7%	09
Built 1980 to 1989	9%	09
Built 1970 to 1979	8%	09
Built 1960 to 1969	11%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	8%	0%

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the main housing characteristics?

What do we measure on this page? This bace describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

Rept: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other 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.

### hv is it important?

y to a Intiput call of 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 market over time. These data also serve to ad 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 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant for public lands managers in the context of the wildinal-urban inference, and as an inductor 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 fine 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 agriculture.

thtods 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 nunning another demographics reports at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census\_govinces/wwwDowtloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions\_pdf <sup>(48)</sup>.

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

		Housing
How affordable is housing?		
This page describes whether housing is affordable	or homeowners and renters.	
Housing Costs as a Percent of House	hold Income, 2013*	

Owner-occupied housing units with a		
mortgage	6,915	49,820,840
Monthly cost <15% of household income	1,017	9,215,740
Monthly cost >30% of household income	2,806	17,636,343
Specified renter-occupied units	5,075	40,534,516
Gross rent <15% of household income	689	4,355,942
Gross rent >30% of household income	2,198	19,581,493
Median monthly mortgage cost <sup>A</sup>	\$1,151	\$1,540
Median gross rent <sup>*</sup>	\$630	\$904
Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost :30% of household income Specified renter-occupied units Gross rent <15% of household income Gross rent >30% of household income Median monthly mortgage cost* Median gross rent*	1,017 2,806 5,075 689 2,198 \$1,151 \$630	9,215 17,636 40,534 4,355 19,581 \$1 \$1

### Percent of Total

Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost >30% of household income Gross rent <15% of household income 14.7% 40.6% 18.5% 35.4% 10.7% Gross tert x 15% of industrial income 100% of the set o 48.3%

### Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\* 60% 50% 40% 20% 10% 40.6% 43.3%

Santa Cruz County, AZ

- In the 2009-2013 period, Santa Cruz County, A2 had the highest estimated percent of owner-occupied household where greater than 30% of household income was spent on mortgage costs (40.6%), 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 than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (K43%), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (43.3%).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs for owner-occupied homes (\$1,540), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (\$1,151).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$904), and Santa Cruz County, AZ had the lowest (\$630).





Santa Cruz County, AZ

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

\$0 ÷

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation				
	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.		
Owner-occupied housing units with a				
mortgage	3.5%	0.3%		
Monthly cost <15% of household income	14.0%	0.3%		
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 <sup>A</sup>	3.2%	0.0%		
Median gross rent <sup>*</sup>	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%	0.1%		

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How affordable is housing?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

upied 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

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.

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 acconomic handship is whether housing is alfordable. This page measures housing alfordability in terms of the share of housing 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 alfordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for highly alfordable.

48.3%

35.4%

IIS

U.S.

Iethods
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
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%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report as 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/ahs.html <sup>(44)</sup>.

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 affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: realtor.org/research/research/research/nousinginx<sup>(46)</sup>.

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

				Benchmarks
How	do demographic, income, and social characteristic	cs in the region co	ompare to the L	J.S.?
This	page compares key demographic, income, and social indi	cators from the regio	on to the United S	itates.
		Santa Cruz		
Indi	cators	County AZ	U.S.	Santa Cruz County AZ vs. U.S.
	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	22.8%	10.7%	
ŝ	Median Age (2013*)	35.7	37.3	
raphic	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	74.6%	74.0%	
amogr	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	82.7%	16.6%	
۵	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	
Income	Per Capita Income (2013*)	\$17,664	\$28,155	
	Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)	26.3%	15.4%	•
	Percent Families Below Poverty (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%	

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? What do we measure on this page? 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 self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and

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 threshold, then the family or unrelated individual is classified as being factors the power level."

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been born between 1946-1964. The reported percent of population that are 'baby boomers' has some associated error since ACS generally reports age classes in 5-year increments (55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, etc.).

Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reintoursement.

Battement Locare Consists of families that nodes income from: (1) reterment pensions and survivo benditi from a former employer; labor usinor, or federat, stati, or focal government; and the U.S. millitary; (2) disability (concer from comparison currinors; federati, statis, or focal government; and the U.S. millitary; (3) periodic receipts from annulities and insurance; and (4) regular income from IRA and Keogh plans. It does not include Social Security income.

hy 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 from the U.S.

It also difers an st-aglance 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 unablottable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indicators can help public land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts of landonariant and english could be provided by high and adverse impacts on the adverse integration of underset.

of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure from the region by the figure from the U.S.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates b 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accur throughout a report, we suggest numbra another demographics report at large regoraphic scale.

Study Guide

Median Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability

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

\* 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.

27.5%

19.8%

31.8%

7.6%

40.6%

43.3%

14.0%

28.8%

8.6%

3.9%

35.4%

48.3%

The Santa Cruz County AZ is most different from the U.S. in Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013\*), Percent Population That Sp English Less Than 'Very Welf' (2013\*), and Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013\*).

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

Indicators		
	Region	US
Population Growth (% 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 (2009*)	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%

Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013\*)

--une or Higher (2013) Parcent Population That Speak English Less Than Very Welf (2013) Recent of Houses that are Re---

Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013\*)

Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013\*)

Page 19

# **Data Sources & Methods**

### **Data Sources**

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

### **Methods**

### 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 userdefined 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.

### For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

### Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceg1297.pdf
- 2 <u>www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\_main/</u>
- 3 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
- 4 <u>www.epa.gov/compliance/ej</u>
- 5 www.stateoftheusa.org
- 6 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
- 7 www.frey-demographer.org
- 8 <u>www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx</u>
- 9 www.census.gov/popest/
- 10 www.countyhealthrankings.org/
- 11 www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
- 12 www.census.gov/population/age/
- 13 www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
- 14 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
- 15 <u>www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html</u>
- 16 <u>www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\_1997standards</u>
- 17 www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
- 18 http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- 19 www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
- 20 www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\_cspan\_hispanics.pdf
- 21 www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf
- 22 www.bia.gov/index.htm
- 23 www.indians.org/index.html
- 24 www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
- 25 www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
- 26 www.bls.gov/soc/
- 27 www.bls.gov/oco/
- 28 www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
- 29 www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
- 30 www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
- 31 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
- 32 www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
- 33 www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
- 34 https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
- 35 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
- 36 www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
- 37 www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
- 38 www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
- 39 www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
- 40 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
- 41 www.bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm
- 42 www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
- 43 www.mla.org/map\_single
- 44 www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
- 45 <u>www.zillow.com</u>
- 46 www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx

# **A Profile of Land Use**

Santa Cruz County AZ

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

### 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 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
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

### 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



lamakon Spilen (GB) bols. Tau primary GE delawih w

### Land Ownership

What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 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 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
Fercent of Total	54.0%	9.4%
Linengeified Designated Area Tupo	50.4%	6.4%
Neticeal Wildeman	30.4%	0.4%
National Manument	3.3%	1.0%
National Monument	0.0%	0.2%
National Come Defuse	0.0%	0.1%
National Game Reluge	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 Refuges are not available for the following states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

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

### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the different types of Forest Service lands?

### 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? These data allow the user to see the range and scale of Forest Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forest Service lands have special designations that may affect management considerations. Different types of designation may impact the economic value and uses of associated lands. ethods

### 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/staff/ar/2009/lar08index.html<sup>49</sup>.

Forest Service Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at: fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm<sup>(5)</sup>.

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



Santa Cruz County, Az

•Туре А вТуре В КТуре С

Lare the different types of federal lands? at do we measure on this page? This page describes the size (in across) and share of federal judic! lands managed for various purposes under differing statutory authorin For purposes of the social, federal public lands have been differing below as Type A, B, or C in order to more easily distinguish lands according to primary or common uses and/or conservation functions, achivities, permitted transportation uses, and whether they have a special destraintic of the howing C-argorization alarchi).

Type A lands tend to have more managerial and commercial use restrictions than Type C lands, represent smaller proportions of total land management areas (non-ph type A lands), and have a designation stim, here easily changed than Type B lands. In most other respects and the start of the

As more popularly described: Type A lands are areas having uncommon bio-physical and/or cultural character worth preserving; Type B lands are areas with limited development and motorized transportation worth preserving; and Type C lands are areas where the landscape may be altered within the objectives and quidelines of multiple use.

(i) it important for it important some proce of foreir public lands, such as National Parks and Wildemess, have been shown to be associated with above memory economic synds. While here a classification by themselves do not guarantee economic growth, when combined with other factors, such as an educated workforce and access to major markets via airports, they have been shown to be statistically significant predictors of growth.

hoods The classifications effered on this page are not absolute categories. They are categories of relative degrees of management priority, categorized by land designation. Lands such as Wildeness and National Monuments, for example, are generably more likely to or 0 and managed for conservation and restration, worr hough there may exist exections (and a National Monument are more likely to also commercial achieves and ELM lands whole designations such as Wildeness or National Monument are more likely to also commercial achieves (a, juning, timeth harvestig), even hough there are execption.

Land defined as either Type A. B. or C includes areas managed by the National Park Sarvice, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another the Sarvice and Face Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers) and another administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Carpet of Engineers). These Bureau of Realizations, address and Bureau of Realizations are not team of the Amy Carpet of Engineers and tool of a general experime of a second and a second and any assessment and and an ana managed by take agencies and tool generament are not included in this classification. The amount of average in particular team by the second and an average management and the second and an averagement and the second anagement and the second analysis of agency approved. A second and a second and any team and the second and average management and the second and averagement and averagement and the second averagement and the second averagement and the second and averagement and averagement and the second averagement averagement and the second averagement averagem

See also: Lorah, P. and R. Southwick. 2003. "Environmental Protection, Population Change, and Economic Development in the Rural Western United States" Population and Environment. 24(3): 255-272; and Holmes, P. and W. Hecox. 2002. "Does Wilderness Impoverbin Rural Areas?" International Journal of Widerness. 10(3): 3439.

For an analysis on the effect on local economies, in particular on resource-based industries, from Wilderness designations, see: Duffy-Deno, K. T. 1998. "The Effect of Foderal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." Journal of Regional Science. 39(1): 109-136.

For the results of a national survey of residents in counties with Wilderness, see: Rudzitis, G. and H.E. Johansen. 1991. "How Imp Wilderness? Results from a United States Survey." Environmental Management. 15(2): 227-233.

For analysis of the role of transportation in high-amenity areas, see: Rasker, R., P.H. Gude, J.A. Gude, J. van den Noort. 2009. "The Economic Importance of Air Travel in High-Amenity Rural Areas." Journal of Rural Studies. 25(2009): 343-353.

ta So

Raker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207: U.S. Gedogical Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3 Study Guide

Data Sources: Rasker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207; U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas: Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3







# **Data Sources & Methods**

### **Data Sources**

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.
- USDA, Forest Service
   Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
   <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html</u>
- Protected Areas Database v 1.3 2012 U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006
   National Aeronautics and Space Administration
   <a href="http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm">http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm</a>

### **Methods**

### 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.

### For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

### Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
- 2 gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- 3 www.nhd.usgs.gov
- 4 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html
- 5 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm
- 6 headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
- 7 http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- 8 <u>www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php</u>

# **A Profile of Federal Land Payments**

Santa Cruz County AZ

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

### 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 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	1
What are rederariand payments:	1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated	2
to unrestricted and restricted uses?	3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? How important are federal land payments to state and local governments	4
(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


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

What are federal land payments?

**Federal Land Payments** 

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# udy Guide and Supplemental Information

# hat are federal land payments

# What do we measure on this page?

at do we measure on this page? This page describes all federal large hayments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin. <u>Federal and payments</u>: These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. Payments are funded by federal appropriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) is based on a maximum per-agropyment reduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. <u>Forest Service Revenues Sharing</u>: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for count yrads and local schools. 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 through the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California (0 & C) grant lands. <u>USEVXS Raluga</u>, these payments sine a portion of receipts from National Wildlie Reluge and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located. Executed States and they are located. Executed States and they are located in the state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may afters, at their discretion, a portion of revenues with the local governments where insplates were generated. Executed Texture 2012; Privers to the federal facual year with be local governments where insplates were generated.

#### hy is it important?

y is a important? State and local government 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 presence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of local government thremun in rural counties with large ledenal 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 detrait revenue haring programs. PILT was instead to basilitize and increase federal and payments to courd governments. Nore recently, the Recure Rurd Schools and Community SetDetermination Act of 2000 (1983) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several major concerns around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment lowel, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several indices of around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment wells, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the structure of the structure of the structure services of the structure servi eceipt-based programs e uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization A 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget co are creating uncertainty for the future of both. ion Act of

#### thods

thtods Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments. Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are instaively insignificant at the idental 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 local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant ontision in states that share a portion of royaties with local governments. Federal mineral royatiles made up 68% of lederal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.

toyation 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 Mountian Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M.T.
Gorte, Ross W. M. Lynne Com, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Congressional Research Station, Bergori EL, Socky Manutan, Research Station,
tops and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Sociecoronnic Measures report and other industry specific reports at
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.
For data on federal and ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.

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 Managament, 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.;
Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt



Grazing Districts
 Grazing Districts
 Gounty Government

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# udy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes how federal land payments nts are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origin.

by 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 sample, PLIT is derived to ocurry government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments decline, the PLIT formula ensures that county government payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments, While PLIT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalities, BLI hreenue sharing payments) are still linked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and governors have a different set of expectations and incentives to tobby for particular outcomes on public lands fram do county commissioners or school officials.

thods State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) lederal mineral royalities and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and lederal statute (see note about data limitations). County Government Distributions: Consist of (1) PILT (2) portions of Forest Service agreements including Secure Rural Schools and Community Salt-Determination Act (SRS) Title I and Tate III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USPWS Refuge revenue scharing; and (5) discentionary state government distributions of Ideral Imineet royalities where these data are available. Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Title I, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

# Resource Advisory Council (RACI Distributions: Consist of SRS Trife II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on put and projects on the national literat or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provide advice and ecommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of apolal projects on Rebra lands as authorized under the Becure Rula Schools Act and Community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 propie representing value intensis and areas of operation, who wich calaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national lorest

<u>Grazing District Distributions</u>: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. <u>Data Limitations</u>: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states made discretionary distributions of inviend regulaties and score 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 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 importal jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at ortance (in terms of headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt<sup>(1)</sup>

#### Data Sources

ia 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/spe-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distribut school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payme ed to the state

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

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments to County		
Government (\$)	1,163,443	616,271,004
Unrestricted	910,527	457,219,872
Restricted-County Roads	252,916	143,265,915
Restricted-Special County Projects	0	15,785,217
Percent of Total		
Unrestricted	78.3%	74.2%
Restricted-County Roads	21.7%	23.2%
Restricted-Special County Projects	0.0%	2.6%



4 -Restricted-County Roads ----- Restricted-Special County Projects

# Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Governments by Permitted Use, FY 2013

In FY 2013, unrestricted federal land payments were the largest type of payment to the county government in Santa Cruz County AZ (78.3%), and restricted-special county projects were the smallest (0%).

60% 40% 20% 0% Santa Cruz County, AZ

100%

80%

Restricted-Special County Projects Restricted-County Roads Unrestricted

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Departmer Agriculture. 2008. 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 Wildline Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www. hadvaterescontracies.org/sp-bid. ent of ent of

#### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses?

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

#### Vhy is it important?

(s) is important?
County governments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For exemple, counties must maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with public lands. Several federal land payment programs, particularly those from the Forest Service, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

sist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal min

<u>interinted</u>: Consist of (1) PLIT, (2) U.S. Fish and virusing service results in the service of the service

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 vailable)

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

#### Data S Sources

Ia Sources US. 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/ops-hdt

# **Federal Land Payments**

How important are federal land payments to state and local gov nts This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state gove nent ge

# Federal Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	
Total General Revenue	68,107	na
Taxes	27,595	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	33,080	na
Total Charges	4,593	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	2,838	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	742	3,312,736
Percent of Total		
Taxes	40.5%	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	48.6%	na
Total Charges	6.7%	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	4.2%	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	1.1%	na

# Federal Land Payments per FY, Percent of Total General Government Revenue, Santa Cruz County AZ 4.5% 4.0% 3.5% 2.5% 2.0% 1.5% 1.0% 0.5% 3.98% 2.25% 1.75% 1.63% 1.09%

2002 2007



1992 1997

1.09%

1987



From FY 1987 to FY 2007, federal land payments shrank from 4 to 1.1 percent of total general government revenue, a decrease of 73 percent.

0.6% 0.4% 0.2%

1.2%

1.0% 0.8%

0.0%

na Santa Cruz County, AZ U.S.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liau of Taxee (PLUT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Services Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2008 Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Frish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resour Networks Washington, D.C.; Additional Sources and methods available at www. Bavdaterescomics orgiges-hd

## udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## w important are federal land payments to state and local governments?

# 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 (FV) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. Interaction Table: Census of Government county financial statistics are based on a national 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 for the latest year.

Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax. <u>Intergovernmental Revenue</u>: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including Ideral education, health care, and transportation assistance to state governments, and state assistance to local governments. <u>Tatal Charges</u>: Charges imposed for providing ourrent services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges. <u>All Other (Missioneus</u>): All other general government revenue from their own iscurces.

#### v is it important?

() In important is 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 revenue stream. Counties must dependent on federal land payments are a effected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For these counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.

thods
Regarding Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the federal FV beginning October 1 and ending September 31. Federal land payments reported for the current FY are often distributed to counties during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opagements authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opagements authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the Census of Government FV 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2005 are compared to Local government revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be undersported 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).

<u>Census of Governments Data Limitations</u>: (1) county linancial statistics may not match local government linancial reports for three main reasons; (a) The Genus of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agencies, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and duals government) entities). This may differ from the way to governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) different reporting periods between the Genus of Governments financial year and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of the Genus and Y 2007, block the recomments from the Way to an other the server and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of Governments way Y 2007, block the recom 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 source of country revenue.

#### dditional Resources

ULUS. Censis Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census gov/govs/estimatel<sup>(2)</sup>. 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/gova<sup>(2)</sup>. Schuster, Ervin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May

Schutzter, Errin Lo and Instation - Gewein Look - Hogen - Hoge

#### Data Sources

ta OULIVES 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 Apriculture. 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 Wildle 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 Wildle 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.hashwatersconnics.org/ep-bdt





## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)?

# 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 compensate 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 Dase payment' that is reduced by the amount of revenue sharing payments and is subject to appouldance;

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 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 full payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Vhy is it important? As county payments became more important to local government after WWII (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-war housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PLT increased and stabilized payments by funding counties from congressional appropriations rather than directly from commodity receipts. PLT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local government services, but can be used at the direction of county commissiones 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/nbc/index.cfm<sup>(4)</sup>.

Schuster, Ervin 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 U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing? 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. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

#### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information hat is Forest Service Re nue Sharing'

# What do we measure on this page?

This pa cribes Fo . ue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act

This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR), 25K, https://dx.and.forest/Grasslands. U.S. Forest Service <u>25 Percent Func</u>: The <u>25K</u> Fund, established in 1908, shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with schools and fund schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services. The <u>Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act</u> d 2000 (SRS) or Public Lan Vio-303: SRS was enacted in FX 2001 to provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counting affected by the decline in revenue from timber harvests on federal lands. SRS was reauthorized for a single year in 2007, and again in 2008 for a period of lour 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 schoots. States determine the split between these two services, and some states is the counties decide.
 Title I - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committees (RACs) at the community level help make specifing determinations and monitor project progress.
 Title II - these spayments 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 wildline protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the 25% Fund and SRS2 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. <u>Forest Grasslands</u>: 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.

#### hy is it important?

USES memory battering is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royslites are distributed to states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when timber harvesto on the National Ferests increased sharply in response to post-was housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shifted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it. Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owi" 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 sharing in three fundament ways: SRS (1) does county payments from National Forest needpts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewards through Titel II funds that pay' for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment quily concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title 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 to expire. It SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the 25% Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on public land.

#### dditional Resources

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determ tion Act payments available at: fs.usda.gov/pts/ 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 Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt Study Guide

# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is BLM Revenue Sharing?

methods available at www.hea

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

#### 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
Title I	0	33,685,617
Title 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%
Title II	0.0%	5.0%
	0.078	0.070

# BLM Revenue Sharing per FY, Santa Cruz County AZ



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and

rseconomics.org/eps-hdt

#### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information Vhat is BLM Revenue Sharing?

What do we measure on this page? 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. <u>Proceeds of Sales</u>: These include receipts from the sale of land and materials. <u>Include regarder</u> Act: These include OI and Gas Right of Way lases nervenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do not include regarders workshet 10.

payments see worksneet to. Tavide Chairund Auf, 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. Funds are restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predetor contrd, noisous weed programs) in cooperation with BLM of livestock organizations. • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the Act.

Nuc. 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 California 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 SaliDetermination Act. Amounts include Title I, Title II, and Title III payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report for definitions and information on the Secure Rural Schools and Community Sali-Determination Act).

Vhy is it important? The BLM is the nation's targest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adjacent commu Similarly, the non-transitie status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide services to county residents, and pro public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in I property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT). dents, and provide overnments in lieu of

xthod 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. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 report i used. To arrive at distribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table 3-1 of BLM Public Land Statistics) was used. Some environ is filley. In addition, some data are usefund directly from states. Distribution satistics of the to fill and government are related to the provides FV seported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2006 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2006.)

#### dditional Resources

BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics web blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html<sup>(6)</sup>.

Information about the Taylor Grazing Act is available at: blm.gov/wv/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html<sup>(7)</sup>.

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-hdt



# **Federal Land Payment Programs**

#### What are Federal Mineral Royalties?

This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local gove

Federal Mineral Royalties by Source, FY 2013 (2013 \$s)

	Santa Cruz County, AZ	U.S
tal Federal Royalty	0	2,001,309,48
Royalties	0	1,784,591,30
Coal	0	353,201,18
Natural Gas	0	498,654,39
Gas Plan Products	0	141,034,61
Oil	0	693,515,90
Other	0	98,185,21
Non-Royalty Revenue	0	216,482,99
Rents	0	22,126,37
Bonus	0	330,986,89
Other Revenues	0	-136,630,27
Geothermal	0	3,659,32
GOMESA	0	235,18
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties	0	235,18
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties	0 na	235,18 89.29
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas	0 na na	235,18 89.29 17.69 24.99
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products	0 na na na	235,18 89.29 17.69 24.99 7 (9
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalities Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil	0 na na na na na	235,18 89.29 17.69 24.99 7.09 34 79
GOMESA ercent of Total Royatties Ceal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other	0 na na na na na	235,18 89,29 17,69 24,99 7,09 34,79 4,99
GOMESA arcent of Total Royaties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royatil Revenue	0 na na na na na na na na	235,18 89,29 17,69 24,99 7,09 34,79 4,99 10,88
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties Coal Coal Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents	0 na na na na na na na na na na na na	235,18 89,29 17,66 24,99 7,09 34,77 4,99 10,88 1,18
GOMESA ercent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royally Revenue Rents Bonus	0 na na na na na na na na na na	235, 18 89, 27 17, 69 24, 99 7, 09 34, 79 4, 99 10, 88 1, 19 16, 55
GOMESA recent of Total Reyatilies Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues	0 na na na na na na na na na na	235, 18 89, 22 17, 69 24, 99 7, 09 34, 79 4, 99 10, 88 1, 11 16, 59 1, 65 5 6, 88
COMESA ercent of Total Royalities Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royally Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues Geathermal	0 na na na na na na na na na na na na na	235,18 89,29 24,99 7,00 34,77 4,99 10,89 1,11 16,55 6,68 5 0,22

#### with counties. These state "pass through" disbursements are not reported here. See 'Additional Resources'



tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

# Vhat are Federal Mineral Royalties?

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

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for This page describes the compon the region.

Royalties, rents, and borus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49% of revenue is returned to states and 51% is retained by the folderal government). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on tederal lands and a share of royalties from dishone difficult in the Gut difficult of the shared of the difficult ocurry governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of folderal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or eccommically impacted by mineral divergement for planning, construction/maintenance of public testifies, and provision of public aevice).

<u>Boyalities</u>: Royality payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royality may be an established minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royality rate increases by steps as the average production on the less increases. A sliding-scale royality rate is based on average production and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat: Seathermat is and stription and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: <u>Count of where Ferry Scattery</u> Act or <u>SCOR</u> (SCME) <u>SCA</u> makes distributions of distributed and the states and their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA lesses include Alabama, Louisana, <u>Mississippi</u>, 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. Borusses: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Boruses represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease. <u>Other Revenues</u>: A disfusement that is not a royally ren, or borus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments, gas storage fees, estimated payments, recoupments, and fees for sand and gravel used for beach restoration.

# hv is it important?

y is it important / Minent royalises are the largest source of revenue derived from extractive activities on public lands. Mineral extraction can place significant demands on lederal, state, and local infrastructure and services. Royalty revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed to provide an ongoing public brendit from the depletion of non-revensible resources owned by the public.

#### thods

Ithods Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royalty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalies were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25 percent of the state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of origin and state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of these data. Headwates Economics Incides a list of state distribution policy. Inits to data, and contract information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Mintods and Resources document. http://headwates.conomics.org/whytwi-pocretinty/loods/EPS-HDT Federal\_Land Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf.

#### Additional Resources

attional Kesources
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 contax information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government
Financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPSHDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf<sup>100</sup>.

For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at: onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/qlossarv.odf<sup>(11)</sup>

Data Sources U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

• U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- U.S. Bureau of Land Management U.S. Department of Interior <u>www.blm.gov</u> Tel. 202-208-3801
- U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture <u>www.fs.fed.us</u> Tel. 800-832-1355

<u>www.onrr.gov</u> Tel. 303-231-3078

U.S. Department of Interior

# **Methods**

# 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 <u>headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt</u>
- 2 www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
- 3 <u>www.census.gov/govs/</u>
- 4 www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
- 5 <u>www.fs.usda.gov/pts/</u>
- 6 www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html
- 7 www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
- 8 <u>www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html</u>
- 9 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
- 11 www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf

# **A Profile of Demographics**

Yavapai County AZ

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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.



**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.

# **Table of Contents**

Demographics How has population changed? What is the age and gender distribution of the population? What is the racial makeup of the population? What is the Hispanic makeup of the population? What is the tribal makeup of the population?	Page 1 2-3 4 5 6-7
Employment What occupations and industries are present? What are the characteristics of labor participation? What are commuting patterns?	8 9 10
Income How is income distributed? What are poverty levels? What are the components of household earnings?	11 12-13 14
Social Characteristics What are education and enrollment levels? What languages are spoken?	15 16
Housing What are the main housing characteristics? How affordable is housing?	17 18
Benchmarks How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
Data Sources & Methods	20
Links to Additional Resources	21

# 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%.

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

#### How has population changed?

This page describes the total population and change in total population

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau, Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section the Savdy Guide text.

#### Population, 2000-2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.	
Population (2013*)	211,968	311,536,594	
Population (2000)	167,517	281,421,906	
Population Change (2000-2013*)	44,451	30,114,688	
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	26.5%	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.			



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		
	Yavapai County, AZ	
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%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### How has population changed? What do we measure on this page?

w - w - ποιοιομία - μι πια μαμμε τ This page describes the total population and change in total population. Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decemial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

#### /hy is this important?

(is turs important / This report covers a broad range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and home ownership. It is the only EPS+HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These include dists, towns, and consuss designated places, American Indian, Atakan nafve, and native Hawaii areas, congressional distincts, and county

nces)

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/isocially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management actions requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minority individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or any othen register health effects from cumulative or multiple adverse adverses to environmental hazards), and disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or naive populations).

Iethods The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). 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).

For populations of 65.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20.000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographice, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this proport are 5-year ACS estimates. Kores of han 16 or 3-year estimates, he 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographice, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographice since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cose-geograp comparisons. The disadvantage is that multilyair estimates cannot be used to describe any parallelity are in the period, only what the average value is over the full period. For threvely, table and figure titles show the latest year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to clarify that the data represent average characterization over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables. **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; ORANCE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with the dota) indicates a coefficient of variation ~ 12%; another domographics report at a leagn groupped space. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the bless provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

#### Additional Resources sible pub

An indi on on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see: census gov/acs/wwwihethodology/methodology\_main/<sup>10</sup>. census gov/acs/wwwDownloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyotData2009.pdf <sup>10</sup>.

#### Data Sources

tal Solurose U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Burseu, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Burseu, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C. Study Guide

50.1

44.5

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 rider

#### 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	402 750	452 047 440

Change in Median Age, 2000-2013\*

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

 Median Ape / (2000)
 1.2 cv%

 Median Ape is Change
 1.2 cv%

 ^Median ape is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations.
 1.7 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.



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.

tion Cooffi

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.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

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes population distribution tion by age and gender, and the change in median age. This page describes population dist

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

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of refines, 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 many counties, the largest segment of the oppulation is in the Baby Boarner generation (people boarnets) motiversities (19-6). The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

37.3

35.3 5.7%

thoos Data in his report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Cansus 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 2006 forwup 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 > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest huming another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of mace, 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<sup>16</sup>.

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/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>.

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: stateoftheusa.org<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistrib and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: frey-demographer.org <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: aoa.go root/aging\_statistics/index.aspx

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/ <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: county-healthrankings.org/ (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.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population? This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distu five age groups. ution, with age categories separated into

## Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 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%
6E and over	22.0%	25.29/

' The data in this table are calcul 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%	1%
35-44	0%	3%
45-64	0%	1%
65 and over	0%	2%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Varia	ation	
	2000	2009*
Under 18	0%	0%
18-34	0%	0%
35-44	0%	0%
45-64	0%	0%
er 1	09/	08/

Study Guide and Supplemental Information What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

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 ca five age groups.

#### hy is it important?

VIS It Important? For public land agency, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retined population, or soon-ba-enteired 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 minors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the reterement of the "Baby Boomen" generation (those 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 demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

#### ods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with noe dot) indicates bet and 40%, and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%, if data have consistently low accuracy thr a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. tween 12 ourthout

dditional Resources The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at: The non-profit Population Reference prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups:

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf

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 gow/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx <sup>(44)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. America's Regional 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 Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st 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.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex 2004-2030." census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html <sup>(15)</sup>. 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.

What is the racial makeup of the population?

cribes the number of people who self-ide ntify as belonging to a particular race This page de

Race: Race is a set-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or maces with which they most closely identify The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicky.

#### Population by Race, 2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	
Total Population	211,968	311,536,594
White alone	194,869	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	1,293	39,167,010
American Indian alone	4,475	2,540,309
Asian alone	1,715	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	"46	526,347
Some other race alone	4,918	14,746,054
Two or more races	4,652	8,732,333
Percent of Total		
White alone	91.9%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	0.6%	12.6%
American Indian alone	2.1%	0.8%
Asian alone	0.8%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race alone	2.3%	4.7%
-		

Two or more races 2.2% 2.8%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average s during this period

Population by Race, Percent of Total, Yavapai County AZ, 2013\*



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

whating her Dana Confficients of M

ropulation by Race, coefficients of variation		
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%
White alone	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	11%	0%
American Indian alone	6%	0%
Asian alone	9%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	57%	1%
Some other race	11%	0%
Two or more races	11%	1%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
White alone	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	10%	0%
American Indian alone	6%	0%
Asian alone	8%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0%	0%
Some other race	10%	0%
Two or more races	11%	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### Vhat is the racial makeup of the populat

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people ple who self-identify 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 identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race

and athnicity. Race Alexe Categories: This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureaw, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawalan or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

Some Other Race: This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Nather, "Alast" and "Native Hausilian of Other Posicilis Islander" race categories described shows. Respondents providing write-in ertities such as multitotal, invent, enterracial, or a Haganic Latino group (for example, Mexican, Pluento Rican, or Culban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category. <u>Two or Mace Races</u>: People may have chosen to provide two or more race response. Providing multiple write-in responses, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

ny is it important?

deral agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this information to omote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act.

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 nacial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic group are inportant for putting into effect a nature of federal statutes (i.e., envirosing billingual election naise whether Mong Rights Act; montoing and entroicing equal employment opportunities under the CNH Rights Act; Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local povernments to in programs and meeting (i.e., evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinessment 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, broady referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 128as. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whethe there is a potential environmental justice issue. For public land ma

#### ods

Annue. Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elevelwere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with non edot) indicates be 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with non dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numming anothe demographics report at large geographic scalar.

dditional 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/federg\_1997standards<sup>(16)</sup>.

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 Hispanic Origin," available at: census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/ist/bages/ind

The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups and is available at: measurecfamerica.org/acenturyapart.<sup>(19)</sup>

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

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

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.

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Maxican," Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those with indicate that the year of ther Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino" Origin can be viewed as the hertiage, unclanality group, langea, or country of birth of the person of the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spansh, Hispanic, or Latino may be dary taxos.

#### Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Total Population	211,968	311,536,594
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	29,107	51,786,591
Not Hispanic or Latino	182,861	259,750,003
White alone	173,253	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	1,117	38,093,998
American Indian alone	3,742	2,061,752
Asian alone	1,631	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	-46	488,646
Some other race	79	606,356
Two or more races	2,993	6,387,422
Descent of Total		

Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	13.7%	16.6%
Not Hispanic or Latino	86.3%	83.4%
White alone	81.7%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	0.5%	12.2%
American Indian alone	1.8%	0.7%
Asian alone	0.8%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race	0.0%	0.2%
<b>T</b>	4 407	0.40/

Two or more races 1.4% 2.1%
\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average acteristics during this period.



Hispanic Population, Percent of Total, Yavapai County AZ, 2013\*

Yavapai County, AZ

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

U.S.

Iditional 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/fedreg\_1997standards <sup>(16)</sup>. 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/c2kbr01-1.pdf <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: factfinder2.census.gov/faces/r

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.pdf <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf <sup>[21]</sup>.

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

Study Guide

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

nic Population Coofficients of Var

0%

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
I Population	0%	05
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 Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	57%	1
Some other race	42%	1
Two or more races	9%	0
cent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.
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 Is. alone	0%	0
Some other race	0%	0
Two or more races	9%	0

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of people who self-identity as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural destination, and Hispanics can be of any race.

Ethnicity: There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal goverr race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. ent considers

Hispanic or Latino Origin: People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mevican," "Puerto Rikan," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanich, Hispanic, or Latino". Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, inseque, or country of bith of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race.

#### hy is it important?

y is it important? Hispanicas ere one of the tastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-dentified 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 200 and 2010, Hispanica accounded for ver one-hald of the trackin'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 imposition on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many feeder programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decomial census (i.e., promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial dispatities in health and environmental riskly and "Data or ethnic groups are important for puting from fields a name of decked astauce (i.e., and/orcing hingual electron nate under the Viole) (highs Act, monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act, Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments (i.e., and/miting local governments (i.e., and/miting under the Viole) and the violation deckal are violation to an programs and merical regulation requirements (i.e., and/miting segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act, evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act,"

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are member 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 54 decised American Indian categories: Apache, Blackted, Chevence, Chevence, Chicksaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chickaw, Chipeyae, Chipeya

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

#### 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	4,066	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes	<b>"0</b>	108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	'283	363,000
Percent of Total Total Native American	2.1%	0.8%
American Indian Tribes	1.9%	0.6%
Alaska Native Tribes	~0.0%	0.0%
Non-Specified Tribes	<b>~0.1%</b>	0.1%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using ann characteristics during this period.	ual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average



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 15 Total Population Total Native American 0% 6% 8% 0% 0% 0% American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes na Non-Specified Tribe 1% 29% Percent of Total, Coeffi ents of Variation U.S. Total Native American 6% 0% 0% American Indian Tribes Alaska Native Tribes Non-Specified Tribes 6% 0%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? , the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in

This page describes, in general ter with one or more other races.

<u>American Indian</u>: 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. Cansus data are available for 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categorizer, Sapeha, Bladketer, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickawa, Chipewa, Chotawa, Coville, Comanche, Cree, Creek. Crow, Delaware, Houma, Ioquids, Kiowa, Lumbee, Manorine, Navajo, Csage, Chawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatom, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shortone, Sixu, Tohoro O'Othum, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al Arber.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### hy is it important?

V is it important ( Different groups depole may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native titbes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current is to be land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

# thoos 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%. Ideat have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

ethods

#### Additional Resources

An indispensible publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance un National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq12 Environmental Justice: Guidance under the ces/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceq1297.pdf <sup>(1)</sup>. The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs res and contacts are available at: bia.gov/index.htm <sup>(22)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: indians.org/index.html <sup>(23)</sup>.

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

#### **Demographics** Region

What is the tribal makeup of the population? This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Ammore other races. an Indian and Alaska Native alo nation with one o

## 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
Blackfeet	<b>"0</b>	26,474
Cherokee	"121	273,192
Cheyenne	<b>"0</b>	11,774
Chickasaw	<b>"0</b>	22,917
Chippewa	-17	115,253
Choctaw	35	90,189
Colville	<b>"0</b>	8,182
Comanche	<b>"0</b>	12,228
Cree	<b>"0</b>	2,191
Creek	<b>"0</b>	41,521
Crow	"9	11,424
Delaware	<b>"0</b>	7,471
Houma	<b>"0</b>	9,488
Iroquois	~25	45,639
Kiowa	<b>"0</b>	8,691
Lumbee	<b>"0</b>	68,171
Menominee	<b>"0</b>	8,259
Navajo	1,382	305,552
Osage	<b>"0</b>	8,332
Ottawa	<b>"0</b>	7,026
Paiute	<b>"0</b>	10,545
Pima	58	24,212
Potawatomi		19,337
Pueblo	"172	71,029
Puget Sound Salish	<b>"0</b>	13,971
Seminole	<b>"0</b>	13,987
Shoshone	<b>"0</b>	9,470
Sioux	- 32	124,383
Tohono O'Odham	- 33	20,343
Ute	<b>"0</b>	8,629
Yakama	<b>"0</b>	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	<b>"0</b>	108,836
Alaska Athabaskan	<b>"0</b>	15,882
Aleut	<b>"0</b>	11,709
Eskimo	<b>"0</b>	60,926
Tlingit-Haida	<b>"0</b>	15,622
All other tribes	<b>"0</b>	4,697
Alaska Native; Not Specified	716	10,616
American Indian or Alaska Native;		

American Indian Or Alaba a native; 283 363,000 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.

Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What is the tribal makeup of the population?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes, in general 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 54 tribes or Selected American Indian categories, Roden, Bladketer, Cherkee, Cheyeme, Chickasw, Chipewa, Chockaw, Colvile, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, toquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menorinee, Navajo, Casge, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminde, Shotone, Siux, Tohomo Odotham, Ute Aviaam, Yaqui, Yuman, and Al cher.

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.

Non-Specified Tribes: This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### hv is it important?

V or important?
Otherwise the people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, belefs, 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 and/or current te to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

#### Methods

thoos 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 numing another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

Iditional 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 relations. See: fs.led.us/spft/tribalrelations/index.shtml <sup>(24)</sup>.

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

Study Guid

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

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
al Population	0%	0%
Total Native American	6%	0%
American Indian Tribes; Specified	8%	0%
Apache	46%	2%
Blackfeet	na	3%
Cherokee	52%	1%
Cheyenne	na	6%
Chickasaw	na	3%
Chippewa	97%	1%
Choctaw	80%	1%
Colville	na	5%
Comanche	na	6%
Cree	na	11%
Creek	na	2%
Crow	115%	5%
Delaware	na	7%
Houma	na	6%
Iroquois	83%	2%
Kiowa	na	7%
Lumbee	na	1%
Menominee	na	4%
Navajo	18%	1%
Osage	na	6%
Ottawa	na	7%
Paiute	na	4%
Pima	53%	4%
Potawatomi	80%	3%
Pueblo	41%	2%
Puget Sound Salish	na	4%
Seminole	na	4%
Shoshone	na	5%
Sioux	80%	1%
Tohono O'Odham	57%	5%
Ute	na	6%
Yakama	na	5%
Yaqui	67%	5%
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	5%
Eskimo	na	1%
Tlingit-Haida	na	4%
All other tribes	na	6%
Alaska Native; Not Specified	87%	6%
American Indian or Alaska Native; No	29%	1%

	Employment
What occupations and industries are present?	

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, professional, & related	25,404	51,341,226
Service	19,734	25,645,065
Sales and office	20,862	34,957,520
Farming, fishing, and forestry	335	1,030,881
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	9,020	11,832,435
Production, transportation, & material moving	7,268	17,057,570
Percent of Total		
Management, professional, & related	30.7%	36.2%
Service	23.9%	18.1%
Sales and office	25.2%	24.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	10.4%	0.7%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	10.9%	8.3%
Production, transportation, & material moving	8.8%	12.0%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys	conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average

# The data in this table are calculated by A characteristics during this period. Employment by Industry, 2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	0.8.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	82,623	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	2,117	2,731,302
Construction	6,658	8,864,481
Manufacturing	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
Information	1,326	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	4,672	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	7,149	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	19,583	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	11,947	13,262,892
Other services, 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%
Manufacturing	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	11.6%	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%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	14.5%	9.3%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & tood Other services, except public administration	14.5%	9.3%

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

Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Var	riation	
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	1%	0%
Management, professional, & related	3%	0%
Service	4%	0%
Sales and office	4%	0%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	29%	1%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	6%	0%
Production, transportation, & material moving	5%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Management, professional, & related	3%	0%
Service	4%	0%
Sales and office	4%	0%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	30%	0%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	6%	0%
Production, transportation, & material moving	6%	0%
Employment by Industry, Coefficients of Variati	ion	
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Civilian employed population > 16 years	1%	0%
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	12%	0%
Construction	6%	0%
Manufacturing	9%	0%
Wholesale trade	13%	0%
Retail trade	5%	0%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	10%	0%
Information	13%	0%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	8%	0%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	7%	0%
Education, health care, & social assistance	3%	0%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	5%	0%
Other services, except public administration	7%	0%
Public administration	9%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, minin	12%	0%
Construction	6%	0%
Manufacturing	9%	0%
Wholesale trade	13%	0%
Retail trade	5%	0%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	9%	0%
Information	15%	0%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	8%	0%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgr	7%	0%
Education, health care, & social assistance	3%	0%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	5%	0%
Other services, except public administration	7%	0%
Public administration	9%	0%

Study Guide and Supplemental Information What occupations and industries are present?

# What do we measure on this page? 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: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classified into with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry. Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

#### hy is it Important?

thods

y 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 people bot a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and professional occupations are could be working for a stream. In mine, or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while employment by industry describes where people work.

# THOUS 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 as large geographic scale.

Additional Resources The Census Bureau provides a definition of SOCS: census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html <sup>(25)</sup>.

Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: bls.gov/soc/ <sup>(26)</sup>.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: bis.gov/oco/<sup>(27)</sup>.

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

What are the characteristics of labor participation? This page describes workers by weeks worked per year and usus Labor Participation Characteristics, 2013' Population 16 to 64 WERKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 21 to 64 weeks Worked 21 to 64 weeks Worked 10 to 62 weeks Worked 10 to 62 weeks Worked 10 to 64 weeks Worked 10 to 64 worker HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 50 of 30 workers Percent of Total WERKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 10 to 26 weeks Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 20 to 62 weeks Worked 21 to 64 worsper week Worked 50 of 20 weeks Worked 50 of 20 weeks Worked 50 of 20 weeks Worked 50 of 20 weeks Worked 50 of 10 to 64 worsper week Worked 50 of 10 to 10 to 50 weeks Worked 10 to 14 hours per week Worked 15 to 44 hours per week	l hours works per week. Yavapat County, A 123,81 14,92 35,45 69,19 23,35 5,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,45 36,4537,45 36,4537,45 36,45,	Z 6 11 2 2 5 5 8 8 0 0 5 5 3 3 3 8 8 4 4 8 8 4 4 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	03 204,340,91 112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,13 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,44 51,138,98 38, 38, 55,00
This page describes workeds per year and usus Labor Participation Characteristics, 2013* Population 16 to 64 WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 10 25 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 50 of more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 27 to 44 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	I hours works per week. Yavepsi County, A 123.81 56.42 14.92	2 6 7 9 8 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	U 3 204,340,91 112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,13 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,48 51,138,98 38, 38, 55,00
Labor Participation Characteristics, 2013*	Yavapai County, A 123,81 58,42 15,01 14,92 35,44 59,19 23,35 581 35,45 36,45,4536,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,4536,4	2 6 11 2 2 5 5 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	U: 204,340,91 112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,12 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,46 51,138,98 38 38
Population 16 to 64 WERKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked D to 52 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Unded 27 to 49 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Unded 16 to 34 hours per week Unded 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 26 to 26 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 26 to 28 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 35 of more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 20 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 20 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 20 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 35 of more hours per week	Yavapat County. A 123.81 123.81 14.92 35.45 59.19 2.33 5.81 35.45 36.45	2 6 7 11 2 2 5 5 8 8 9 0 5 5 3 3 3 8 8 4 4 8 8 8 4 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	U3 204,340,91 112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,13 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,48 51,138,98 38 55,00 10,51
Population 16 to 64 WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 70 to 63 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 55 or 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Did not work Mean usait hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 55 weeks Worked 56 softwarps per week Worked 56 softwarps per week	123,81 58,42 15,01 14,92 35,46 69,10 23,35 5,81 35,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,4536,45 36,4536,45 36,4536,45 36,4536,45 36,45	6 1 2 5 5 8 0 5 3 3 3 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	204,340,91 112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,13 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,44 51,138,98 38
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 56 of more hours per week Worked 10 with hours per week Worked 10 with hours per week Worked 10 with hours per week Maan usaih hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 10 b 52 weeks Worked 20 to 54 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 54 weeks Did not work Worked 50 to 54 weeks Worked 10 to 54 hours per week Worked 10 to 54 hours per week Worked 10 to 14 hours per week Worked 10 to 14 hours per week Worked 10 to 14 hours per week	58,42 15,01 14,92 35,45 59,19 2,3,35 5,84 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,4536,45,45 36,45,45 36,45,4536,45,45 36,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,45,	11 2 5 5 8 8 0 0 5 3 3 3 8 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,13 51,138,90 116,424,22 29,453,27 7,324,44 51,138,90 38 38
Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 71 to 26 weeks Diri not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEKC Worked 35 more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Diri not work Mean usain hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 27 to 54 weeks Worked 25 more hours per week Worked 15 to 36 more hours per week Worked 15 to 36 more hours per week Worked 15 to 14 hours per week Diri not work Diri not work	58,42 15,01 14,92 35,45 59,19 23,35 5,845 35,45 35,45 36	11 2 55 60 05 53 33 33 34 4 4 4 55 55 55 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56	112,330,37 21,646,42 19,225,12 51,138,96 116,424,22 29,453,27 7,324,46 51,138,96 38 38
Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 10 26 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED WEEK: HOURS WORKED FOR WEEK: Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Did not work Mean usual hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 20 to 52 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 35 or more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	15,01 14,92 35,44 5,91 22,33 5,81 28,45 38,45 38,45 38,45 38,45 38,45 38,45 12,11 14,11 12,11 14,114,1	2 5 5 8 0 5 5 3 3 3 4 4 % %	21,646,4 19,225,13 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,27 7,324,48 51,138,98 38 55,0 10,55,0
Worked 1 to 26 weeks Did not weeks HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 55 or more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Did not work Mean usal hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 27 to 48 weeks Worked 27 to 48 weeks Worked 27 to 58 weeks Worked 10 to 28 weeks Worked 10 to 28 weeks Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Did not work.	14,32,2 35,45 59,19 23,35 35,45 35,45 36, 36, 36, 36, 36, 36, 36, 36, 36, 36,	58 8 00 55 3 88 4 4 % % %	19,225,13 51,138,98 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,48 51,138,98 38 55,0 10,55,0
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 55 m data hours per week Worked 15 m 34 hours per week Dist not work Mean usual hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 n52 weeks Worked 10 h52 weeks Dist not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 50 n53 hours per week Worked 15 n54 hours per week	59,19 59,19 23,35 5,84 35,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 36,45 12,11 28,66 47,28 18,97 18,97	0 55 3 3 4 4 % %	51,130,40 116,424,22 29,453,21 7,324,48 51,138,98 38 55.0 10 e
Worked 35 or more hours per week Worked 15 of 34 hours per week Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 70 Hours WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 70 Hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15	59,11 23,38 55,45 36,45 36,45 36, 47,24 12,11 28,64 47,28 12,11 28,64 47,28 18,94 18,94	00 55 38 84 4 % % %	116,424,22 29,453,2 7,324,44 51,138,94 38 55,0 10 6
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Dict not work Mean usual hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Dict not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 50 of 20 weeks Worked 16 034 hours per week Worked 16 034 hours per week The data in this bale are calculated by ACS using annual surve haraderistics during this period.	23.35 5.81 35.45 47.22 12.1 12.1 28.6 47.8 8 18.9	5 3 8 4 % % %	29,453,2 7,324,44 51,138,94 38 55.0
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week Did not work Mean usual hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 1 to 26 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 51 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Did not work Did 16 uar bit 14 hours per week Did not work	5,84 35,45 36 47,2* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 12,1* 14,2	3 88 4 % % %	7,324,44 51,138,94 38 55.0
Dici not work Maan usal hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 10 to 28 weeks Dici not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 50 of more hours per week Worked 15 uS4 hours per week Worked 15 uS4 hours per week More to 14 hours per week Dicited to 14 hours per week Dicited to 14 hours per week	35,45 36. 47.2' 12.1' 12.1' 12.8.6' 47.8' 18.9' 18.9'	8 4 % % %	51,138,94 38 55.0
Mean usual hours worked for workers Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 70 to 49 weeks Dird not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 55 more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Dird not work Did not work Did not work The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	36. 47.25 12.15 12.15 28.65 47.85 47.85 18.99	4 % % %	38 55.0
Percent of Total WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 20 to 52 weeks Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked 10 to 28 weeks Defined work HOURS WORKEY HOURS WORKS for more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Defined work The data in finit bale are calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	47.2 12.1 12.1 28.6 47.8 18.9	% % %	55.0
WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR: Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 10 to 52 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK- Worked 35 or more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week To date and works are calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	47.2 12.1 12.1 28.6 47.8 18.9	% % %	55.0
Worked 50 to 52 weeks Worked 10 to 26 weeks Worked 1 to 26 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 35 more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Did not work Did not work The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	47.29 12.19 12.19 28.69 47.89 18.99	% % %	55.0
Worked 27 to 49 weeks Worked to 26 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEKC Worked 35 of more hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week Worked 16 to 34 hours per week The data in finit balks are calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	12.19 12.19 28.69 47.89 18.99	% %	10 6
Worked 1 to 25 weeks Did not work HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 35 more hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 10 14 hours per week Did not work The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	12.1 28.6 47.8 18.9	%	10.6
bid not work. HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: Worked 25 or more hours per week Worked 15 03 A hours per week Did not work. Did not work A hours per week Did not work and be re-calculated by ACS using annual surve haracteristics during this period.	47.8° 18.9°	70	9.4
NUCRS WORKEU PER WEEK. Worked 15 to 34 hours per week Worked 15 to 34 hours per week <u>Did not work</u> The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surver haracteristics during this period.	47.8 <sup>°</sup> 18.9 <sup>°</sup>		25.0
Worked 15 to 24 hours per week Worked 15 to 24 hours per week Did not work The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surver haracteristics during this period.	18.9	ν.	67.0
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week Did not work The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surver haracteristics during this period.		%	14.4
Did not work The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surver haracteristics during this period.	4.79	%	3.6
The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surver haracteristics during this period.	28.6	%	25.0
In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (55.0%), 20	0% 0% 0%		"
and Yavapai County, AZ had the lowest (47.2%).	0% Yavapai County	, AZ U.S.	
1	Did not work	Worked 1 to 26 weeks	s
	Worked 27 to 49 weeks	Worked 50 to 52 weel	ks
	Hours Worked	d per Week, 2013*	
10	0%		
8	0%		
6 In the 2000 2012 period the U.S. had the	0%		~
<ul> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the 0.5. had the bighest estimated percent of people that</li> </ul>	0%		
worked 35 or more hours per week (57.0%).	0%		
and Yavapai County, AZ had the lowest			
(47.8%).	Yavapai County	/, AZ U.S.	
■>35 Ho	urs/Week ∎15-34 Hours/V eau. American Community	Veek ∎1-14 Hours/Week ⊗E Survev Office, Washington, E	Did not work
	,	,	

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	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%
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%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the characteristics of labor participation?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

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".

#### /hy is it important?

One, it to be hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, intravitantia to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have considered been among the lowest of the industrial datases 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 how say to remain active in the workplice but do not wart to work at all shedule. Advances in computer texthologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more fielde hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, burism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods ele concriming stability, the vast majority of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time 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, 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 failing wages or rates of employment that outpace population change (see the Scooconcom Kleasures report for changes in wages, employment, and population change time).

#### nods

sthods 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 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/pdf/G0612501.pdf <sup>(28)</sup>.

# For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.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.

		Employment
What are commuting patterns?		
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	139,786,63
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	73,343	101,321,53
Worked outside county of residence	6,904	38,465,10
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	16,191	18,023,63
10 to 14 minutes	12,359	19,150,65
15 to 19 minutes	11,516	20,753,054
20 to 24 minutes	9,940	19,796,41
25 to 29 minutes	4,412	8,189,640
30 to 34 minutes	9,427	18,220,85
35 to 39 minutes	1,662	3,673,57
40 to 44 minutes	'1,621	4,920,00
45 to 59 minutes	3,178	10,154,52
	4,355	10,857,90
60 or more minutes		

T DIOL OF MONTE		
Worked in county of residence	91.4%	72.5%
Worked outside county 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 surve	vs conducted during 2009-2013 and are repre	sentative of average
characteristics during this period.		
	Discourse and a contract	

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 percent of people that worked outside the county of residence (27.5%), and Yavapai County, AZ had the lowest (8.6%).



Worked outside county of residence Worked in county of residence

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

## What are commuting patterns?

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 eaving, for the oily of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worker 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 necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job coportunities 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 sever facilities without an adequate source of revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

thoos 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 numing 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 Perspectives 2(2), encudad gov/Publications/RDPR0/P697/RDP697/RDP697 epd<sup>(10)</sup>.

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

	Yavapai County, AZ	
orkers 16 years and over	1%	09
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	1%	09
Worked outside county of residence	6%	09
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	5%	05
10 to 14 minutes	5%	09
15 to 19 minutes	5%	09
20 to 24 minutes	6%	05
25 to 29 minutes	9%	05
30 to 34 minutes	6%	05
35 to 39 minutes	14%	0'
40 to 44 minutes	16%	0'
45 to 59 minutes	9%	0'
60 or more minutes	8%	0'
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	3%	0'
ercent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
PLACE OF WORK:		
Worked in county of residence	1%	0'
Worked outside county of residence	6%	0'
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:		
Less than 10 minutes	5%	0'
10 to 14 minutes	5%	0
15 to 19 minutes	6%	0
20 to 24 minutes	6%	0'
25 to 29 minutes	9%	0'
30 to 34 minutes	6%	0'
35 to 39 minutes	15%	0'
40 to 44 minutes	15%	0'
45 to 59 minutes	9%	0'
60 or more minutes	8%	0'

		Income
How is income distributed?		
This page describes the distribution of household income	l.	
Household Income Distribution, 2013*		
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$25,186	\$28,155
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$42,987	\$53,046
Total Households	91,349	115,610,216
Less than \$10,000	6,841	8,380,364
\$10,000 to \$14,999	6,421	6,214,548
\$15,000 to \$24,999	11,842	12,468,604
\$25,000 to \$34,999	11,768	11,929,761
\$35,000 to \$49,999	15,528	15,723,148
\$50,000 to \$74,999	17,471	20,744,045
\$75,000 to \$99,999	9,636	14,107,031
\$100,000 to \$149,999	7,512	14,858,239
\$150,000 to \$199,999	2,631	5,651,848
\$200,000 or more	1,699	5,532,628
Gini Coefficient <sup>A</sup>	0.45	0.47
Percent of Total		
Less than \$10,000	7.5%	7.2%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	7.0%	5.4%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	13.0%	10.8%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	12.9%	10.3%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	17.0%	13.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	19.1%	17.9%
675 000 · 600 000	10 50/	10.00/

#### \$75,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000 to \$149,999 \$150,000 to \$199,999 8.2% 12.2% 200.000 or mor

S200.000 or more 199 Median Household flocme and Gini Coefficient are not available for metroinon-metro or regional aggregations. 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.



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

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
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	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%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information How is income distributed?

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

hat do we measure not mis pager / This page describes the distribution of household income. <u>Per Capita Income</u>: Total personal income divided by total population of an area. <u>Household</u>: A household includes all the people who cocury a housing unit as their usual place of residence. <u>Gini Coefficient</u>: provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 perfects inequality. The bower the Gini coefficient, the more equal the income distribution. <u>Lorenz Curve</u>: 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 income," or "the top \_% of households have \_% of all income."

#### hv is it important?

y is it important? For public land mages, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionality high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographics helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-polation 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 fagure that shows a propriorinal jurge number of households at both enterme inclates a segregriph characterization by Thaves' and Thave-not

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 mixidualis and households. ned

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run Account protocol and the second secon

#### ethods

4.8%

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 Durve and the Gain 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 nd 40%, can RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout report, we suggest running another demographics report a larger geographic scale.

Iditional Resources The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-me inequality. McLaughin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf <sup>(31)</sup>. stro income le

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/Bernanke/20070206a.htm <sup>(3)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09W/IZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl:

#### Data Sources

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

## Income What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line

Powerty: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "bolw the poverty beaut".

#### Poverty, 2013\*

	Yavapai 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 poverty	6,118	8,666,630
Percent of Total		
People Below Poverty	15.8%	15.4%

15.4% 11.3% ntative of average 
 Families below poverfy
 10.8%

 \* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representancements
 6.0%

 Characteristics during this period.
 1000
 1000

•	In the 2009-2013 period, Yavapai County,
	AZ had the highest estimated percent of
	individuals living below poverty (15.8%),
	and the U.S. had the lowest (15.4%).

In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty (11.3%), and Yavapai County, AZ had the lowest (10.8%).



People Below Poverty Families below poverty

#### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
People	15.8%	15.4%
Under 18 years	22.3%	21.6%
65 years and older	6.3%	9.4%
Families	10.8%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	20.4%	17.8%
Married couple families	7.0%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	'12.0%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	26.3%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	'38.2%	40.0%

-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.

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 County, 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%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

#### What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes the number of iduals 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 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 threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as the power [seed."

#### y 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 teacors. First people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed activities or public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience dispropriorities/limits and advance effects.

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 important because aggregate poverty rates (or example, families below poverty) may hide some important formation (or example, the poverty rate is drivid) embedde with children).

#### lethods

thoos 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

Intronal 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, gov/topics/tvrai-economy-population/tural-poverty-well-being.aspx<sup>(56)</sup>. For more info

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: www.npc.umich.edu/poverty<sup>(36)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement al glapophe 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 as available at eps polycompliance(ef <sup>16</sup>.

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

Income

## What are poverty levels?

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<sup>\*</sup>, 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	713	99,943
Some other race	1,092	3,872,191
Two or more races	'677	1,696,884
All Ethnicities in Poverty		
		10 507 000
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	7,550	12,507,866
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	7,550 25,476	12,507,866 34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in p	7,550 25,476 overty)	34,155,567
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in p White alone	7,550 25,476 overty) 88.2%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in p White alone Black or African American alone	7.550 25,476 overty) 88.2% 0.7%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in p White alone Black or African American alone American Indian Alone	7,550 25,476 overty) 88.2% 0.7% 5.1%	12,507,865 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5%
Hispanic or Latino (d'any mao) Nor Hispanic or Latino (d'any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in p White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone	7,550 25,476 overty) 88.2% 0.7% 5,1% 0.0%	12,507,865 34,155,567 60.5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in p White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	7,550 25,476 overty) 88,2% 0,7% 5,1% 0,6% 0,0%	12,507,866 34,155,567 60,5% 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2%
Hispanic of Latino (id any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in p White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaiian & Oth, Pacific Is. alone Some other race	7,550 25,476 overty) 88,2% 0.7% 5,1% 0.6% 0.6% 0.0% 3.3%	12,507,866 34,155,567 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in p White alone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone Some other race Two or more races	7,550 25,476 00000000 0,7% 0,7% 0,7% 0,0% 0,0% 0,0%	12,507,866 34,155,567 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6%
Hispanic or Latino (id any race) Nat Hispanic or Latino (of any race) Percent of Total (Total = All Individuals in p White atone Black or African American alone American Indian alone Asian alone Native Heavalian & Oth.Pacific Is, alone Some other race Two or more races Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	7,550 25,476 overty) 88,2% 0,7% 5,1% 0,6% 0,6% 0,6% 0,0% 3,3% 2,2%	12,507,866 34,155,567 21.8% 1.5% 4.0% 0.2% 8.3% 3.6% 26.8%

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.

#### Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty~, 2013\*

	Tavapai County, AZ	
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 calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that

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

	Vavanai County AZ	118
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%	0%
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 Ethn	icity, Coefficients of Variation	
	Yavapai County, AZ	
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%
No. I Provident all and a state of	E9/	40/

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are poverty levels?

What do we measure on this page? 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 deat-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: 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 fails below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as their "below the poverty level".

## /hy is it important?

V is it important? For public land magners, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the contact of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

THOUS The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their ball family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of heiled children under 15 present (see below for poverty) releaf thresholds.

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local vinations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at census, goothers/wwwpoerty/dathreshold/reskum<sup>100</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

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 University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: nor.umich.deuterach/ethnicity<sup>100</sup>.

The U.S. Cansus Bureau briefing on "Powerty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: census, gorybounditor/scodem/distative/spovera.html<sup>109</sup>.

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

	Income
What are the components of household earnings?	
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 <sup>^</sup>		
Labor earnings	64.1%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	47.7%	28.9%
Retirement income	20.1%	17.7%

17.7% 4.9% 2.8% 12.4%



#### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

characteristics during this period.

	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.

	Vavanai County 47	118
Total bousebolds:	1%	0%
Labor earnings	1%	0%
Social Security (SS)	1%	0%
Retirement income	2%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	6%	0%
Cash public assistance income	11%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	4%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Labor earnings	1%	0%
Social Security (SS)	1%	0%
Retirement income	2%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	7%	0%
Cash public assistance income	12%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	4%	0%
Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, (	Coefficients of Variation	
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
Mean earnings	2%	0%
Mean Social Security income	2%	0%
Mean retirement income	5%	0%
Mean Supplemental Security Income	11%	0%
Mean cash public assistance income	18%	0%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What are the components of household earnings?

#### What do we measure on this page? This page describes household ea ngs by source

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Ratirament income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer, labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.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.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to 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 item.

#### ethods

HOUS 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 BDLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest funning another demographics report at a larger georganic scade.

# Why is this important?

Vis 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 reflement and Social Socium<sup>1</sup>. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of referee (reflement) payments), other measures for example, SSI or Food Sampa) are an indication of a concome hardship.

#### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_doc tation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

#### Data Sources

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

	Social Cha	racteristics
What are education and enrollment levels?		
This page describes educational attainment and schoo	l enroliment.	
Educational Attainment, 2013*		
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
Total Population 25 vrs or older	157,797	206.587.85
No high school degree	15.516	28.887.72
High school graduate	142,281	177,700,13
Associates degree	14,074	16,135,79
Bachelor's degree or higher	38,204	59,583,13
Bachelor's degree	24,541	37,286,24
Graduate or professional	13,663	22,296,893
Percent of Total		
No high school degree	9.8%	14.0%
High school graduate	90.2%	86.0%
Associates degree	8.9%	7.89
Bachelor's degree or higher	24.2%	28.89
Bachelor's degree	15.6%	18.09
Graduate or professional	8.7%	10.89
<ul> <li>characteristics during this period.</li> <li>In the 2003-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with a bachelot's degree or higher (28.5%), and 'howpair County, 42 had the lowest (24.5%).</li> <li>In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school degree (14.0%), and Yawapai County, 42 had the lowest (9.8%).</li> <li>School Enrollment, 2013*</li> </ul>	Educational Attainment, 2013*	28.8% 14.0% U.S. begree or higher
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S
Total Population over 3 years old:	206,035	299,795,52
Enrolled in school:	43,125	82,624,80
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	1,860	5,011,192
Enrolled in kindergarten	2,313	4,208,394
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	0.225	
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	0,220	16,286,543
	9,465	16,286,54 16,510,31
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	9,465	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea	9,465 8,812 10,867	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school	9,465 8,812 10,867	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03 4,121,76
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school	0.225 9,465 8,812 10,867 1,583 162,910	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03 4,121,76 217,170,71
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total	9,465 8,812 10,867 1,583 162,910	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03 4,121,76 217,170,71
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in school:	0.223 9,465 8,812 10,867 11,583 162,910 20,9%	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03 4,121,76 217,170,71 27,69
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in school: Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	0.226 9,465 8,812 10,867 1,583 162,910 20,9% 0,9%	16,286,543 16,510,313 17,153,555 19,333,03 4,121,761 217,170,711 27,69 1,79
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in kindergarten	9,445 8,812 10,867 1,553 162,910 20,9% 0,9% 1,1%	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03 4,121,76 217,170,71 27,69 1,77 1,49
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yes Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nursery school, preschool Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	9 9465 8,812 10,867 1,583 162,910 20,9% 0,9% 1,1% 4,0%	16,286,54 16,510,311 17,153,551 19,333,033 4,121,761 217,170,711 27,69 1,79 1,49 5,49 5,49
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in olicipe, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nachool: Enrolled in indersy school, preschool Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	9 4465 8 812 10 867 1 553 1 62,910 20,9% 0,9% 1,1% 4,0% 4,6%	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,55 19,333,03 4,127,76 217,170,71 277,69 1.79 1.49 5,49 5,59
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in college, undergraduate yes Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in nusery school, preschool Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 15 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	9 9465 8,812 10,867 1,583 162,910 20,9% 1,9% 4,0% 4,0% 4,3%	16,286,54 16,510,31 17,153,551 91,333,03 4,121,761 217,170,71 27,69 1,779 1,49 5,49 5,59 5,79
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in olicipe, undergraduate yea Graduate or professional school Not enrolled in school Percent of Total Enrolled in school: Enrolled in kndergarten Enrolled in kindergarten Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 4 Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 12 Enrolled in ograde 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in ograde 9 to grade 12 Enrolled in ocalege, undergraduate yea	9 4465 8 812 10 867 1 583 162,910 20,9% 0,9% 1,1% 4,0% 4,6% 4,3% 5,3%	16.285.42 16.510.31 17.153.55 19.333.03 4.121.07,71 27.6% 1.7% 1.4% 5.5% 5.7% 6.4%

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

79.1%

#### Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

Not enrolled in school

	ravapar county, Az	0.5.
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 County, 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%
Enrolled 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

# What are education and enrollment levels? What do we measure on this page? This page describes levels of educational attainment.

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.

<u>School Errollment</u>: 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.

hy is it important? Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and lack of education is closely linked to poverty. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during economic 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 might experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication and outrach efforts could be tailored of different addresces.

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 growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

thods 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 support unning another demographics report at a larger egospathic scale.

Additional Resources For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemployment rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: bls.gov/emp/ep\_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.gov/prod/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 Ec vol. 34, New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

72.4%

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

# **Social Characteristics**

# What languages are spoken?

This page mea sures 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.

## Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	201,991	291,484,482
Speak only English	180,973	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	21,018	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	15,906	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	'3,142	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	'853	9,539,099
Other languages	1,117	2,626,244
Speak English less than "very well"	7,521	25,148,900
Percent of Total Speak only English	89.6%	79.3%
Speak a language other than English	10.4%	20.7%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	7.9%	12.9%
Other Indo-European languages	1.6%	3.7%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	0.4%	3.3%
Other languages	10.6%	0.9%
Speak English less than "very well"	3.7%	8.6%
* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual su characteristics during this period.	rveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are re	presentative of average

Percent of Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



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

Language Spoken at nome, Coefficients of Varia	ation	
	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	0%	0%
Speak only English	1%	0%
Speak a language other than English	4%	0%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	5%	0%
Other Indo-European languages	26%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	21%	0%
Other languages	19%	1%
Speak English less than "very well"	8%	0%
Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation		
Speak only English	0%	0%
Speak a language other than English	4%	0%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	5%	0%
Other Indo-European languages	27%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	14%	0%
Other languages	22%	0%
	99/	0%

# Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# What languages are spoken? 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.

/hy is it important? For public land managers who are trying to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent to public lands, it is important to know wh a significant protor of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implement may need to be conducted in multiple languages.

TROS 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%, it data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest numary another demographics report at latinger 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: mix.org/map\_single <sup>(13)</sup>.



What are the main housing characteristics?	

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built

#### Housing Characteristics, 2013\*

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Total Housing Units	110,838	132,057,804
Occupied	91,349	115,610,216
Vacant	19,489	16,447,588
For rent	1,690	3,230,123
Rented, not occupied	-107	599,884
For sale only	'3,000	1,682,020
Sold, not occupied	'356	608,590
For seasonal, recreational, occasional us	9,628	5,122,778
For migrant workers	"20	34,233
Other vacant	4,688	5,169,960
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	356	771,765
Built 2000 to 2004	30,371	19,385,497
Built 1990 to 1999	25,389	18,390,124
Built 1980 to 1989	23,017	18,345,244
Built 1970 to 1979	17,494	21,042,566
Built 1960 to 1969	5,677	14,634,125
Built 1959 or earlier	8,534	39,488,483
Median year structure built*	1990	1976
Percent of Total		
Occupancy		
Occupied	82.4%	87.5%
Vacant	17.6%	12.5%
For rent	'1.5%	2.4%
Rented, not occupied	<b>``0.1%</b>	0.5%
For sale only	2.7%	1.3%
Sold, not occupied	0.3%	0.5%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional	8.7%	3.9%
For migrant workers	0.0%	0.0%
Other vacant	4.2%	3.9%
Year Built		
Built 2005 or later	'0.3%	0.6%
Built 2000 to 2004	27.4%	14.7%
Built 1990 to 1999	22.9%	13.9%
Built 1980 to 1989	20.8%	13.9%
Built 1970 to 1979	15.8%	15.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	5.1%	11.1%
Built 1959 or earlier	7.7%	29.9%

# Median year structure built is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations. "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. More than the structure during this period. More than the structure during this period.

In the 2009-2013 period, Yavapai County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing (17.6%), and the U.S. had the lowest (12.5%).



■Occupied ■Vacant

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

	Yavapai County, 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%
Built 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%

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

Housing

# What are the main housing characteristics?

What do we measure on this page? This bace describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

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 vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other 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,

#### hv is it important?

y to a mulportaint r 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 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 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 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a last rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant to public lands managers in the context of the wildlind-urban in inference, and as an inclustor 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 fine 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

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 nunning another demographics report a la larger geographic scale.

Additional Resources For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see: census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_docr ntation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf (40).

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

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

# Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

	Tavapai County, Az	0.5.	
Owner-occupied housing units with a			
mortgage	37,304	49,820,840	
Monthly cost <15% of household income	5,079	9,215,740	
Monthly cost >30% of household income	16,959	17,636,343	
Specified renter-occupied units	27,446	40,534,516	
Gross rent <15% of household income	3,020	4,355,942	
Gross rent >30% of household income	13,237	19,581,493	
Median monthly mortgage cost*	\$1,312	\$1,540	
Median gross rent <sup>A</sup>	\$847	\$904	

#### Percent of Total

Monthly cost <15% of household income Monthly cost >30% of household income Gross rent <15% of household income 35.4% 10.7% 45.5% Gross rent >0% of household income Gross rent >0% of household income A Median monthy mortgage cost and median gross rent are not available for metrolin - The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted durin characteristics during this period. 48.2% 48.3% non-metro or regional aggregations. ng 2009-2013 and are representative of average

# Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

Yavapai County, AZ

13.6%

- In the 2009-2013 period, Yavapai County, AZ had the highest estimated percent of owner-occupied households where greater than 30% of household income was spent on mortgage costs (45.5%), 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 than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (48.3%), and Yaopai County, AZ had the lowest (48.2%).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs for owner-occupied homes (\$1,540), and Yavapai County, AZ had the lowest (\$1,312).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated monthly gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$904), and Yavapai County, AZ had the lowest (\$847).



Median monthly mortgage cost^ Median gross rent^

Yavapai County, AZ

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

\$0 ÷

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation						
	U.S.					
Owner-occupied housing units with a						
mortgage	2.0%	0.3%				
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%	0.2%				
Gross rent <15% of household income	8.0%	0.3%				
Gross rent >30% of household income	4.5%	0.1%				
Median monthly mortgage cost <sup>A</sup>	1.7%	0.0%				
Median gross rent <sup>A</sup> 1.6%		0.1%				
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%	0.1%				

#### Study Guide and Supplemental Information

# How affordable is housing?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

upied 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

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.

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 acconomic handship is whether housing is alfordable. This page measures housing alfordability in terms of the share of housing 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 alfordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for highly alfordable.

48.3%

35.4%

IIS

U.S.

Iethods
The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as
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%. It data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report as 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/ahs.html <sup>(44)</sup>.

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 affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: realtor.org/research/research/research/nousinginx<sup>(46)</sup>.

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

# Benchmarks

How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.? This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States.

ndi	cators	Yavapai County AZ	U.S.	Yavapai County AZ vs. U.S.
	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	26.5%	10.7%	
s	Median Age (2013*)	50.1	37.3	•
apnic	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	91.9%	74.0%	
louie	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	13.7%	16.6%	
ž	Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013*)	2.1%	0.8%	
	Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*)	39.0%	30.6%	•
	Median Household Income (2013*)	\$42,987	\$53,046	
	Per Capita Income (2013*)	\$25,186	\$28,155	
Ð	Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)	15.8%	15.4%	
	Percent Families Below Poverty (2013*)	10.8%	11.3%	
	Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*)	76.8%	46.6%	-
	Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income (2013*)	19.2%	20.2%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*)	9.8%	14.0%	
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*)	24.2%	28.8%	
ante	Percent Population That Speak English Less Than 'Very Well' (2013*)	3.7%	8.6%	•
Struc	Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*)	8.7%	3.9%	
	Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*)	45.5%	35.4%	
	Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*)	48.2%	48.3%	
				0

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.
 The Yavapai County AZ is most different from the U.S. in Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013'), Population Growt (% change, 2002-031'), and Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Hones (2013).

(v change, 2000 2010), and referred reades that are occupied in terres (2010).

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

Indicators		
	Region	
Population Growth (% 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 (2009*)	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%

# A service of the serv

Study Guide and Supplemental Information
# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

# **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\_guidance\_nepa\_ceg1297.pdf
- 2 <u>www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\_main/</u>
- 3 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf
- 4 <u>www.epa.gov/compliance/ej</u>
- 5 www.stateoftheusa.org
- 6 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx
- 7 www.frey-demographer.org
- 8 <u>www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\_statistics/index.aspx</u>
- 9 www.census.gov/popest/
- 10 www.countyhealthrankings.org/
- 11 www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx
- 12 www.census.gov/population/age/
- 13 www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf
- 14 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx
- 15 <u>www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html</u>
- 16 <u>www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\_1997standards</u>
- 17 www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf
- 18 http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- 19 www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart
- 20 www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\_cspan\_hispanics.pdf
- 21 www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\_10pg.pdf
- 22 www.bia.gov/index.htm
- 23 www.indians.org/index.html
- 24 www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml
- 25 www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html
- 26 www.bls.gov/soc/
- 27 www.bls.gov/oco/
- 28 www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf
- 29 www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf
- 30 www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf
- 31 www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf
- 32 www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm
- 33 www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator
- 34 https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en
- 35 www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx
- 36 www.npc.umich.edu/poverty
- 37 www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html
- 38 www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity
- 39 www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html
- 40 www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf
- 41 www.bls.gov/emp/ep\_chart\_001.htm
- 42 www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf
- 43 www.mla.org/map\_single
- 44 www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html
- 45 <u>www.zillow.com</u>
- 46 www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx

# **A Profile of Land Use**

Yavapai County AZ

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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
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

## 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



lamakon Spilen (GB) bols. Tau primary GE delawih w

## Land Ownership

What are the different types of Forest Service lands? 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	
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 Wilderness	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 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 Refuges are r Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the different types of Forest Service lands?

# 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? These data allow the user to see the range and scale of Forest Service land designations. This information is a useful way to see whether any Forest Service lands have special designations that may affect management considerations. Different types of designation may impact the economic value and uses of associated lands.

ethods Courty socilic 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/statf/lar/2009/lar08index.html<sup>49</sup>.

Forest Service Land Areas Report definitions of terms are available at: fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm<sup>(5)</sup>.

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

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





•Туре А вТуре В КТуре С

## dy Guide and Suppl

Lare the different types of federal lands? at do we measure on this page? This page describes the size (in across) and share of federal judic! lands managed for various purposes under differing statutory authorin For purposes of the social, federal public lands have been differing below as Type A, B, or C in order to more easily distinguish lands according to primary or common uses and/or conservation functions, achivities, permitted transportation uses, and whether they have a special destraintic of the howing C-argorization alarchi).

Type A loads tend to have note managelial and communications on metations that Type C loads, represent an matter proportion of load lend. Type B loads are shift being that the second second

As more popularly described: Type A lands are areas having uncommon bio-physical and/or cultural character worth preserving; Type B lands are areas with limited development and motorized transportation worth preserving; and Type C lands are areas where the landscape may be altered within the objectives and quidelines of multiple use.

(i) it important for it important some proce of foreir public lands, such as National Parks and Wildemess, have been shown to be associated with above memory economic synds. While here classifications by themselves do not guarantee economic growth, when combined with other factors, such as an educated workforce and access to major markets via airports, they have been shown to be statistically significant predictors of growth.

hoods The classifications effered on this page are not absolute categories. They are categories of relative degrees of management priority, categorized by land designation. Lands such as Wildeness and National Monuments, for example, are generably more likely to or 0 and managed for conservation and restration, worr hough there may exist exections (and a National Monument are more likely to also commercial achieves and ELM lands whole designations such as Wildeness or National Monument are more likely to also commercial achieves (a, juning, timeth havered), even hough to have an exections.

Land defined as either Type A. B. or C includes areas managed by the National Park Sarvice, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Finh and Wildle Service. Lands administent by other feetal agencies (including the Amy Cape) of Engineers and Readmands. Despinement of Readmands in Despinement of Readmands in Despinement of Readmand and Despineers and Read Despineers and Readmand Readmand Despineers and Readmand Readmand Despineers and Readman

Initional Resources Studies, articles and literature reviews on the economic contribution of protected public lands are available from: headwaterseconomics.org/protected/ands.php<sup>48</sup>.

See also: Lorah, P. and R. Southwick. 2003. "Environmental Protection, Population Change, and Economic Development in the Rural Western United Stater' Population and Environment. 24(3): 255-272, and Holmes, P. and W. Hecox. 2002. "Does Wilderness Impoverbin Rural Areas?" International Journal of Wolferness. 10(3): 34-39.

For an analysis on the effect on local economies, in particular on resource-based industries, from Wilderness designations, see: Duffy-Deno, K. T. 1998. "The Effect of Foderal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." Journal of Regional Science. 39(1): 109-136.

For the results of a national survey of residents in counties with Wilderness, see: Rudzitis, G. and H.E. Johansen. 1991. "How Imp Wilderness? Results from a United States Survey." Environmental Management. 15(2): 227-233.

For analysis of the role of transportation in high-amenity areas, see: Rasker, R., P.H. Gude, J.A. Gude, J. van den Noort. 2009. "The Economic Importance of Air Travel in High-Amenity Rural Areas." Journal of Rural Studies. 25(2009): 343-353.

a So

Raker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207: U.S. Gedogical Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3 Study Guide

Data Sources: Rasker, R. 2006. "An Exploration Into the Economic Impact of Industrial Development Versus Conservation on Western Public Lands." Society and Natural Resources. 19(3): 191-207; U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program. 2012. Protected Areas: Database of the United States (PADUS) version 1.3







# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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.
- USDA, Forest Service
   Land Areas Report 2009, Oracle LAR Database
   <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html</u>
- Protected Areas Database v 1.3 2012 U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- MODIS Land Cover Type 2006
   National Aeronautics and Space Administration
   <a href="http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm">http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/landcover.htm</a>

# **Methods**

## 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/tgrshp2012/tgrshp2012.html
- 2 gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/
- 3 www.nhd.usgs.gov
- 4 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/2009/lar09index.html
- 5 www.fs.fed.us/land/staff/lar/definitions\_of\_terms.htm
- 6 headwaterseconomics.org/protectedlands.php
- 7 http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- 8 <u>www.landcover.usgs.gov/landcoverdata.php</u>

# **A Profile of Federal Land Payments**

**Yavapai County AZ** 

Produced by Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit EPS-HDT March 18, 2015

# **About EPS-HDT**

# 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 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	1
What are rederariand payments:	1
How are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments? How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated	2
to unrestricted and restricted uses?	3
How important are federal land payments to state and local governments? How important are federal land payments to state and local governments	4
(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



What are federal land payments?

**Federal Land Payments** 

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## hat are federal land payments

## What do we measure on this page?

tat do we measure on this page? This page describes all federal large hayments distributed to state and local governments by the geography of origin. <u>Federal and payments</u>: These are federal payments that compensate state and local governments for non-taxable federal lands within their borders. Payments are funded by federal appropriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) and from receipts received by federal agenoriations (e.g., PLIT) is based on a maximum per-aproper payment reduced by the sum of all revenue sharing payments and subject to a population cap. <u>Forest Service Revenues Sharing</u>: These are payments based on USFS receipts and must be used for count yrads and local schools. 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 through the Taylor Grazing Act and timber receipts generated on Oregon and California (0 & C) grant lands. <u>USEVXS Raluga</u>, these payments sine a portion of receipts from National Wildlie Reluge and other areas managed by the USFWS directly with the counties in which they are located. Executed States and they are located. Executed States and the states are provided to state governments by the U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. States may afters, at their discrition, a portion of revenues with the local governments where insplates were generated. Executed Terminal Value: The resources and the locate Internet where insplates were generated. Executed Terminal Value: The relevant bit the local posteriments where insplates were generated.

### hy is it important?

y is a important? State and local government 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 presence of federal lands. These programs can represent a significant portion of local government thremun in rural counties with large ledenal 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 detrait revenue haring programs. PILT was instead to basilitize and increase federal and payments to courd governments. Nore recently, the Recure Rurd Schools and Community SetDetermination Act of 2000 (1985) decoupled USFS payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several major concerns around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment lowel, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the payments from commercial receipts. SRS received broad support because it addressed several indices of around receipt-based programs-volatility, the payment wells, and the incremines provided to counties by inking lederal fard payments directly in the structure set of the structure of the structure of the structure services of the structure servi eceipt-based programs e uses of public lands.

PILT and SRS each received a significant increase in federal appropriations in FY 2008 through the Emergency Economic Stabilization A 2008. Despite the increased appropriations, SRS is authorized only through FY 2011, PILT only through FY 2012, and federal budget co are creating uncertainty for the future of both. ion Act of

### hods

thtods Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and some states that make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments. Significance of Data Limitations: USFWS data limitations are instaively insignificant at the idental 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 local governments with significant USFWS acreage. Federal mineral royatiles represent a more significant ontision in states that share a portion of royaties with local governments. Federal mineral royatiles made up 68% of lederal land payments in the U.S. in FFY 2008.

toyational 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 Mountian Research Station,
USDA Forest Service, Missoula, M.T.
Gorte, Ross W. M. Lynne Com, and Carol Hardy Vincent. 1999. Federal Land Management Agencies' Permanently Appropriated Accounts.
Congressional Research Station, Bergori EL, Socky Manutan, Research Station,
tops and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socieconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at
headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.
For data on federal and ownership, see the EPS-HDT Land Use report at headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdf<sup>(1)</sup>.

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 Managament, 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.;
Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to state and local govern nts This page describes how federal land payments are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origi

# Distribution of Federal Land Payments to State and Local Governments by Geography of Origin

	Yavapai County, AZ	
otal Federal Land Payments by		
Seography of Origin (\$)	5,570,313	2,787,139,55
State Government	0	2,005,231,997
County Government	4,156,095	616,271,004
Local School Districts	1,017,395	113,488,835
RACs	330.653	33.302.236
Grazing Districts	66,169	12,684,340
Percent of Total		
State Government	0.0%	71.9%
County Government	74.6%	22.1%
Local School Districts	18.3%	4.1%



Grazing Districts RACs ELOCAI School Districts
 ELocal School Districts
 State Government

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lisu 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. Other of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to state and local governments?

What do we measure on this page? This page describes how federal land payments are distributed to state and local governments by geography of origin.

by 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 sample, PLIT is deviced to occurry government only, while USFS payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments decline, the PLIT formula ensures that county government payments are shared between county government and schods. If USFS payments, While PLIT and SRS have decoupled local government payments from commercial activities on public lands, all the federal land payments delivered to state government (mineral royalities, BLI hreenue sharing payments) are still linked directly to how public lands are managed. This means state legislators and governors have a different set of expectations and incentives to tobby for particular outcomes on public lands fram do county commissioners or school officials.

thods State Government Distributions: Consist of: (1) lederal mineral royalises and (2) portions BLM revenue sharing. States make subsequent distributions to local government according to state and lederal statute (see note about data limitations). <u>Country Government Distributions:</u> Consist of (1) PILT: (2) portions of Forest Service apprents including Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR5) Title 1 and Title III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: (4) BLM Bankhead-Jones; (4) USFW S Refuge revenue sharing; and (5) discriptional state and the III, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands: Local School District Distributions: Consist of portions of SRS Title 1, 25% Fund, and Forest Grasslands.

# Resource Advisory Council (RACI Distributions: Consist of SRS Trife II. These funds are retained by the Federal Treasury to be used on put and projects on the national literat or BLM land where the payment originated. Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provide advice and ecommendations to the Forest Service on the development and implementation of apolal projects on Rebra lands as authorized under the Becure Rula Schools Act and Community Self-Determination Act, Public Law 110-343. Each RAC consists of 15 propie representing value intensis and areas of operation, who wich calaboratively to improve working relationships among community members and national lorest

<u>Grazing District Distributions</u>: Consist of BLM Taylor Grazing Act payments. <u>Data Limitations</u>: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be underreported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states made discretionary distributions of inviend regulaties and score 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 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 importa jobs and income) of these activities, see the EPS-HDT Socioeconomic Measures report and other industry specific reports at headwaterseconomics or glose-hei<sup>10</sup>. ortance (in terms of

### Data Sources

ia 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/spe-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses? This page describes the amount of money distributed to county governments (federal land payments distribut school districts, grazing districts, and RACs are excluded) based on the permitted uses of federal land payme ed to the state

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

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Land Payments to County		
Government (\$)	4,156,095	616,271,004
Unrestricted	2,960,656	457,219,872
Restricted-County Roads	1,017,395	143,265,915
Restricted-Special County Projects	178,044	15,785,217
Percent of Total		
Unrestricted	71.2%	74.2%
Restricted-County Roads	24.5%	23.2%
Restricted-Special County Projects	4.3%	2.6%



100%

80% 60% 40% 20% 0% ----- Restricted-Special County Projects

## Allocation of Federal Land Payments to County Governments by Permitted Use, FY 2013

In FY 2013, unrestricted federal land payments were the largest type of payment to the county government in Yavapai County AZ (71.2%), and restricted-special county projects were the smallest (4.3%).

Yavapai County, AZ U.S Restricted-Special County Projects Restricted-County Roads

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Departmer Agriculture. 2008. 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 Wildline Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www. hadvaterescontracies.org/sp-bid. ent of ent of

Unrestricted

### tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

w are federal land payments distributed to county governments allocated to unrestricted and restricted uses?

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

### Vhy is it important?

(s) is important?
County governments can incur a number of costs associated with activities that take place on federal public lands within their boundaries. For exemple, counties must maintain county roads used by logging trucks and recreational traffic traveling to and from federal lands, and they must pay for law enforcement and emergency services associated with public lands. Several federal land payment programs, particularly those from the Forest Service, are specifically targeted to help pay for these costs.

sist of (1) PILT, (2) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Revenue Sharing, and (3) any distrbutions of federal mineral

Interditcied: Consist of (1) PLIT, [2] U.S. Fish and virusing Service results in the service results of (1) PLIT, [2] U.S. Fish and virusing Service results and the service service 25% setticited-County Reads: Consist of (1) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS) Trile I, (2) Forest Service 25% and (3) Forest Service OV payments (between 1933 and 2000 only), and (4) Forest Grasslands. Federal law mandates payments be used roomry reads and public schools. Each state determines how to split funds between he two services. setticited-Specific County Projects: Consist of (1) SRS Trill III India that are distributed to county government for use on specific projects, ch as Filewise Communities projects, reimbursement for emergency services provided on federal land, and developing community wildlife

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 ailable)

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

### Data S Sources

Ia Sources US. 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.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/ops-hdt

## **Federal Land Payments**

How important are federal land payments to state and local gov nts This page describes federal land payments as a proportion of total county and state gove nent ge

From FY 1987 to FY 2007, federal land payments shrank from 3.4 to 1.4 percent of total general government revenue, a decrease of 59 percent.

### deral Land Payments as a Share of Total General Government Revenue, Thousands of FY 2007 (2013 \$s)

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Total General Revenue	183,246	na
Taxes	69,238	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	96,216	na
Total Charges	5,238	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	12,554	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	2,570	3,312,736
Percent of Total		
Taxes	37.8%	na
Intergovernmental Revenue	52.5%	na
Total Charges	2.9%	na
All Other (Miscellaneous)	6.9%	na
Federal Land Payments (FY 2007)	1.4%	na

# Federal Land Payments per FY, Percent of Total General Government Revenue, Yavapai County AZ







Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2014. Census Bureau, Governments Division, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Depart of Interior. 2009. Payments in Liau of Taxee (PLUT), Washington D.C.; U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Services Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2008 Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2007. U.S. Frish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resour Newnus. Washington, D.C.; Additional Sources and methods available at www. headvaterscommics orgiges-hd

## udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## w important are federal land payments to state and local governments?

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 (FV) 2007. Federal land payments reported for FY 2006 are received by state and local government during FY 2007. Interaction Table: Census of Government county financial statistics are based on a national 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 for the latest year.

Taxes: All taxes collected by state and local governments, including property, sales, and income tax. <u>Intergovernmental Revenue</u>: Payments, grants, and distributions from other governments, including Ideral education, health care, and transportation assistance to state governments, and state assistance to local governments. <u>Tatal Charges</u>: Charges imposed for providing ourrent services, including social services, library, and clerk and recorder charges. <u>All Other (Missioneus</u>): All other general government revenue from their own iscurces.

### v is it important?

() In important is 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 revenue stream. Counties must dependent on federal land payments are a effected most by changes in distribution and funding levels. For these counties, volatility and uncertainty makes budgeting and planning difficult.

thods
Regarding Period: The Census of Government FY covers the period July1 to June 30 for most states and counties and does not match the federal FV beginning October 1 and ending September 31. Federal land payments reported for the current FY are often distributed to counties during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opaments authorized and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the following FV. For semanding. Forest Service opaments subnotzed and appropriated for FV 2007 are delivered to counties in January of 2008, during the Census of Government FV 2008. To correct for the different reporting periods, federal land payments allocated in FY 2008 are compared to Local government revenue received in FY 2007.
Federal Land Payments Data Limitations: Local government distributions of federal land payments may be undersported due to data limitations from USFWS, ONRR, and from states (some states make discretionary distributions of mineral royatiles and some BLM payments, and these data may not be available).

<u>Census of Governments Data Limitations</u>: (1) county linancial statistics may not match local government linancial reports for three main reasons; (a) The Genus of Government defines the general county government as the aggregation of the parent (county) government and all agenesis, institutions, and authorities connected to it (including government and quasi-government) entities). This may differ from the way to governments define themselves for budgeting purposes; (b) different reporting periods between the Genus of Governments financial year and the introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of the different and governments was a Governments for SMS and introduce server. (b) the late publishes defines of Governments was PY 2007, blocks the recom knowes in payments from SMS and PILT, and (3) federal land payments data limitations may under-represent the importance of federal land payments relative to other source of country everue.

### dditional Resources

ULUS. Censis Bureau State and Local Government Finance statistics can be downloaded at: census gov/govs/estimatel<sup>(2)</sup>. 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/gova<sup>(2)</sup>. Schuster, Ervin G. and Krista M. Gebert. 2001. Property Tax Equivalency on Federal Resource Management Lands. Journal of Forestry. May

Schutzter, Errin Lo and Initia in General Loor, Index, Index, Internet, Internet, Errich Long, Internet, Index, In

### Data Sources

ta OULIVES 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 Apriculture. 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 Wildle 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 Wildle 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.hashwatersconnics.org/ep-bdt





## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information

## What are Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)?

# 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 compensate 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 Dase payment' that is reduced by the amount of revenue sharing payments and is subject to appouldance;

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 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 full payment amounts (FY 2008 to FY 2012 payments).

Vhy is it important? As county payments became more important to local government after WWII (largely due to high timber extaction levels to fuel the post-war housing and economic growth), volatility became an issue. PLT increased and stabilized payments by funding counties from congressional appropriations rather than directly from commodity receipts. PLT payments are also important because they are not restricted to particular local government services, but can be used at the direction of county commissiones 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/nbc/index.cfm<sup>(4)</sup>.

Schuster, Ervin 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 U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), Washington D.C.

## **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is Forest Service Revenue Sharing? 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)



Title I Title II Title III 25% Fund Forest Grasslands Special Acts

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

### udy Guide and Supplemental Information hat is Forest Service Re nue Sharing'

## What do we measure on this page?

This pa cribes Fo . ue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act

This page describes Forest Service revenue sharing programs, including the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SR), 25K, https://dx.and.forest/Grasslands. U.S. Forest Service <u>25 Percent Func</u>: The <u>25K</u> Fund, established in 1908, shares revenue generated from the sale of commodities produced on public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with the courty where the activities take place. Twenty-they percent of the value of public land with schools and fund schools. States determine how to allocate receipts between these two local services. The <u>Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act</u> d 2000 (SRS) or Public Lan Vio-303: SRS was enacted in FX 2001 to provide 5 years of transitional assistance to rural counting affected by the decline in revenue from timber harvests on federal lands. SRS was reauthorized for a single year in 2007, and again in 2008 for a period of lour 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 schoots. States determine the split between these two services, and some states is the counties decide.
 Title I - these funds are retained by the federal treasury to be used on special projects on federal land. Resource advisory committees (RACs) at the community level help make specifing determinations and monitor project progress.
 Title II - these spayments 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 wildline protection plans.

What is the Relationship Between the 25% Fund and SRS2 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. <u>Forest Grasslands</u>: 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. 577g), payments associated with the Quinault Special Management Area in Washington (PL. 100-638, 102 Stat. 3327), and receipts from the sale of quarts from the Quachita National Forest in Arbanas (842, 300 Not State), and the Arbanas (Stat. 3327) and the Arbanas (Stat. 374). Payments to Minnesota provides a special payment (75% of the appraised value) for lands in the Boundary Waters Cance Area in St. Louis, Cook, and Lake counties. The Forest Service shares 45 percent of timber receipts from the Outnault Special Management Area with both PoUnault Indian The and with the State of Washington. Congress directed the Forest Service to sell quarts from the Outachita National Forest as common variety mineral materials (rather than being available under the 1872 General Mining Law), with 50 percent of the receipts to Arkanas counties with Outachita National Forest lands for roads and schools.

### hy is it important?

USES memory battering is the largest source of federal land payments to counties on a national basis (federal mineral royslites are distributed to states). For some counties it provides a significant portion of total local government revenue. Payments became important after WWII when timber harvesto on the National Ferests increased sharply in response to post-was housing and economic growth.

As the timber economy shifted and ideas about public land management changed, harvests declined and county payments along with it. Congress addressed these changes by authorizing "owi" 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 sharing in three fundament ways: SRS (1) does county payments from National Forest needpts traditionally dominated by timber, (2) introduced new purposes of restoration and stewards through Titel II funds that pay' for projects on public lands, and (3) addressed payment quily concerns by adjusting county and school payments based on economic need (the Title 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 to expire. It SRS expires, counties will again receive payments from the 25% Fund, recoupling payments directly to commercial activities on public land.

### dditional Resources

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determ tion Act payments available at: fs.usda.gov/pts/ 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 Agriculture. 2009. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and methods available at www.headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt Study Guide

## **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What is BLM Revenue Sharing?

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

## 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
Title II	0	3,343,873
Title III	0	2.600.648
Percent of Total		
Proceeds or 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%
Title II	0.0%	5.0%
Title III	0.09/	2.09/



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Interior. 2009. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.; Additional sources and

rseconomics.org/eps-hdt

methods available at www.head

## tudy Guide and Supplemental Information Vhat is BLM Revenue Sharing?

What do we measure on this page? 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. <u>Proceeds of Sales</u>: These include receipts from the sale of land and materials. <u>Include regarder</u> Act: These include OI and Gas Right of Way lases nervenue and the National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska Lands. These do not include regardise workshet 10.

payments see worksneet to. Tavide Chairund Auf, 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. Funds are restricted to use for range improvements (e.g., predetor contrd, noisous weed programs) in cooperation with BLM of livestock organizations. • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the • Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act concerns spraing grazing leases on public lands within grazing district established under the Act.

Nuc. 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 California 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 SeliDetermination Act. Amounts include Title I, Title II, and Title III payments (see the Forest Service revenue sharing section in this report for definitions and information on the Secure Rural Schools and Community Seli-Determination Act).

Vhy is it important? The BLM is the nation's targest land owner, and activities that take place on BLM lands can be extremely important to adjacent commu Similarly, the non-tanable status of BLM lands is important to local government who must provide services to county residents, and pro public safety and law enforcement activities on BLM lands. BLM revenue sharing programs provide resources to local governments in I property taxes (and these revenue sharing dollars are supplemented by PILT). dents, and provide overnments in lieu of

xthod 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. FRD 198 is not available for some years, so the FRD 196 report i used. To arrive at distribution amounts from receipts, the Legal Allocation of BLM Receipts (Table 3-1 of BLM Public Land Statistics) was used. Some environ is filley. In addition, some data are usefund directly from states. Distribution satistics of the to fill and government are related to the provides FV seported distributions (BLM distributions reported for federal FY 2006 are received and reported by state and local government in FY 2006.)

## dditional Resources

BLM Public Land Statistics are available at the Annual Reports and Public Land Statistics web blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html<sup>(6)</sup>.

Information about the Taylor Grazing Act is available at: blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html(7).

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-hdt



## **Federal Land Payment Programs**

What are Federal Mineral Royalties?

This page describes components of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local government

|--|

	Yavapai County, AZ	U.S.
Total Federal Royalty	0	2,001,309,488
Royalties	0	1,784,591,308
Coal	0	353,201,189
Natural Gas	0	498,654,394
Gas Plan Products	0	141,034,611
Oil	0	693,515,903
Other	0	98,185,211
Non-Royalty Revenue	0	216,482,995
Rents	0	22,126,372
Bonus	0	330,986,898
Other Revenues	0	-136,630,275
Geothermal	0	3.659.328
GOMESA	0	235,185
GOMESA Percent of Total Rovalties	0 na	235,185
GOMESA Percent of Total Royalties Coal	0 na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6%
GOMESA Percent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas	0 na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6% 24.9%
GOMESA Percent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products	0 na na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6% 24.9% 7.0%
GOMESA Percent of Total Royalties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil	0 na na na na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6% 24.9% 7.0% 34.7%
GOMESA Percent of Total Royaties Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other	0 na na na na na	235,185 89.2% 24.9% 7.0% 34.7% 4.9%
GOMESA Percent of Total Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue	0 na na na na na na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6% 24.9% 7.0% 34.7% 4.9% 10.8%
GOMESA Percent of Total Royaltios Calar Ban Products Gas Plan Products Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents	0 na na na na na na na	235,185 89,2% 17,6% 24,9% 7,0% 34,7% 4,9% 10,8% 1,1%
GOMESA Percent of Total Coal Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus	0 na na na na na na na na na na	235,185 89,2% 17,6% 24,9% 7,0% 34,7% 4,9% 10,8% 1,1%
GOMESA Percent of Total Royalites Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Other Non Royally Revenue Bennus Other Revenues Cother Re	0 na na na na na na na na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6% 24.9% 34.7% 4.9% 10.8% 1.1% 16.5%
GOMESA Percent of Total Coal Coal Natural Gas Gas Plan Products Oil Other Non-Royalty Revenue Rents Bonus Other Revenues Gedhermal	0 na na na na na na na na na na na na	235,185 89.2% 17.6% 24.9% 34.7% 4.9% 1.1% 1.8% 6.8% 0.2%

## This table shows federal royalties disbursed directly to state and local governments. States may share a portion of their roy with counties. These state "pass through" disbursements are not reported here. See 'Additional Resources'.



udy Guide and Supplemental Information

## Vhat are Federal Mineral Royalties?

### What do we measure on this page?

of federal mineral royalty distributions to state and local governments across geographies, and trends for This page describes the compone the region.

Royalties, rents, and borus payments from mining activities on federal land are shared with the state of origin (49% of revenue is returned to states and 51% is retained by the folderal government). In addition, revenue from geothermal production on tederal lands and a share of royalties from dishone difficult in the Gut difficult of the shared of the difficult ocurry governments. State and local governments determine how to spend their share of folderal mineral royalties within broad federal guidelines (priority must be given to areas socially or eccommically impacted by mineral divergement for planning, construction/maintenance of public calcities, and provision of public aevice).

<u>Boyalities</u>: Royality payments represent a stated share or percentage of the value of the mineral produced. The royality may be an established minimum, a step-scale, or a sliding-scale. A step-scale royality rate increases by steps as the average production on the less increases. A sliding-scale royality rate is based on average production and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat: Seathermat is and stription and applies to all production form the less. A royality is due when production begins. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: Gothermat payments are distributed directly to counties where the activity takes place. <u>Scattermat</u>: <u>Count of where Cherry Scatter</u>, and <u>Towas</u>. <u>Counties where the states are their eligible political subdivisions receiving revenues from the GOMESA Reseas include Alabama, Louisana, Mississippi, and <u>Towas</u>.</u>

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. Bonuess: Leases issued in areas known or believed to contain minerals are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Bonuess represent the cash amount successfully bid to win the rights to a lease. <u>Other Revenues</u>: A disfusement that is not a royally ren, or bonus. Other revenue may include minimum royalties, settlement payments, gas storage fees, estimated payments, recoupments, and fees for sand and gravel used for beach restoration.

## hv is it important?

y is it important / Minent royates 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. Royally revenue helps meet some of these demands. They are also designed to provide an ongoing public benefit from the depletion of non-revensible resources owned by the public.

### thods

Ithods Data Limitations: State governments that receive federal mineral royalty distributions often choose to pass through a share of federal distributions directly to the local government of origin (the location where the royalies were generated). For example, Montana distributes 25 percent of the state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of origin and state governments share of lederal mineral royalies with to county of origin. Because information about royalities by county of these data. Headwates Economics Incides a list of state distribution policy. Inits to data, and contract information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government Financial Data Mintods and Resources document. http://headwates.conomics.org/whytwi-pocretinty/locad/EPS-HDT Federal\_Land Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf.

### Additional Resources

attional Kesources
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 contax information for Western U.S. States in the EPS-HDT Federal, State, and Local Government
Financial Data Methods and Resources document: headwaterseconomics.org/wphw/wp-content/uploads/EPSHDT\_Federal\_Land\_Payments\_Documentation\_1-30-2011.pdf<sup>100</sup>.

For more definitions, see the Glossary of Mineral Terms, Office of Natural Resources Revenue available at: ary.pdf

Data Sources U.S. Department of Interior. 2012. Office of Natural Resources Revenue. Washington, D.C.

# **Data Sources & Methods**

# **Data Sources**

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

• U.S. Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- U.S. Bureau of Land Management U.S. Department of Interior <u>www.blm.gov</u> Tel. 202-208-3801
- U.S. Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture <u>www.fs.fed.us</u> Tel. 800-832-1355

U.S. Department of Interior www.onrr.gov Tel. 303-231-3078

# **Methods**

## 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 userdefined 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.

# For more information about EPS-HDT see:

headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt

# Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

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

- 1 <u>headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt</u>
- 2 www.census.gov/govs/estimate/
- 3 <u>www.census.gov/govs/</u>
- 4 www.doi.gov/nbc/index.cfm
- 5 <u>www.fs.usda.gov/pts/</u>
- 6 www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/Direct\_Links\_to\_Publications/ann\_rpt\_and\_pls.html
- 7 www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/field\_offices/Casper/range/taylor.1.html
- 8 <u>www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/rrs.html</u>
- 9 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
- 11 www.onrr.gov/Stats/pdfdocs/glossary.pdf