Social Assessment of the Four County Area

INTRODUCTION

Big Horn, Johnson, Sheridan, and Washakie counties contain the entirety of the Bighorn National Forest (BNF). The BNF comprising just over a million acres represents a substantial portion of the four counties ranging from less than five percent in Washakie County to almost twenty-five percent for Sheridan County. In addition to employment, the BNF provides commodities, recreation and scenic opportunities for the residents of the four counties. It is obvious that management decisions regarding the BNF for the coming fifteen years will have immediate impacts on the residents of the four counties. This social assessment will provide information that examines these interconnections between the national forest and the residents of the four counties.

The social assessment is composed of three sections. First, a socio-demographic overview is provided. That assessment provides some historical information on the four counties and the major cities within the counties. When available, trend data are provided for the past fifty years. Then a current socio-demographic snapshot of the counties is presented along with data for some of the incorporated areas (generally, population data are very limited for cities of less than 2,500 population). Most of this data is from state and federal sources. Second, based on survey questionnaire data the residents of the four counties are compared in terms of their attitudes regarding management of the (Bighorn National Forest) BNF and in their use of the forest. Third, based on in-depth interviews an overview of opinion leaders is presented along with an appraisal of how various groups depend on forest service management. The report concludes with a brief summary of findings.

SECTION 1: SOCIAL-DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

In the past fifty years each of the counties experienced negative population growth at least once with the largest percent loss occurring in Big Horn (14.3 percent) and Waskakie (14.8 percent). Big Horn, Sheridan and Washakie counties all experienced losses for three of the five decades while Johnson had a negative growth once (the 1980s). In these same five decades, Wyoming experienced a negative growth (-3.8 percent) in the 1980s, which reflected a rapid decline in the energy industry. During the 1970s, Sheridan had the largest gain both in magnitude and percent when the county experienced a net increase of 7,196 (40.3 percent). These data (see Tables 1 and 2) reveal that the population shifts for the four counties containing the Bighorn National Forest has been quite volatile over the past fifty years. This volatility can in part be explained by changes in economies of the counties. On the west side the ever-changing market for sugar beets along with substantial shifts in minerals, particularly oil and gas, account for some the positive and negative population numbers. On the east side a downward slide in agriculture has had some impact on population figures, but much of volatility is due to changes in energy production such as the coal boom in the 1970s for Sheridan and coal bed methane gas production in the late 1990s for Sheridan and Johnson counties. The population ups and downs of the four counties are mirrored by shifts that occurred in the communities within the counties.

Table 1: Population by County from 1950 to 2000

Year	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Waskakie	Total	Wyoming
1950	13,176	4,707	20,185	7,252	45,320	290,529
1960	11,898	5,475	18,989	8,883	45,245	330,066
1970	10,202	5,587	17,852	7,569	41,210	332,416
1980	11,896	6,700	25,048	9,496	53,140	469,557
1990	10,525	6,145	23,562	8,388	48,620	453,588
2000	11,461	7,075	26,560	8,289	53,385	493,782

Table 2: Population Change by County, Big Horn Forest Region and for Wyoming

Decade	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Region Total	Wyoming
1950/1960	-1,278 (-9.7%)	+768 (16.3%)	-1,196 (-5.9%)	+1,631 (22.5%)	-75 (-.2%)	+39,537 (13.6%)
1960/1970	-1,696 (-14.3%)	+112 (2.0%)	-1,137 (-6.0%)	-1,314 (-14.8%)	-4,035 (-8.9%)	+2,350 (.7%)
1970/1980	+1,694 (16.6)	+1,113 (19.9%)	+7,196 (40.3%)	+1,927 (25.5%)	+11,930 (28.9%)	+137,141 (41.3%)
1980/1990	-1,371 (-11.5%)	-555 (-8.3%)	-1,485 (-5.9%)	-1,108 (-11.7%)	-4,520 (-8.5%)	-15,969 (-3.4%)
1990/2000	+936 (8.9%)	+930 (15.1%)	+2,998 (12.7%)	-99 (-1.2%)	+4,765 (9.8%)	+40,194 (8.9%)

Three of the four counties contain one city that represents at least 50 percent or more of the respective county's population. Sheridan City with 15,804 people (59.5 percent of Sheridan County's population) is the largest city in the four county region. Worland in Washakie County and Buffalo in Johnson County contain 63.3 percent and 55.1 percent of their respective county's population. Lovell's population of 2,281 makes it the largest community in Big Horn County (19.9 percent of its population). Greybull follows Lovell with a population of 1,815 (15.8 percent) followed by Basin's population of 1,238 (10.8 percent). All nine incorporated communities represent only 62.7 percent of Big Horn County's population (see Table 3).

Basin, Greybull, Lovell, Manderson in Big Horn County and Clearmont in Sheridan County were smaller in size in 2000 than they were in 1950. All of the cities in the Bighorn region with more than 1,000 population in 2000 (Basin, Greybull, Lovell, Buffalo, Sheridan and Worland) experienced at least one decade of negative population growth.

This negative and positive growth pattern at both the county and municipal level undoubtedly poses unusual problems for these entities in terms of infrastructure, housing, and schools. Also, the possible uncertainty of population growth must pose constraints on municipal and county services. These ups and downs in population growth are reflective of uncertainty in the employment sectors and speak to the vulnerability of the communities to possible forest service shifts in management policies in the coming fifteen years.

Table 3: Population for Selected Communities by Counties, 1950 to 2000

City	2000	1990	1980	1970	1960	1950
Big Horn						
Basin	1,238	1,180	1,349	1,145	1,319	1,220
Burlington	250	184				
Byron	557	470	633	397	417	350
Cowley	560	477	455	366	459	463
Deaver	177	199	178	112	121	118
Frannie	209	148	138	139	171	
Greybull	1,815	1,789	2,277	1,953	2,286	2,262
Lovell	2,281	2,131	2,447	2,371	2,451	2,508
Manderson	104	83	174	117	167	107
Johnson						
Buffalo	3,900	3,302	3,799	3,394	2,907	2,674
Kaycee	249	256	271	272	284	211
Sheridan						
Clearmont	115	119	191	141	154	225
Dayton	678	565	701	396	333	316
Ranchester	701	676	655	208	235	251
Sheridan	15,804	13,900	15,146	10,856	11,651	11,500
Washakie						
Ten Sleep	304	311	407	320	314	289
Worland	5,250	5,742	6,391	5,055	5,806	4,202

Source: Wyoming Department of A & I, Division of Economic Analysis

The population of the four counties in the Bighorn Region is older than the population of Wyoming as a whole. Median age varied from 38.7 for Big Horn County to 43.0 for Johnson County compared to 36.2 for the state of Wyoming. The older population is accounted for by an out migration of young adults and at least for Johnson and Sheridan counties an in migration of

retirees. The out flow of young adults, presumably upon graduation from high school, community college or university education is depicted in all four counties by the shift in population sizes for the age group 20-24 compared to either ages 15-19 or 25-29. For example, population declines from 530 for those 15 to 19 in Johnson County to 229 for those 20-24. This shift of 301 persons from one age cohort to another age cohort is too dramatic to be accounted for by shift in fertility two decades earlier. Interestingly, there seems to be a rebound in population for those 25-29 in all four counties with the greatest rebound occurring in Johnson and Washakie counties (please refer to Table 4). Relative to the State's population age distribution, Johnson and Sheridan counties are under represented from 0-4 through 35-44 age categories and they are over represented in the age categories 45-54 through the top category of 85 and over. Likewise, Big Horn and Washakie counties are over represented in these same older age groups, but the data are more mixed for the younger age groups. For example, Big Horn County is over represented in the under 15 age groups relative to the State while Washakie County is over represented for the age group of 10-14. The age structure, particular at the younger age groups, has implications for the viability of existing educational institutions within the counties while the over representation of population in the older age groups has implications for employment and health sectors of the various counties. As these counties continue to age, the social character of the communities will change with a focus on facilities for an older population including that of recreation.

Table 4: Population Age Distribution by County, Wyoming for 2000

Age	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Wyoming
Under 5	781 (6.8%)	366 (5.2%)	1407 (5.3%)	488 (5.9%)	30,940 (6.3%)
5 to 9	896 (7.8%)	468 (6.6%)	1642 (6.2%)	574 (6.9%)	34,127 (6.9%)
10 to14	982 (8.6%)	512 (7.2%)	1917 (7.2%)	702 (8.5%)	38,376 (7.8%)
15 to 19	965 (8.4%)	530 (7.5%)	2186 (8.2%)	704 (8.5%)	41,903 (8.5%)
20 to 24	495 (4.3%)	229 (3.2%)	1383 (5.2%)	322 (3.9%)	33,455 (6.8%)
25 to 34	1102 (9.6%)	687 (9.7%)	2686 (10.1%)	825 (10.0%)	59,854 (12.1%)
35 to 44	1490 (13.0%)	979 (13.8%)	4025 (15.2%)	1262 (15.2%)	78,765 (16.0%)
45 to 54	1599 (14.0%)	1150 (16.3%)	4427 (16.7%)	1227 (14.8%)	74,079 (15.0%)
55 to 59	645 (5.6%)	476 (6.7%)	1580 (5.9%)	475 (5.7%)	24,935 (5.0%)
60 to 64	581 (5.1%)	403 (5.7 %)	1186 (4.5%)	394 (4.8%)	19,655 (4.0%)
65 to 74	960 (8.4%)	683 (9.7%)	2077 (7.8%)	685 (8.3%)	31,343 (6.3%)
75 to 84	678 (5.9%)	439 (6.2%)	1480 (5.6%)	457 (5.5%)	19,615 (4.0%)
85 & over	287 (2.5%)	153 (2.2%)	564 (2.1%)	174 (2.1%)	6,735 (1.4%)
Median	38.7	43.0	40.6	39.4	36.2

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

Little diversity by either race or ethnicity is present in the four counties (see Table 5). Almost 93 percent of the residents classified themselves as non-Hispanic white in the 2000 census. Among the four, Washakie with 13.8 percent had the largest minority population by percent while Johnson with only 4.3 percent minority population was least diversified by race/ethnicity. Hispanic or Latino was the largest minority group (2,452 or 4.6 percent) in the four counties followed by 461 (.9 percent) American Indians.

Table 5: Race, Hispanic or Latino by County or Municipality, 2000

Location	White	Hispanic	Black	American Indian	Asian	Other	Two or More races
Big Horn Co.	10,527 91.9%	707 6.2%	9 .1%	76 .7%	24 .2%	14 .1%	104 .9%
Lovell	2,020 88.6%	209 9.2%	1 .0%	14 .6%	4 .2%	1 .0%	32 1.4%
Greybull	1,690 93.1%	86 4.7%	2 .1%	12 .7%	7 .4%	0 .0%	18 1.0%
Johnson Co.	6,771 95.7%	148 2.1%	5 .1%	42 .6%	4 .1%	7 .1%	98 1.4%
Buffalo	3,715 95.3%	71 1.8%	4 .1%	31 .8%	2 .1%	7 .2%	70 1.8%
Kaycee	243 97.6%	4 1.6%	0 .0%	2 .8%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%
Sheridan Co.	25,122 94.6%	646 2.4%	44 .2%	306 1.2%	101 .4%	64 .2%	277 1.0%
Big Horn CDP	194 98.0%	3 1.5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 .5%
Dayton	638 94.15	11 1.6%	1 .1%	20 2.9%	3 .4%	0 .0%	5 .7%
Ranchester	618 88.2%	30 4.3%	0 .0%	41 5.8%	0 .0%	3 .4%	9 1.3%
Sheridan	14,926 94.4%	417 2.6%	31 .2%	137 .9%	72 .5%	49 .3%	172 1.1%
Washakie Co.	7,143 86.2%	951 11.5%	8 .1%	37 .4%	57 .7%	4 .0%	89 1.1%
Worland	4,414 84.1%	708 13.5%	3 .1%	21 .4%	43 .8%	1 .0%	60 1.1%
Ten Sleep	300 98.7%	2 .7%	0 .0%	2 .7%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%

Notes: Clarification of categories. Black/African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Hispanic/Latino. Also, for the 2000 census individuals could claim two or more races for the first time.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data, Summary File.

Among the municipalities, Worland had the largest percent of minorities with 15.9 percent while Ten Sleep had the fewest minorities with 1.3 percent. Only Lovell (11.4 percent, mostly Hispanic) and Ranchester (11.8 percent, mostly American Indian) had more than one in ten residents of non-Hispanic white ethnicity or race.

Land Ownership

In 1996 almost six of every ten acres (59.51 percent) in the four county Bighorn Region was under public ownership (federal, state or county agencies). Public ownership varied from a high of 93.83 percent in Big Horn County to a low of 35.07 percent for Sheridan County (see Table 6). The dominant landowner in the Bighorn Region was the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) with 33.39 percent of all land followed by the United States Forest Service (USFS) with 14.32 percent. These two agencies control almost one of every two acres in the four counties. The next largest controller of land in the region was the state of Wyoming (6.52 percent). With such a high percentage of land controlled by public agencies it is obvious that management of these public lands will have effects on the residents of the Bighorn Region, and especially for Big Horn County. Table 13.6 shows sand ownership in the four county area.

Table 13.6: Landownership by County and Bighorn Region in Acres, 1996

Land Owner	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Region
National Park	30,805 (1.53%)				30,805 (.40%)
U.S. Forest Service	351,160 (17.40%)	326,881 (12.26%)	393,627 (24.33%)	36,003 (2.51%)	1,107,671 (14.32%)
Bureau Land Management	1,097,362 (54.36%)	511,002 (19.16%)	48,073 (2.97%)	927,009 (64.68%)	2,583,446 (33.39%)
U.S. Bureau Reclamation	69,614 (3.45%)			1,105 (.08%)	70,719 (.91%)
Wyoming Game & Fish	7,746 (.38%)	12,223 (.46%)	8,507 (.53%)	464 (.03%)	28,940 (.37%)
State of Wyoming	72,083 (3.57%)	219,180 (8.22%)	112,825 (6.97%)	100,105 (6.98%)	504,193 (6.52%)
Other	265,291 (13.14%)	6,780 (.25%)	4,478 (.28%)	1,922 (.13%)	278,471 (3.60%)
Total Public	1,894,061 (93.83%)	1,076,066 (40.35%)	567,510 (35.07%)	1,066,608 (74.42%)	4,604,245 (59.51%)
Private	124,568 (6.17%)	1,591,016 (59.65%)	1,050,677 (64.93%)	366,557 (25.58%)	3,132,818 (40.49%)
Total Land Area	2,018,629	2,667,082	1,618,187	1,433,165	7,737,063
Water	14,233	15,658	1,996	1,031	32,918
Total	2,032,862	2,682,740	1,620,183	1,434,196	7,769,981

Source: Equality State Almanac, 1998.

Sheridan County, in terms of acreage and percentage of the county owned by the USFS, has the largest amount (393,627 acres or 24.33 percent) while Washakie County has the least (36,003 or 2.51 percent). Big Horn County (351,160 acres or 17.40 percent) and Johnson County (326,881 acres or 12.26 percent) also contain sizable USFS holdings.

The large public holdings also have important implications for the distribution of payment in lieu of taxes (PILT) and the Forest Service 25 percent funds. Since the amount and distribution of these funds have varied over time it makes financial planning on the part of county government

more difficult. Furthermore, if these sources of revenue were to decline in the coming fifteen years, counties would be constrained in providing essential services and maintaining existing infrastructures.

SECTION 2: SOCIAL SURVEY RESULTS FOR RESIDENTS IN THE BIGHORN FOUR COUNTY AREA

One objective of the social assessment of the Bighorn National Forest revision plan was to obtain an overview of opinions, attitudes and utilization of the forest by a representative sample of residents in those four counties that contain the forest. This was accomplished through the use of a mail questionnaire.

The questionnaire survey instrument is a modification of a questionnaire that was used in the Medicine Bow Social Assessment, modified in consultation with Bighorn National Forest (BNF) personnel and the Big Horn Mountain Country Coalition (BHMCC). The modified, pretested form, and final questionnaire were made available to both the BNF and BHMCC for further comments. (See Attachment A for a copy of the survey questionnaire.) The final questionnaire was mailed to a probability sample of residents of Big Horn, Johnson, Sheridan and Washakie counties from a sample frame based on telephone listings and property tax roles. 1230 individuals responded, a 51.2 percent response rate, (three additional questionnaires were received several months after the data had been coded and incorporated in computer data files) after three mailings and two postcard reminders. Responses rates were higher in Johnson (55.2 percent) and Sheridan (55.1 percent) than in Big Horn (46.6 percent) and Washakie (43.7 percent).

Demographic profile of respondents:

Males (68.6 percent) are over represented in the sample population. This is in part reflective of the telephone and property tax listings. Median age of respondents was 54.8; 223 (20 percent) of the 1116 respondents who reported both age and length of residence were life-long residents. Median length of residence in the current county of residence was 27.4 years with most residents residing “within the city limits” (681 of 1135 or 60 percent). Another 146 (12.9) respondents resided adjacent to a city while 308 (22.1 percent) indicated that they lived in a rural part of the county. Of the rural residents, 126 (11.1 percent), of all those who responded to the residential location question, noted that they lived on a ranch or farm. More than 9 out of 10 (91.1 percent) indicated that they lived in a house that they owned. The remaining nine percent rented or were managing property that provided housing.

The occupational distribution of the respondents was varied, with 415 of 1161 (35.7 percent) indicating that they were retired. Also, a large number of individuals (150, 20.1 percent) were employed in blue-collar jobs including machinist, mechanic, welder, carpenter, machine operator, truck/bus driver and construction. Among those not retired, the largest single occupational group was that of educators (71 of 746, or 9.5 percent) followed by the 64 (8.6 percent) individuals who noted that their primary occupation to be ranching or farming. One hundred sixteen listed highly trained professional work, such as banking, law, medicine, accounting and so on. Fifty-two individuals were self-employed while 19 managed a business. Another 26 were employees of federal, state or local government. Thirty-six were engaged in clerical or

secretarial work and 53 were involved in sales or, in semi-skilled work such as cooking, day care, building maintenance, or aides (51 individuals).

Among retirees a similar occupational distribution was evident with the single largest occupation being ranching or farming (45, or 10.8 percent) followed by educators (38, or 9.2 percent). There was a larger percent of individuals that indicated that they managed a business (32, or 9.2 percent) than among currently employed individuals. The occupations of the currently employed and those of retirees reflect a wide spread of types of jobs that is representative of the occupational structures of the four counties.

The remainder of the survey questions are analyzed by county and when appropriate by type of residence—city, adjacent to a town or city, rural non-farm or rural farm. About 95 respondents did not answer that question the total (7.7 percent non-response). The non-response is not the same for the county and residence location tables, therefore totals are not presented in the residential location tables except for "most favorite activities."

Respondents' Reasons for Living in the Bighorns

Nine possible reasons along with open-ended options were provided respondents

Table 7: Rank Order of Why Respondents Chose To Live In "This Area" (Rank of Median Score Values)

Reasons	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Proximity to National Forest Lands	4.12 (5)	3.79 (4)	3.13 (4)	3.81 (5)	3.56 (5)
Staying Close to Family	2.85 (3)	4.16 (6)	3.72 (5)	3.47 (4)	3.53 (4)
Close to Work /Employment	4.43 (7)	5.51 (8)	5.50 (8)	4.03 (7)	4.87 (7)
To Avoid Big City Lifestyle	2.41 (2)	2.48 (2)	2.52 (2)	2.23 (1)	2.44 (2)
Because I Can Afford to Live Here	4.86 (8)	6.06 (9)	6.08 (9)	5.49 (8)	5.78 (9)
Proximity to Recreation Opportunities	4.16 (6)	3.90 (5)	3.82 (6)	3.91 (6)	3.90 (6)
For the Wide-open Spaces	2.34 (1)	2.03 (1)	2.45 (1)	2.48 (2)	2.35 (1)
The Climate	5.56 (9)	5.27 (7)	5.27 (7)	5.57 (9)	5.35 (8)
Appreciate Rural Lifestyle	3.14 (4)	2.50 (3)	2.85 (3)	3.02 (3)	2.89 (3)

Respondents were asked to rank order the possible options with one being their first reason and nine for their least important reason for living in the area. The "other option" was noted but not included in this analysis because of small number of respondents (N=189) who indicated an "other" option. Although the median "importance" vary substantially across the four counties, when the median values are ranked there is substantial agreement for Bighorn area residents on factors impacting their decision on where to live. Factors related to bucolic lifestyle such as "for the wide-open space," "to avoid big city lifestyle" or "appreciate rural lifestyle" were ranked 1, 2 or 3 for residents in all four counties except for Big Horn respondents who ranked "staying close to family" as 3rd and "appreciate rural lifestyle" as 4th most important as factors for in living in the Bighorn area.

Likewise there was also substantial agreement that "the climate," "affordability," and being "close to work or employment" were not significant influences on respondents' decision to live in one of the four Bighorn area counties. "Proximity to national forest lands" and "proximity to recreation opportunities" (5th and 6th priority) lagged slightly behind "staying close to family" (4th) as factors affecting location decisions for our respondents. The data reveal differences between the four counties, but the overall pattern of responses in terms of ranked importance is surprisingly similar.

Where residential location was examined, there was substantial variation in the median scores regarding why the respondents chose to live in a given area. The greatest difference of 3.04 for the reason of "close to work or employment" was between rural farm (3.39 median) and rural non-farm (6.43). Differences in median scores were less than one for "to avoid big city lifestyle," "because I can afford to live here," "for the wide-open spaces," and the "climate."

Although there is a great deal of variation in the median scores the ranking of the scores from 1 (lowest value or most important) to 9 (highest value or least important) reveal some uniformities. For example, except for rural farm respondents who ranked "appreciate rural lifestyles" as being most important, respondents in cities, suburbs, and rural non-farm ranked "to avoid big city lifestyle," or "for wide open spaces" as either their first or second choice (rural farm respondents ranked these choices either 2nd or 3rd). Low priorities (according to ranked scores) was given on "because I can afford to live here," and the "climate." All-in-all the ranking of median scores reveal a great deal of consensus with lifestyles issues being ranked as important and issues related to work, affordability and climate as being unimportant. The greatest differences in ranks occurred between the rural non-farm and rural farm respondents for the choice of "close to work or employment with ranks of 9 for rural non-farm compared to 5 for rural farm respondents.

Table 8: Rank Order of Why Respondents Chose To Live In "This Area" By Residence (Rank of Median Score Values)

Reasons	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm
Proximity to National Forest Lands	3.39 (5)	3.31 (5)	3.00 (4)	4.60 (6)
Staying Close to Family	3.13 (3)	3.13 (4)	5.32 (7)	3.33 (4)
Close to Work /Employment	4.63 (7)	4.80 (7)	6.43 (9)	3.39 (5)
To Avoid Big City Lifestyle	2.35 (1)	2.80 (2)	1.92 (2)	2.66 (3)
Because I Can Afford to Live Here	5.29 (9)	6.24 (9)	6.14 (8)	5.82 (9)
Proximity to Recreation Opportunities	3.64 (6)	4.45 (6)	3.29 (5)	5.23 (7)
For the Wide-open Spaces	2.42 (2)	2.72 (1)	1.82 (1)	1.90 (2)
The Climate	5.21 (8)	5.50 (8)	4.97 (6)	5.62 (8)
Appreciate Rural Lifestyle	3.31 (4)	3.02 (3)	2.08 (3)	1.86 (1)

Residents' opinions concerning forest management

Five questions were used to measure opinions concerning how residents thought that the Bighorn National Forest should be managed. Respondents were asked to rate management options from 1 or "strongly agree" to 5 or "strongly disagree." Responses to these five issue areas can be found in Table 9. Generally, people residing in the Bighorn Forest area strongly supported each of the five management options; although some variation in support was apparent across counties.

More than fifty percent of the respondents in each of the four counties checked "strongly agree" to the three statements that the "federal government should include the opinions of the public in making management decisions;" that the "federal government should include the needs and wants of local communities in making long-term management decisions;" and "how the U.S. Forest Service manages the national lands matters to me." For these statements the greatest amount of variation was in regard to "including needs and wants of local communities in making long-term management decisions" with over seven in ten respondents in Big Horn answering "strongly agree" compared to 55 percent of those from Sheridan county. The least amount of variation across counties was on the statement "how the USFS manages the national lands matters to me" where nearly two of three respondents in all four counties answered "strongly agree."

Fifty-five percent of the residents in Washakie responded "strongly agree" to the idea that the "federal government should balance recreation and wilderness uses with commodity uses" compared to about four in ten respondents in the other three counties with the fewest positive responses coming from Sheridan County (38.1 percent). The least amount of agreement across counties was for the fifth item, "the need to conserve natural resources on public forestlands will continue to increase" with the least support found among respondents from Big Horn (24.8 percent) and Washakie (25.5 percent) responding "strongly agree" while nearly one of three residents in Johnson and almost half of Sheridan residents so responded. Generally, there is widespread support for individual and community involvement in forestland management and for the need to balance recreation and wilderness with commodity usage in the forest. Likewise there is a general awareness of the need to conserve natural resources on public forestlands for future generations.

Table 9: Median Opinion Scores Concerning Forest Management* with Percentage checking strongly agree in parenthesis

Opinions	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Federal Government Should Balance Recreation and Wilderness Uses with Commodity Uses	1.18 (44.1%)	1.22 (41.8%)	1.32 (38.1%)	1.00** (55.0%)	1.21 (42.8%)
Federal Government Should Include the Opinions of the Public in Making Management Decisions	1.00** (58.9%)	1.00** (53.9%)	1.00** (57.2%)	1.00** (55.2%)	1.00** (56.8%)
Federal Government Should Include the Needs and Wants of Local Communities in Making long-term Management Decisions	1.00** (70.8%)	1.00** (64.6%)	1.00** (55.2)	1.00** (69.6%)	1.00** (62.0%)
How the U.S. Forest Service Manages the National Lands Matters to Me	1.00** (65.3%)	1.00** (63.7%)	1.00** (66.3%)	1.00** (65.8%)	1.00** (65.6%)
Need to Conserve Natural Resources on Public Forestlands will continue to Increase	1.61 (24.8%)	1.46 (32.8%)	1.10 (46.2%)	1.58 (25.5%)	1.36 (36.7%)

**Opinions ranged from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5).*
***More than fifty percent of the respondents agreed to these management options.*

When these management issues were examined by place of residence, the data reveal that most respondents checked "strongly agreed." More than fifty percent of the respondents checked "strongly agree" to "the federal governmental should include opinions of the public in making management decisions," "the federal government should include the needs and wants of local communities in making long-term management decisions," and "how the U.S. forest service manages the national lands matters to me." On the remaining two management issues a majority checked "strongly agree" or "agree" to "the federal government should balance recreation and wilderness uses with commodity uses," and the "need to conserve natural resources on public forestlands will continue to increase" (please refer to Table 10).

Table 10: Median Opinion Scores Concerning Forest Management By Residence* (With percentage checking strong agree in parenthesis)

Opinions	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Farm
Federal Government Should Balance Recreation and Wilderness Uses with Commodity Uses	1.32 (38.2%)	1.17 (43.7%)	1.16 (45.5%)	1.00** (55.2%)
Federal Government Should Include the Opinions of the Public in Making Management Decisions	1.00** (58.8%)	1.00** (50.7%)	1.00** 61.7%)	1.00** (54.4%)
Federal Government Should Include the Needs and Wants of Local Communities in Making long-term Management Decisions	1.00** (60.2%)	1.00** 64.6%)	1.00** (64.2%)	1.00** (69.6%)
How the U.S. Forest Service Manages the National Lands Matters to Me	1.00** (63.9%)	1.00** (66.7%)	1.00** (70.7%)	1.00** (68.0%)
Need to Conserve Natural Resources on Public Forestlands will continue to Increase	1.26 (40.4%)	1.53 (28.9%)	1.36 (37.6%)	1.45 (34.7%)

**Opinions ranges from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5).*
***Fifty percent or more answered "strongly agree."*

These data suggest that, like the county analysis, respondents regardless of place of residence strongly agree on the need for local participation and consideration of local needs in making forest service management decisions. There is a surprising amount of agreement across residential location, with the greatest differences occurring on the first item (17 percent difference between cities, 38.2 percent, and those living on farms, 55.2 percent) and the last item (11.5 percent difference between city dwellers (40.4 percent) and suburbanites (28.9 percent).

Public Benefits Provided by the Forest Service

Respondents were asked to rank order nine different forest service activities or benefits with one being highest priority and 9 lowest priority. Although there is substantial variation across the nine options, the median scores for the four counties were very similar (see Table 11 for median scores for the nine benefits). For example, residents in Johnson and Sheridan counties ranked "provide and protect sources of water for human use" as their number priority one use while residents in Big Horn and Washakie ranked

this benefit as their second priority, with median scores varying from 1.12 for Sheridan to 1.77 for Big Horn. The ranking flip-flopped on "make sure the forest are available for future use" with Big Horn and Washakie ranking this benefit as their top priority while people in Johnson and Sheridan placed this benefit as their second priority with median scores varying from 1.55 (Washakie and Johnson counties) to 1.73 for Big Horn County (see Table 11).

Table 11: Median Rank of Public Benefits Provided by the Forest Service, With 1 Being the Highest Priority and 9 Lowest Priority

Type of Public Benefit	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Provide and Protect Sources of Water for Human Use	1.77 (2)*	1.31 (1)	1.12 (1)	1.91 (2)	1.40 (1)
Provide Healthy Home for Wildlife	2.51 (3)	2.13 (3)	1.88 (3)	2.58 (3)	2.13 (3)
Provide a Place for People to Relax	3.62 (5)	3.73 (5)	3.33 (4)	3.68 (4)	3.46 (4)
Make Sure the Forest are Available for Future Use	1.73 (1)	1.55 (2)	1.69 (2)	1.55 (1)	1.66 (2)
Support Traditional Ways of Life for Local Communities and Individuals	2.84 (4)	3.63 (4)	5.47 (6)	3.92 (5)	4.01 (5)
Provide Grazing Land for Livestock	5.56 (8)	5.54 (8)	6.63 (8)	5.32 (8)	6.18 (8)
Provide Minerals	6.99 (9)	7.31 (9)	7.55 (9)	6.57 (9)	7.35 (9)
Provide Timber	4.96 (7)	5.5 (7)	5.96 (7)	5.31 (7)	5.64 (7)
Provide Recreational Opportunities	4.08 (6)	4.4 (6)	4.16 (6)	4.03 (6)	4.16 (6)

*The figures in parenthesis are the rank order of the median scores for each county and for the total population.

In all four counties, residents ranked "provide healthy home for wildlife" as their third greatest priority (median scores varied from 1.88 for Sheridan to 3.68 for Washakie). Similarly there was a general agreement for the fourth, fifth and sixth priority with "provide a place for people to relax either being ranked 4th or 5th, and "support traditional ways of life for local communities and individuals ranked 4th, 5th or 6th while "provide recreational opportunities was ranked 5th or 6th.

Although there is some variation in median scores given to the commodity activities there was uniformity in the rank order of the median scores with residents in all four counties ranking "provide timber" at their 7th priority, "provide grazing land for livestock" as their 8th priority and the 9th priority was "provide minerals." Given the differences in

the four counties and the sizeable variation in median scores the ranked priorities are surprisingly similar. There appears to be substantial agreement among respondents in terms of their priority rankings of benefits provided by the forest service.

The median score values reveal substantial variation in values with the greatest gap occurring between city dwellers (6.78) and farmers (4.30) concerning the role of grazing on the national forest. Of course, this should come as no surprise. At the same time there was less than a .68 score difference across counties for three items: "provide a healthy home for wildlife," "support traditional ways of life for local communities and individuals," and "provide recreational opportunities" (please refer to Table 12).

Table 12: Median Score of Public Benefits Provided by the Forest Service By Residence, With 1 Being the Highest Priority and 9 Lowest Priority

(with rank of median scores in parenthesis)

Type of Public Benefit	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-farm	Rural Farm
Provide and Protect Sources of Water for Human Use	1.18 (1)	1.80 (1)	1.36 (1)	2.47 (2)
Provide Healthy Home for Wildlife	1.99 (3)	2.52 (3)	2.02 (3)	2.55 (3)
Provide a Place for People to Relax	3.36 (4)	3.46 (4)	3.52 (4)	4.69 (8)
Make Sure the Forest are Available for Future Use	1.51 (2)	1.91 (2)	1.63 (2)	1.88 (1)
Support Traditional Ways of Life for Local Communities and Individuals	4.05 (5)	3.90 (5)	4.58 (6)	3.38 (4)
Provide Grazing Land for Livestock	6.78 (8)	5.61 (7)	6.28 (8)	4.30 (5)
Provide Minerals	7.43 (9)	7.17 (9)	7.66 (9)	6.91 (9)
Provide Timber	6.09 (7)	5.74 (8)	5.16 (7)	4.42 (6)
Provide Recreational Opportunities	4.11 (6)	4.05 (6)	4.22 (5)	4.50 (7)

Given the range of differences across the median scores of some of the possible public benefits, it is somewhat surprising the degree of commonality among the median score ranks across residential location. For example, respondents from all four residential areas ranked "provide and protect sources of water for human use," and "make sure the forest are available for future use" as either their 1st or 2nd priority and residents in all four

locations ranked "provide a healthy home for wildlife as their 3rd priority and "provide minerals" as their 9th priority. There was significant disagreement regarding the issues of "providing a place for people to relax," which was ranked 4th by city dwellers, suburbanites, and rural non-farm and 8th by farmers. In general issues related to protecting and conserving water and wildlife for now and in the future were given the highest priority and commodity uses ranked towards the bottom. Thus rankings by residential location provide similar rank patterns as the data ranked by county.

Possible Impacts from Shifts in Forest Service Management Decisions

In general residents in Big Horn and Washakie counties reported a higher percentage of negative impacts from possible shifts in management decisions regarding "increased restrictions on grazing," "decrease winter motorized use," "decreased summer motorized use," or "decreased logging." Sheridan residents were the least likely to report negative effects of the possible management changes. (See Tables 13A, 13B and 13C for specifics percentages.) With the exception of a possible "decrease in summer motorized use" about half of the respondents reported that possible shifts in management decisions regarding these issues would have no impact (neither positive or negative) on themselves.

In general Sheridan County respondents were more like to report positive effects of the possible management shifts noted above while residents in Johnson, Big Horn and Washakie were slightly more likely to report negative consequences.

Table 13A: Frequency and Percent of Respondents Reporting Negative Effects From Possible Changes in Forest Service Management Decisions

Type of Management Decisions	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Increased Restrictions on Grazing	67 (29.3%)	56 (29.0%)	79 (13.6%)	56 (30.3%)	258 (21.8%)
Decreased Winter Motorized Use	74 (32.3%)	65 (33.7%)	140 (24.2%)	72 (39.1%)	351 (29.6%)
Decreased Summer Motorized Use	117 (51.1%)	84 (43.5%)	201 (34.8%)	95 (51.6%)	497 (42.0%)
Decreased Logging	90 (39.5%)	53 (27.6%)	137 (23.7%)	63 (34.1%)	343 (29.0%)

Table 13B: Frequency and Percent of Respondents Reporting No Effects From Possible Changes in Forest Service Management Decisions

Type of Management Decisions	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Increased Restrictions on Grazing	120 (52.4%)	95 (49.2%)	313 (54.1%)	97 (52.4%)	625 (52.7%)
Decreased Winter Motorized Use	106 (46.1%)	86 (44.6%)	279 (48.2%)	80 (43.5%)	551 (46.5%)
Decreased Summer Motorized Use	48 (21.0%)	56 (29.0%)	165 (28.5%)	46 (25.0%)	315 (26.6%)
Decreased Logging	108 (47.4%)	103 (53.6%)	298 (51.6%)	84 (45.4%)	593 (50.1%)

Table 13C: Frequency and Percent of Respondents Reporting Positive Effects From Possible Changes in Forest Service Management Decisions

Type of Management Decisions	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Increased Restrictions on Grazing	42 (18.3%)	42 (21.8%)	187 (32.3%)	32 (17.3%)	303 (25.5%)
Decreased Winter Motorized Use	50 (21.7%)	42 (21.8%)	160 (27.6%)	32 (17.4%)	284 (23.9%)
Decreased Summer Motorized Use	64 (27.9%)	53 (27.5%)	212 (36.7%)	43 (23.4%)	372 (31.4%)
Decreased Logging	30 (13.2%)	36 (18.8%)	143 (24.7%)	38 (20.5%)	247 (20.9%)

When queried about possible shifts in forest service management decisions responses varied little across residential locations, with the exception of those living in rural farm areas where 42.6 percent noted that a increased restrictions on grazing would negatively impact them compared to only about one in five respondents living in cities, suburbia or rural non-farm areas (see Table 14A). Between 25 to 35 percent of respondents across residence location indicated a possible negative effect of decreased winter motorize use compared to the 38 percent (rural farm) to 45 percent (suburban and rural non-farm) for those indicating a possible negative impact of decreased summer motorized use. Possible negative effects from a decrease in logging were most often voiced by the rural farm population (35 percent) and least often by those living in suburban areas (23.8 percent).

Table 14A: Frequency and Percent of Respondents Reporting Negative Effects From Possible Changes in Forest Service Management Decisions By Residence

Type of Management Decisions	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm
Increased Restrictions on Grazing	106 (16.0%)	31 (21.7%)	37 (20.6%)	52 (42.6%)
Decreased Winter Motorized Use	189 (28.5%)	52 (36.1%)	52 (28.9%)	33 (27.3%)
Decreased Summer Motorized Use	262 (39.7%)	65 (45.1%)	81 (45.0%)	46 (38.0%)
Decreased Logging	172 (26.1%)	34 (23.8%)	57 (31.7%)	43 (35.0%)

Nearly half of the respondents across residential location, excepting rural farm, noted that shifts management policy in regard to increased restrictions on grazing, decreased winter motorized use and decrease logging would have no discernible impact on themselves (see table 14B). However, only 18.3 percent (rural non-farm) to 28.9 percent (city dwellers) noted a lack of impact from a decreased in summer motorized use.

Table 14B: Frequency and Percent of Respondents Reporting No Effects From Possible Changes in Forest Service Management Decisions By Residence

Type of Management Decisions	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non- Farm	Rural Farm
Increased Restrictions on Grazing	373 (56.3%)	82 (57.3%)	85 (46.7%)	43 (35.2%)
Decreased Winter Motorized Use	320 (48.3%)	58 (40.3%)	77 (42.8%)	63 (52.1%)
Decreased Summer Motorized Use	191 (28.9%)	34 (23.6%)	33 (18.3%)	34 (28.1%)
Decreased Logging	334 (50.8%)	84 (58.7%)	81 (45.0%)	56 (45.5%)

The least amount of variation across residential location occurred when respondents reported positive effects from possible shifts in forest management policies. The largest reported percentages were for possible positive effects of a decreased in summer motorized use, which occurred for all for residential locations. While the lowest positive responses for all four residential areas was for possible decreased logging.

From these data it becomes obvious that residents regardless of residential location are most divisive in terms of positive or negative effects on the issue of decreased summer motorized use and that at least for residents in rural farm areas an increase in restrictions on grazing would involve more negative than positive effects by a two to one ratio. Similarly, those in rural areas voiced many more possible negative than positive effects brought about by decreased logging.

Table 14C: Frequency and Percent of Respondents Reporting Positive Effects From Possible Changes in Forest Service Management Decisions By Residence

Type of Management Decisions	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm
Increased Restrictions on Grazing	183 (27.6%)	30 (21.0%)	58 (32.2%)	27 (22.1%)
Decreased Winter Motorized Use	153 (23.1%)	34 (23.6%)	51 (28.3%)	25 (20.7%)
Decreased Summer Motorized Use	207 (31.4%)	45 (31.3%)	66 (36.7%)	41 (33.9%)
Decreased Logging	152 (23.1%)	25 (17.5%)	42 (23.3%)	24 (19.5%)

Favorite activities on the Bighorn National Forest

An open-ended question that asked respondent to list their three favorite activities or things to do on the Bighorn National Forest provided a number of interesting findings. Fishing, camping/picnicking, and hunting were consistently listed as either first or second favorite activities while “enjoyed the scenery” and “camping/picnicking” were ranked by many as their third favorite mountain activity. Overall of the 3262 activities listed by respondents, fishing with 691 (21.2 percent) was the most often listed activity followed by “camping/picnicking with 586 (18.0 percent) notations. “Enjoyed the scenery” was listed by 478 (14.7 percent) and was comparable in popularity as “hunting” with 474 (14.5 percent) and “hiking/backpacking” with 420 (12.9 percent) notations. Please refer to Tables 15A, 15B, 15C and 15D.

Table 15A: First Favorite Thing to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Number and Percent

Activities	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Fishing	51 (22.3%)	47 (24.4%)	134 (24.3%)	45 (25.6%)	277 (24.1%)
Camping/Picnicking	66 (28.8%)	34 (17.6%)	108 (19.6%)	42 (23.9%)	250 (21.7%)
Hunting	31 (13.5%)	27 (14.0%)	72 (13.0%)	34 (19.3%)	164 (14.3%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	33 (14.4%)	27 (14.0%)	62 (11.2%)	13 (7.4%)	135 (11.7%)
Hiking/Backpacking	14 (6.1%)	24 (12.4%)	81 (14.7%)	12 (6.8%)	131 (11.4%)
Snowmobiling	6 (2.6%)	8 (4.1%)	22 (4.0%)	7 (4.0%)	43 (3.7%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	2 (.9%)	3 (1.6%)	19 (3.4%)	4 (2.3%)	28 (2.4%)
ATV/Off Road	3 (1.3%)	4 (2.1%)	10 (1.8%)	5 (2.8%)	22 (1.9%)
Other	23 (10.0%)	19 (9.8%)	44 (7.9%)	14 (8.0%)	100 (8.7%)

Table 15B: Second Favorite Thing to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Number and Percent

Activities	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Fishing	58 (26.6%)	51 (28.0%)	145 (27.2%)	39 (23.2%)	293 (26.6%)
Camping/Picnicking	34 (15.6%)	21 (11.5%)	66 (12.4%)	25 (14.9%)	146 (13.2%)
Hunting	40 (18.3%)	31 (17.0%)	99 (18.5%)	33 (19.6%)	203 (18.4%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	36 (16.5%)	22 (12.1%)	56 (10.5%)	17 (10.1%)	131 (11.9%)
Hiking/Backpacking	16 (7.3%)	26 (14.3%)	91 (17.0%)	24 (14.3%)	157 (14.2%)
Snowmobiling	5 (2.3%)	4 (2.2%)	14 (2.6%)	12 (7.1%)	35 (3.2%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	2 (.9%)	5 (2.7%)	16 (3.0%)	1 (.6%)	24 (2.2%)
ATV/Off Road	5 (2.3%)	2 (1.1%)	13 (2.4%)	3 (1.8%)	23 (2.1%)
Other	22 (10.1%)	20 (10.9%)	34 (6.3%)	14 (8.3%)	90 (8.2%)

Table 15C: Third Favorite Thing to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Number and Percent

Activities	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Fishing	29 (14.6%)	24 (14.4%)	55 (11.2%)	13 (8.4%)	121 (12.0%)
Camping/Picnicking	38 (19.2%)	35 (21.0%)	74 (15.1%)	35 (22.7%)	190 (18.8%)
Hunting	23 (11.6%)	20 (12.0%)	53 (10.8%)	11 (7.1%)	107 (10.6%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	40 (20.2%)	33 (19.8%)	102 (20.8%)	37 (24.0%)	212 (21.0%)
Hiking/Backpacking	17 (8.6%)	21 (12.6%)	74 (15.1%)	20 (13.0%)	132 (13.1%)
Snowmobiling	8 (4.0%)	9 (5.4%)	23 (4.7%)	7 (4.5%)	47 (4.7%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	7 (3.5%)	7 (4.2%)	21 (4.3%)	3 (1.9%)	38 (3.8%)
ATV/Off Road	6 (3.0%)	2 (1.2%)	14 (2.9%)	5 (3.2%)	27 (2.7%)
Other	30 (15.1%)	16 (9.9%)	67 (13.6%)	23 (14.9%)	136 (13.5%)

In general, fewer than five percent of the respondents listed “snowmobiling,” “skiing/snowshoeing,” or “ATV/off road” among their three favorite mountain activities. Also, the low involvement in these activities did not vary much across the four counties with snowmobiling being slightly more popular than either skiing/snowshoeing or ATV/off road activities.

Table 15 D: Three Most Favorite Things to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Number and Percent

Activities	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Fishing	138 (21.4)	122 (22.5)	334 (21.2)	97 (19.5)	691 (21.2)
Camping/Picnicking	138 (21.4)	90 (16.6)	256 (16.2)	102 (20.5)	586 (18.0)
Hunting	94 (14.6)	78 (14.4)	224 (14.2)	78 (15.7)	474 (14.5)
Enjoyed the Scenery	109 (16.9)	82 (15.1)	220 (14.0)	67 (13.5)	478 (14.7)
Hiking/Backpacking	47 (7.3)	71 (13.1)	246 (15.6)	56 (11.2)	420 (12.9)
Snowmobiling	19 (2.9)	21 (3.9)	59 (3.7)	26 (5.2)	125 (3.8)
Skiing/snowshoeing	11 (1.7)	15 (2.8)	56 (3.6)	8 (1.6)	90 (2.8)
ATV/Off Road	14 (2.2)	8 (1.5)	37 (2.3)	13 (2.6)	72 (2.2)
Other	75 (11.6)	55 (10.1)	145 (9.2)	51 (10.2)	326 (10.0)
Total	645	542	1577	498	3262

Fishing was the favorite activity to do on the Bighorn National Forest for all four residential areas in terms of their first and second choices and for the total of all three choices. Likewise camping and picnicking was the second most favorite activity across the four residential areas. Although selected frequently, hunting, hiking/backpacking and enjoyed the scenery varied across residential location with rural farm respondents more likely to select hunting and less likely to be hikers or backpackers while city respondents were more likely to have noted enjoying the scenery and less likely to go hunting. Suburban dwellers were mostly likely to be hikers or backpackers.

Snowmobiling, skiing/snowshoeing, and ATV off road activities were not very often among the top three recreational activities, with none of the three being cited by even seven percent of the respondents. There were few differences across residential location for these three activities other than suburbanites, who were more likely to be snowmobilers. The other category was very diverse with horseback riding, photography, painting/drawing and rock collecting being cited most often.

Table 16A: First Favorite Thing to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Residence and Number and Percent

Activities	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non- Farm	Rural Farm	Total
Fishing	160 (25.7%)	27 (19.4%)	41 (23.6%)	25 (20.3%)	253 (23.4%)
Camping/Picnicking	154 (23.8%)	34 (24.5%)	30 (17.2%)	22 (17.9%)	240 (22.2%
Hunting	83 (12.8%)	24 (17.3%)	32 (18.4%)	24 (19.5%)	163 (15.1%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	78 (12.1%)	12 (8.6%)	18 (10.3%)	15 (12.2%)	123 (11.4%)
Hiking/Backpacking	78 (12.1%)	18 (12.9%)	18 (10.3%)	10 (8.1%)	124 (11.4%)
Snowmobiling	16 (2.5%)	9 (6.5%)	8 (4.6%)	6 (4.9%)	39 (3.6%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	16 (2.5%)	5 (3.6%)	5 (2.9%)	1 (.8%)	27 (2.5%)
ATV/Off Road	12 (1.9)	3 (2.2%)	6 (3.4%)	1 (.8%)	22 (2.0%)
Other	50 (7.7%)	7 (5.0%)	16 (9.2%)	19 (15.4%)	92 (8.5%)

Table 16B: Second Favorite Thing to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Residence and Number and Percent

Activities	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non- Farm	Rural Farm	Total
Fishing	155 (24.7%)	37 (26.6%)	51 (29.8%)	31 (27.4%)	274 (26.1%)
Camping/Picnicking	84 (13.4%)	17 (12.2%)	24 (14.0%)	8 (7.1%)	133 (12.7%)
Hunting	110 (17.5%)	28 (20.1%)	26 (15.2%)	23 (20.4%)	187 (17.8%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	82 (13.1%)	9 (6.5%)	19 (11.1%)	14 (12.4%)	124 (11.5%)
Hiking/Backpacking	98 (15.6%)	24 (17.3%)	20 (11.7%)	11 (9.7%)	153 (14.6%)
Snowmobiling	20 (3.2%)	8 (5.8%)	4 (2.3%)	4 (3.5%)	36 (3.4%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	15 (2.4%)	4 (2.9%)	4 (2.3%)	1 (.9%)	24 (2.3%)
ATV/Off Road	7 (1.1%)	5 (3.6%)	5 (2.9%)	6 (5.3%)	23 (2.2%)
Other	56 (9.0%)	7 (5.0%)	18 (10.6%)	15 (13.3%)	96 (9.1%)

Table 16C: Third Favorite Thing to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Residence and Number and Percent

Activities	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non- Farm	Rural Farm	Total
Fishing	71 (11.9%)	16 (12.3%)	16 (9.8%)	9 (8.5%)	112 (11.3%)
Camping/Picnicking	111 (18.6%)	18 (13.8%)	34 (20.7%)	26 (24.5%)	189 (19.0%)
Hunting	59 (9.9%)	8 (6.2%)	19 (11.6%)	11 (10.4%)	97 (9.8%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	123 (20.6%)	36 (27.7%)	25 (15.2%)	17 (16.0%)	201 (20.2%)
Hiking/Backpacking	69 (11.6%)	15 (11.5%)	25 (15.2%)	12 (11.3%)	121 (12.2%)
Snowmobiling	29 (4.9%)	8 (6.2%)	5 (3.0%)	3 (2.8%)	45 (4.5%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	19 (3.2%)	5 (3.8%)	7 (4.3%)	7 (6.6%)	38 (3.8%)
ATV/Off Road	11 (1.3%)	8 (6.2%)	5 (3.0%)	1 (.9%)	25 (2.5%)
Other	104 (17.4%)	14 (12.2%)	28 (17.1%)	20 (18.9%)	166 (16.7%)

Table 16D: First Three Favorite Things to Do On the Bighorn National Forest by Residence and Number and Percent

Activities	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non- Farm	Rural Farm	Total
Fishing	386 (20.6%)	80 (19.7%)	108 (21.2%)	65 (19.0%)	639 (20.4%)
Camping/Picnicking	349 (18.7%)	69 (17.0%)	88 (17.3%)	56 (16.4%)	562 (18.0%)
Hunting	252 (13.5%)	60 (14.8%)	77 (15.1%)	58 (17.0%)	447 (14.3%)
Enjoyed the Scenery	283 (15.1%)	57 (14.0%)	62 (12.1%)	46 (13.5%)	448 (14.3%)
Hiking/Backpacking	245 (13.1%)	57 (14.50	63 (12.4%)	33 (9.6%)	398 (12.7%)
Snowmobiling	65 (3.5%)	25 (6.2%)	17 (3.3%)	13 (3.8%)	120 (3.8%)
Skiing/snowshoeing	50 (2.7%)	14 (3.4%)	16 (3.1%)	9 (2.6%)	89 (2.8%)
ATV/Off Road	30 (1.6%)	16 (3.9%)	16 (3.1%)	8 (2.3%)	70 (2.2%)
Other	210 (11.2%)	28 (6.9%)	62 (12.1%)	54 (15.8%)	354 (11.3%)

Self report of recreational activities on the Bighorn National Forest

Respondents had the opportunity to check off twenty-three different recreational activities as well as provide an estimate of how often they engaged in the activity (this latter data is coded but is not presented in this discussion). The number one recreational activity was "wildlife viewing" selected by 78.4 percent of all those who responded to the last question. "Wildlife viewing" was the most often selected activity for all four counties (with variation from 75.2 percent in Big Horn to 81.8 percent in Johnson County). The second most often activity for all respondents (66.1 percent) was "sightseeing/scenery viewing" was also the second most often activity selected by all four counties (variation of selection ranged from a low of 60.9 in Big Horn to a high of 71.5 percent in Johnson County.

The 3rd and 4th activities selected were "fishing" at 63.0 percent and "picnicking" at 60.2 percent. Here, selection varied a little across counties with "fishing" being the 3rd most often mentioned activity in Johnson and Sheridan counties and was 4th most often mentioned activity in Big Horn and Washakie with these ranking reversed for picnicking (see Table 17).

"Big game hunting" was the 5th most often mentioned activity in Big Horn and Washakie counties while the 5th most often mentioned activity in Sheridan and Johnson counties was "day hiking." None of the other 17 activities received over a 40 percent participation

rate; however, one-fourth to one-third participated in "other camping (dispersed)," "historical site visitation," "camping in campgrounds," and "spiritual/ mental renewal." Please refer to Table 17 for the completed activity participation percentage by county and for the total respondent pool.

Table 17: Percent Engaging in Diverse Recreational Activities on the Big Horn National Forest

Recreational Activities	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Wildlife Viewing	75.2	81.8	79.4	76.0	78.4
Bird/Waterfowl Hunting	13.9	3.1	13.3	11.7	11.5
Small Game Hunting	11.3	8.9	8.5	12.3	9.7
Big Game Hunting	42.2	37.5	33.2	41.3	36.9
Horseback Riding	22.6	23.4	15.8	15.6	18.4
Fishing	57.0	68.6	64.3	60.9	63.0
Four Wheeling/ RV	30.9	20.3	23.3	31.3	25.5
Historical Site Visitation	28.3	25.5	33.8	31.8	31.0
Ice Fishing	5.7	8.3	7.8	8.4	7.6
Backpacking (overnight)	9.1	9.9	17.8	9.5	13.5
Camping in Campgrounds	34.8	20.3	27.9	35.2	29.1
Other Camping (dispersed)	33.5	24.9	33.4	34.6	32.2
Picnicking	59.6	60.7	61.6	55.9	60.2
Day Hiking	34.3	46.1	52.2	38.5	45.6
Downhill Skiing	9.1	13.6	12.8	10.1	11.8
Cross Country Skiing	7.4	14.6	13.3	8.9	11.7
Snowboarding	1.7	4.2	3.0	4.5	3.2
Snowmobiling	11.7	15.6	14.0	13.4	13.7
Boating	11.7	12.0	8.5	12.3	10.3
Rick Climbing	7.4	7.8	8.9	5.0	7.8

Spiritual/ Mental Renewal	19.6	22.8	29.8	24.0	25.8
Sightseeing/Scenery Viewing	60.9	71.5	68.0	61.1	66.1
Other 1	5.7	8.4	6.2	4.5	6.2
Other 2	3.9	2.6	4.3	3.4	3.8
Other 3	1.3	.5	.9	1.1	.9
Other 4	1.3	.2	.2	1.1	.5

Respondent Visitation to the Bighorn by Type of Visit

Respondents were asked about how many times a year on average they traveled to the Bighorn National Forest for the purpose of recreation, business on the other side of the forest, or for commerce on the forest. These data are presented in Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18: Median Frequency of Visitation to the Bighorn National Forest*

Type of Visit	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Visit for Recreation	7.75	8.90	8.05	7.30	7.80
Travel for Business on the Other Side of the Bighorn National Forest	2.93	2.81	1.96	4.82	2.66
Travel to Bighorn National Forest for the Purpose of Business/Commerce	0*	0*	0*	1.07	.81

* The majority of residents in these counties made no visit on the Bighorn National Forest for the purpose of business or commerce.

Table 19: Number and Percent of Respondents Making No Visits to the Bighorn National Forest During the Past Year

Type of Visit	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
No Visit for Recreation	19 (7.9%)	9 (4.6%)	33 (5.7%)	14 (7.5%)	75 (6.2%)
No Travel for Business on the Other Side of the Bighorn National Forest	36 (15.3%)	37 (19.9%)	162 (28.7%)	22 (12.0%)	257 (22.0%)
No Travel to Bighorn National Forest for the Purpose of Business/Commerce	132 (56.9%)	111 (59.7%)	385 (68.1%)	89 (49.2%)	717 (61.6%)

The median number of visits for recreations was 7.8 times per year with respondents from Johnson County making 8.9 trips compared to the low of 7.3 trips made by Washakie residents. On the other hand, Washakie residents made 4.82 trips per year compared to the low of 1.96 trips for Sheridan resident across the Bighorn Forest for the purpose of business. Only respondents from Washakie County indicated that they traveled on the Bighorn Forest for the purpose of business or commerce more than once during the year.

According to Table 19 almost 19 of every 20 respondents indicated that they visited the Bighorns at least once during 2000 for the purpose of recreation. Residents of Johnson County were most likely while those residing in Washakie or Big Horn were least likely to have made a recreational visit at least once during the year. Sheridan respondents were most likely (28.7 percent) while Washakie (12.0 percent) were least likely to indicate that they travel across the Bighorns for the purpose of business during the past year. Even fewer respondents traveled to the Bighorn National Forest for the purpose of business with 6 of 10 respondents indicating no visits to the Bighorns for the purpose of business or commerce. Only in Washakie was there even a majority of respondents who made one or more trips to the mountains for the purpose of business or commerce.

Things that made latest outing on the Bighorn National Forest Satisfying

A list of twelve activities along with an "open ended response category" were presented to respondents who were asked to check all those things that made their last outing to the mountains a satisfying experience. There was tremendous variation across the twelve "activities" with 96.8 percent checking "enjoyed the countryside" in Johnson County down to 6.3 percent in Sheridan County who checked "appreciated learning about another culture (see Table 20); yet, the distribution of responses across counties is similar by activity.

For example, the top four "activities" by county were the same. The greatest number of respondents in all four counties (94.6 percent) indicated that they "enjoyed the countryside" with a low of 91.5 percent in Big Horn and a high of 96.8 percent in Johnson County. "Observed wildlife" was the second most often checked activity by residents in all four counties with a high of 87.6 percent in Johnson and a low of 81.7 percent in Washakie County. Almost three out of four respondents (73.2 percent) checked "escaped my routine for awhile:" variation across counties ranged from 77.3 percent for Sheridan respondents to 62.2 percent for those living in Johnson County. Nearly six of ten Bighorn area residents checked "reduced mental anxiety or stress" as their fourth most frequently thing that made their latest visit to the forest satisfying. Frequency of that selection varied from a high of 63.8 percent in Sheridan County to a low of 52.2 percent in Washakie County.

Fewer than fifty percent of all respondents checked "cleared my thoughts" as a factor contributing to the satisfaction of their last trip to the forest yet this factor was the fifth most frequently checked item by residents in Johnson, Sheridan and Washakie counties and was sixth for Big Horn County respondents. Likewise, the category of "provided me a sense of adventure" was selected as the sixth most checked item by respondents in Johnson, Sheridan and Washakie counties and was 7th for Big Horn residents. In terms of frequency of selection, items 7th through 12th show similar patterns of selection across the four counties. The one commodity related item, "appreciation of forest related

economic activities" was checked by one of every five respondents (19.9 percent) with the lowest selection rate by Sheridan residents (17.3 percent) and highest selection rate by Johnson County respondents (23.8 percent). "Appreciated learning about another culture" received the fewest selections of all activities with 6.7 percent of the respondents checking it (variation of 6.3 percent in Sheridan to 8.1 percent in Johnson County.

Table 20: Percent Responding Yes to Things that Made Their Latest Outing to the Bighorn National Forest Satisfying

Satisfying Activities	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Enjoyed the countryside	91.5 (1)	96.8 (1)	95.9 (1)	92.3 (1)	94.6 (1)
Escaped my routine for awhile	72.5 (3)	62.2 (3)	77.7 (3)	71.3 (3)	73.2 (3)
Appreciated learning about another culture	6.9 (13)	8.1 (13)	6.3 (13)	6.7 (13)	6.7 (13)
Cleared my thoughts	43.5 (6)	50.8 (5)	49.6 (5)	48.9 (5)	48.5 (5)
Reduced mental anxiety or stress	54.3 (4)	56.2 (4)	63.8 (4)	52.2 (4)	58.9 (4)
Improved family relations	46.3 (5)	29.2 (8)	37.8 (8)	40.6 (7)	38.5 (7)
News sense of freedom	32.5 (8)	31.9 (7)	41.1 (7)	38.3 (8)	37.5 (8)
Reinforced my sense of accomplishment	12.6 (12)	11.9 (12)	15.7 (10)	9.4 (11)	13.5 (11)
Appreciation of forest related economic activities	21.1 (10)	23.8 (10)	17.3 (9)	22.2 (10)	19.9 (10)
Observed wildlife	85.0 (2)	87.6 (2)	87.5 (2)	81.7 (2)	86.1 (2)
Provided me a sense of adventure	36.4 (7)	47.6 (6)	45.9 (6)`	43.9 (6)	43.9 (6)
Enjoyed watching ranching operations	27.0 (9)	26.5 (9)	14.7 (11)	23.3 (9)	20.4 (9)
Other things	14.8 (11)	13.1 (11)	10.3 (12)	8.3 (12)	11.4 (12)

When respondents were given the opportunity to check 'yes' to a list of possible things that made their last visit to the Bighorn forest, the percentages varied from a low of 4.8 percent (rural farm) to a high of 98.9 percent for rural non-farm respondents. In general rural farm residents made fewer 'yes' checks on the relatively infrequent selected items of "reinforced my sense of accomplishment," "appreciation of forest related economic activities," and "enjoyed watching ranching operations." Rural farm respondents had the greatest discrepancy compared to the other three residence groups.

Interestingly, although the percentages varied somewhat, when the percentages were ranked one (most often checked) to twelve (least often checked), there was complete agreement across the top five choices and for the bottom two choices (11th and 12th). The greatest differences in the rankings were for "enjoyed watching ranching operations," which was ranked 6th for those in rural farm location and 10th by city dwellers. Please refer to Table 21 for the specific percentages and ranks.

Table 21: Percent Responding Yes to Things that Made Their Latest Outing to the Bighorn National Forest Satisfying By Residence

(With percent 'yes' ranked)

Satisfying Activities	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm
Enjoyed the countryside	94.6 (1)	95.0 (1)	98.9 (1)	93.6 (1)
Escaped my routine for awhile	72.5 (3)	75.0 (3)	76.8 (3)	64.8 (3)
Appreciated learning about another culture	7.1 (12)	5.7 (12)	7.3 (12)	4.8 (12)
Cleared my thoughts	49.0 (5)	52.9 (5)	52.0 (5)	40.8 (5)
Reduced mental anxiety or stress	61.1 (4)	60.0 (4)	61.6 (4)	43.2 (4)
Improved family relations	40.7 (7)	37.1 (8)	37.9 (8)	33.6 (7)
News sense of freedom	39.5 (8)	39.3 (7)	39.0 (7)	25.6 (9)
Reinforced my sense of accomplishment	15.2 (11)	10.7 (11)	12.4 (11)	12.0 (11)
Appreciation of forest related economic activities	19.3 (9)	15.7 (10)	15.8 (10)	22.4 (10)
Observed wildlife	87.6 (2)	82.1 (2)	89.8 (2)	80.0 (2)
Provided me a sense of adventure	45.9	51.4	41.2	28.0

	(6)	(6)	(6)	(8)
Enjoyed watching ranching operations	16.2 (10)	19.3 (9)	19.2 (9)	37.6 (6)

Respondents rankings of factors related to the local economy

Respondents were asked to rank order five economic activities associated with the Bighorn National Forest, with one being most important and five least important to the local economy. For the four counties combined tourism was viewed as most important (median rank of 1.69) followed by summer recreation (median=1.82), grazing (median=2.39), winter recreation (median=2.59) and last was logging (median=3.10). Unlike many of the other questions, there were substantial differences in the rankings by county (see Table 22).

Residents in Big Horn and Washakie counties ranked grazing as the most important economic activity on the forest while grazing was ranked least important by Sheridan County residents. Tourism was ranked as the most important economic activity by Sheridan and Johnson counties' residents, second by Washakie residents and third by Big Horn residents. There was more consensus across counties concerning the economic importance of logging with logging ranked last by residents in Big Horn, Washakie, and Johnson Counties and fourth by residents in Sheridan County.

Table 22: Respondents' Rankings of Five Economic Sectors in Terms of Their Importance to the Local Economic With 1 Being Most Important

Economic Sectors	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Grazing	1.00*	1.82	3.23	1.63	2.39
Logging	3.59	3.25	2.86	3.12	3.10
Winter Recreation Business	2.60	2.76	2.50	2.65	2.59
Summer Recreation Business	1.80	1.83	1.79	1.90	1.82
Tourism	2.27	1.55	1.49	1.66	1.69

**More than fifty percent of respondents ranked grazing as the most import economic activity for their local economy.*

In terms of the numerical value of the median ranking, there was a consensus across counties for the strong importance of summer recreation business (varied from a low of 1.79 for Sheridan to 1.90 for Washakie) and for the less important winter recreation business (varied from 2.50 for Sheridan to 2.76 for Johnson County). The least amount of agreement in terms of magnitude of medians was for grazing, which varied from 1.00 for Big Horn to 3.23 for Sheridan. Overall there is a strong recognition for the

importance of tourism for local economies with summer recreation business being much more significant than winter recreation business, and for grazing being an important part of the economies in Big Horn, Johnson and Washakie counties.

Table 23: Respondents' Rankings of Five Economic Sectors in Terms of Their Importance to the Local Economic by Location With 1 Being Most Important

Economic Sectors	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm	Total
Grazing	2.66	2.19	2.57	1.0*	2.39
Logging	3.18	3.31	3.04	1.88	3.10
Winter Recreation Business	2.48	2.45	2.68	2.78	2.59
Summer Recreation Business	1.76	1.88	1.73	2.16	1.82
Tourism	1.52	1.58	1.60	2.41	1.69

**More than fifty percent rated this items as most important to the local economy*

Tourism was considered the most important factor for the local economy by those residing in cities (1.52), suburbs (1.58) and rural non-farm areas (1.60) compared to a 4th place finish by those residing in rural farm areas (2.41). Likewise, the second most important segment of the economy was summer recreation business for cities (1.76), suburbs (1.88), and rural non-farm areas (1.73) compared to a 3rd place ranking by farmers/ranchers (2.16). Generally, people residing in cities, suburbs, and rural non-farm areas thought that winter recreation and summer recreation businesses along with tourism in general were the most significant factors for the local economy. Ranchers/farmers, on the other hand, selected grazing and logging to be the most important factors in the local economy. Please refer to Table 23 for the median score values.

Future Desired Conditions on the Bighorn National Forest

Respondents were given a rather large list of possible changes or conditions for the Bighorn National Forest and asked if they approved of the change or condition (they were asked to check the items they supported). Data in Table 24 are presented in terms of the percentage of respondents approving of the item. Generally, residents in Sheridan (low of 22.2 percent and high of 65.8 percent) and Johnson (low of 19.1 percent and high of 64.5 percent) counties were much more likely to check desired future conditions than were residents in Big Horn (low of 11.9 percent and high of 55.1 percent) and Washakie (low of 13.3 percent and high of 61.1 percent) Counties. The greater involvement of residents on the east side compared to west side of the forest is reflected by a number of other questions (i.e., economic usage and activities on the forest), and perhaps reflects the smaller proportion of land in the west side counties that are under the management of the USFS.

Of the fourteen possible action items the overall greatest support was given to "plants and animals as a high priority" (59.0 percent) followed by "consider forest appearance in

making decisions" (56.5 percent) and "continuity of commodity uses of the forest" (51.3 percent). None of the other items received a majority of support.

The least amount of support (fewer than one in four) was for "set aside land for wilderness" (21.1 percent), "allow lightning-caused fire to burn" (23.6 percent), and "modern facilities for recreation" (24.4 percent).

Because respondents on the west side were less likely to check items in general than those residing on the east side the across county discussion will focus on the ranking of percentage checked rather than magnitude of the percentage. The analysis of rankings reveals both consensus and disagreement regarding desired future conditions on the Bighorn National Forest. The greatest consensus in rankings was for "consider forest appearance in making decisions" which was ranked 2nd in all four counties followed by "limit camping to designated sites in heavily used areas" which was ranked either 7th or 8th by respondents. Likewise there was relatively strong agreement regarding two other items: "Plants and animals as a high priority" that was ranked first in Sheridan and Johnson Counties and third in Big Horn and Washakie Counties.

Table 24: Percent of Respondent Responding "Yes" to Future Desired Conditions on the Bighorn National Forest

Desired Condition	Big Horn	Johnson	Sheridan	Washakie	Total
Set aside land for wilderness	11.9 (14)	21.3 (13)	27.2 (11)	13.3 (14)	21.1 (14)
Modern facilities for recreation	29.1 (9)	19.1 (14)	22.4 (13)	30.0 (10)	24.4 (12)
Plants and animals as a high priority	47.6 (3)	64.5 (1)	65.8 (1)	46.7 (3)	59.0 (1)
Provide more roads for access	35.2 (7)	22.4 (12)	22.2 (14)	35.6 (6)	26.9 (10)
Consider forest appearance in making decisions	49.3 (2)	63.9 (2)	59.1 (2)	50.0 (2)	56.5 (2)
Allow lightning-caused fire to burn	19.8 (11)	24.6 (9)	25.6 (12)	21.1 (11)	23.6 (13)
Continuity commodity uses of forest	55.1 (1)	51.9 (3)	46.4 (6)	61.1 (1)	51.3 (3)
Open areas for recreation that are neither wilderness or roaded (motorized)	41.0 (6)	44.5 (4)	46.6 (5)	42.6 (5)	44.6 (4)
Create designated ATV trails	43.2 (4)	33.5 (8)	38.4 (8)	46.1 (4)	39.8 (71/2)
Created separate recreation areas for	42.7	40.7	47.0	33.9	43.1

motorized and non-motorized use	(5)	(6)	(4)	(8)	(5)
Designate Wild and Scenic river areas	18.9 (12)	23.6 (10)	36.5 (9)	18.3 (121/2)	28.1 (9)
Set aside Research Natural Areas	16.7 (13)	23.1 (11)	31.1 (10)	18.3 (121/2)	25.0 (11)
Close some dispersed recreation sites	28.6 (10)	43.2 (5)	47.7 (3)	31.1 (9)	40.6 (6)
Limit camping to designated sites in heavily used areas	33.9 (8)	39.3 (7)	44.0 (7)	34.4 (7)	39.8 (71/2)

Ranked percent checked in parenthesis with highest checked ranked 1.

There was moderate agreement on "set aside land for wilderness with rankings varying from 11th (Sheridan) to 14th (Big Horn and Washakie), "allow lightning-caused fire to burn" with rankings varying from 9th (Johnson) to 12th (Sheridan), "designate Wild and Scenic River areas" that also varied by 3 rankings from 9th (Sheridan) to 12th (Big Horn), and for "set aside Research Natural Areas that varied from 10th (Sheridan) to 13th (Big Horn).

A gap of four ranks occurred for two items including "create designated ATV trails" with ranks varying from 4th for Big Horn and Washakie to 8th for Johnson and Sheridan, and for "create separate recreation areas for motorized and non-motorized use" where median "checked" percentages varied from 4th for Sheridan to 8th for Washakie County. For two additional items a gap of five ranks occurred. Ranks on "continuity of commodity uses of the forest" varied from first for Big Horn and Washakie counties to 6th for Sheridan County. A similar gap occurred for "modern facilities for recreation which was ranked 9th by Big Horn respondents and 14th by Johnson County respondents.

The greatest disagreement in median ranks were for "provide more roads for access" which was ranked 6th by Washakie respondents compared to 14th by residents in Sheridan County, and for "close some dispersed recreation sites" which was ranked 3rd by Sheridan respondents and 10th by Big Horn respondents. In large, median rankings are similar for Big Horn and Washakie respondents while responses of Sheridan respondents are more similar to Johnson County respondents. There is something of an east-west divide, but there is surprising similarities in the ranking of future desired conditions particularly in regard to "consider forest appearance in making decisions" and "plants and animals as a high priority."

A cluster of five items-- "open areas for recreation that are neither wilderness or roaded," "create designated ATV trails," "created separate recreation areas for motorized and non-motorized use," "close some dispersed recreation sites," and "limit camping to designated sites in heavily used areas"-- reveal an overall high level of concern on motorized/non-motorize recreational use. Between 40 percent and 45 percent of all respondents indicated a concern with these issues with ranks varying from 4 to 8. Obviously, recreational planning will be an important part of any future management plan.

In examining the survey data respondents who checked "yes" to future desired conditions on the forest by residential location, wide variation is evident, but that variation tends to follow response patterns of the county analysis. For example, those living in rural farm areas had the most frequent response, 68.3 percent, for "continuity of commodity uses of the forest," which mirrors their previous support of logging and grazing. And, these same respondents had the lowest "yes" checked responses, 14.3 percent, for "modern facilities for recreation."

Although the largest gap across residential location is over 20 percent on the item of "continuity of commodity uses of the forest" (47.0 percent for city dwellers and 68.3 percent for farmers/ranchers), in general the percentage difference is less than 10 percent and when the magnitude of the "yeses" are rank ordered there a few differences. The largest difference in ranks was the 10th rank given by city dwellers and the 14th rank given by rural farm and rural non-farm residents.

The idea of keeping things the same seems evident across residential location. For example, "set aside land for wilderness," "provide more roads for access," "modern facilities for recreation," "set aside research natural areas," and "allow lightning-caused fire to burn" were ranked among the bottom five future desired conditions by all four residential locations while "plants and animals as a high priority," "continuity of commodity uses of the forest," "open areas for recreation that are neither wilderness or roaded (motorized)," "consider forest appearance in making decisions," "and create separate recreation areas for motorized and non-motorized use" were among the top five future desired conditions on the Bighorn National Forest. Please refer to Table 25 for specific percentage and ranking by residence.

Table 25: Percent of Respondent Responding "Yes" to Future Desired Conditions on the Bighorn National Forest By Residence

Desired Condition	Cities	Suburban	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm
Set aside land for wilderness	23.2 (14)	18.1 (14)	21.0 (13)	16.8 (13)
Modern facilities for recreation	29.7 (10)	25.0 (11)	13.8 (14)	14.3 (14)
Plants and animals as a high priority	65.2 (1)	50.0 (3)	58.0 (1)	50.8 (3)
Provide more roads for access	25.8 (12)	29.2 (9)	24.3 (11)	25.4 (9)
Consider forest appearance in making decisions	60.4 (2)	53.5 (2)	55.8 (2)	59.5 (2)
Allow lighting-caused fire to burn	23.5 (13)	18.8 (13)	22.7 (12)	23.8 (10)
Continuity commodity uses of forest	47.0	54.9	53.0	68.3

	(3)	(1)	(3)	(1)
Open areas for recreation that are neither wilderness or roaded (motorized)	45.6 (4)	43.1 (4.5)	41.4 (5)	45.2 (5)
Create designated ATV trails	39.2 (8)	43.1 (4.5)	37.6 (8)	36.5 (8)
Created separate recreation areas for motorized and non-motorized use	44.9 (5)	41.7 (6)	43.6 (4)	38.9 (6.5)
Designate Wild and Scenic river areas	31.2 (9)	25.7 (10)	28.7 (9)	20.6 (11.5)
Set aside Research Natural Areas	27.9 (11)	20.8 (12)	25.4 (10)	20.6 (11.5)
Close some dispersed recreation sites	43.7 (6)	35.4 (8)	39.2 (7)	38.9 (6.5)
Limit camping to designated sites in heavily used areas	41.1 (7)	38.2 (7)	39.8 (6)	46.0 (4)

Respondent comments regarding the fifteen-year assessment project

Respondents were provided space for sharing their ideas and concerns regarding the use of the Bighorn National Forest and fifteen-year planning process. These open-end responses (285), submitted by 23.2 percent of all respondents, when content analyzed fell into 29 different content areas (please refer to Table 26 for the breakdown of content categories and response numbers and percentages. (See appendix B for a complete listing of comments by county).

Table 26: Open-ended Responses

Responses	Number	Percent
Pro-multiple use	13	4.56
General environmental stand	12	4.21
Support grazing and ranching	7	2.46
Limit or eliminate grazing	25	8.77
Support timbering, management and selective cutting	24	8.42
Opposed to timbering	5	1.75
Support motorized use, maintaining roads	18	6.32
Oppose increased motorized use, support roadless initiative	10	3.51
Control/license snowmobiles, ATVs	16	5.61
Limit off-road camping, cabins	9	3.16
Access to public lands	3	1.05

Object to camping fees, limits, regulations, private managers	12	4.21
No more wilderness	6	2.11
Expand wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, limit access	1	.35
Support tourism	1	.35
Concerns about growing tourism use	3	1.05
Fight forest fires, limit controlled burns	9	3.16
Support natural burning	1	.35
Protect water	7	2.46
Fear of bears, wolves returning	4	1.40
Stop littering, impose fines	9	3.16
General celebration of forest, condition, and management	28	9.82
Mining, pro and con	6	2.11
Complaints about Forest Service, Federal Government	25	8.77
Questionnaire: bias, demographic data, want results	12	4.21
Old or disabled	12	4.21
Medicine Wheel	4	1.40
Undecipherable, irrelevant	2	.70
Want trail maintenance	1	.35
Total	285	

The open-ended responses reveal the difficulty of pleasing all the people even some of the time in developing long term planning for the forest. For example, the most often content category (n=28) the "general celebration of the forest in its management and condition" was almost counterbalanced by the twenty-five comments that "complained about the forest service and/or the federal government." This latter position is represented by respondent #4440 who noted, "I find it very sad the way the Bighorn national forest is being managed! Why can't small logging companies make a living from the trees? The national forests are so over regulated…Logging, agriculture, recreation can all work in and around each other. However all the Federal regulations won't let it." While celebration of the forest and its management is found in the comments of respondent 0965 who notes "We must preserve our land, wildlife, air, water, forest animals, and mountains with a passion. Once its gone or destroyed that's it. It's nice to play but other issues come first or we won't have a place to play. We can't be selfish about this; we owe caring for all these issues so generations to come any enjoy what we have enjoyed…."

Similarly, the thirty-one comments supporting timbering, management and selective cutting and grazing and ranching (commodity usage) were matched by the twenty-nine comments to limit or eliminate grazing and opposed to timbering on the forest. Typical of the anti-commodity was respondent #0701 who wrote, "Take cattle off the mountain!

Tired of having to walk around cow shit and having to picket mule away from a creek or pond only to turn around and see a cow standing in the middle of it. Likewise, respondent #0111 wrote, "Cattle's grazing is a hindrance to tourists and local outings. Leave the feed grass etc. for the wilderness animals." On the other hand, respondent #0815 noted "For the benefit of the local communities we must utilize resources from our forestlands for grazing, wood products, mining. We have used the resources for 100 years, not destroyed a national forest yet. With the knowledge we have today we can continue to utilize the resources with no harm with proper management." A similar theme was mentioned by respondent #058: "The national forests are for balanced multiple use and recreation of resources not preservation (as in the national parks). Proper timber management can enhance wildlife habitat and reduce the fuel for forest fires while providing lumber and jobs. Limited road construction provides access not only for resource and recreational access and fire management while limiting off road use by ATVs, wheelers, etc., that can be environmentally destructive."

Likewise, the eighteen comments in support of "motorized use and maintaining roads" were almost matched by the sixteen comments advocating the control and licensing of snowmobiles and ATVs. A number of comments favoring ATVs did so in terms of accessibility. For example, respondent #1216 wrote, "I don't like to see horseback people given the privilege to ride some trails or areas that us in our 60s or 70's cannot go in our 4 wheelers. When people age they cannot walk long distances any more and can't afford to own a horse. People over 60 should perhaps be given special benefit or be allowed to ride 4 wheels on some of these trails. While others opposed ATVs on public lands as illustrated by #1437's comment that "Just because something can be done in the forest doesn't mean it should be. All off road use ….. should be eliminated. All "racing" of snow machines, ATVs, etc should be confined to private lands as is car racing. I see no reason why idiots should not only abuse the mts., but they have to be rescued." Finally, there we several comments that focused on enforcement of existing regulations for ATVs. For example, # 4113 comment "Should make all ATVs stay on roads and all kids have an adult ride with them" represents this position.

An examination of appendix B reveals the range and intensity of respondents' attitudes and behaviors regarding use of the Bighorn National Forest. The list documents not only the divisiveness of many usage issues on the Bighorn National Forest but also the passion of respondents regarding the forest, at least for the 22.3 percent of respondents who made open-ended comments.

SECTION 3: STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

In addition to the mailed survey, open-ended interviews, averaging more than one hour each, were conducted in the spring and summer of 2001 with a diverse group of 43 individuals identified as active citizen/stakeholders or opinion leaders in the four counties. This list was produced by Forest Service personnel and the Big Horn Mountain Country Coalition. With sixteen interviews, Johnson County is overrepresented, as it was on the list submitted to us. All interviews were taped and noted manually on a four-page interview schedule modified from the Medicine Bow/Wisconsin schedule. In fifteen cases a second set of notes were taken by a co-interviewer. Interview data was then entered in Excel files from the interview schedule. Finally, the data was coded independently by topic. For each of 38 variables, the comments were coded "opposed", "in favor of," mentioned without opinion, or no comment/neutral. The

variables were cross-tabulated by county and years of residence [median is 25 years] in SPSS, allowing some quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of the interviews. However, the people interviewed in general expressed complex opinions on the complex issues facing the Bighorn communities, regardless of their particular stake in the mountain and the forest, so while we used the quantitative analysis as a check on our interpretations, for the most part we are reporting the concerns of the interviewees in their own words. The proportions and percentages represent the predominating sentiments of the 43 intentionally chosen interviewees and do not represent the four-county population as a whole.

The interview schedule was organized in four sections, although people often structured their comments in terms of their particular interests. The first section was personal identifiers such as place and length of residence and occupation . The second was on community characteristics and their relation to the forest and public lands, including changing population and other issues facing the community. Third was on forest-community linkages, resource management, community sustainability and vulnerability. Finally interviewees were ask to talk about interest groups and general areas of disagreement as well as personal experiences with federal managers. The last question was an open-ended question about specific issues of importance in the Bighorn National Forest, and we have coded them similarly to the comments some respondents to the survey wrote at the end of the questionnaire.

Overall, nearly two-thirds of the interviewees agree that their community is dependent on public land resources, and only in Sheridan and Big Horn counties were there any who would say they are not. Most people also argue in favor of multiple use (74 percent) with the greatest opposition to multiple use from Sheridan County interviewees. Yet nearly half (48 percent) also took a general environmental stand personally (those mainly being in Johnson and Sheridan counties), while there were evenly divided opinions on the environmental movement generally. Interestingly, a couple of people declared that the interview schedule itself was biased, but one was a timber cutter who saw an environmental bias and another was an environmentalist who found it directed in favor of commodities. That person wanted to emphasize the importance of "wilderness, wilderness, wilderness," and wondered if that preference would find its way into the report. Eighteen of the forty-three interviewees mentioned the aesthetic beauty of the mountains somewhere in their comments. Most of them were people whose work or recreation put them on the mountain itself, rather than overtly defending it.

Consistent with overall support for multiple use, 55 percent of the interviewees were in favor of continuing grazing permits, with about twice as many supporters as opposers in each county (none in Big Horn County). Logging in the forest was favored by 16 interviewees and opposed by ten, half of whom were from Sheridan County. The only comments in support of mining were in Big Horn County, while comments from Sheridan and Johnson counties were opposed to mining by seven to two. A much bigger resource concern is the protection of water. More than half (25) of all the interviewees emphasized the protection of water; however the concerns were different on the east and west sides of the mountain. Johnson and Sheridan County citizens worried about housing sprawl using up water, while those in Washakie and Big Horn seemed more worried that the Forest would claim more water.

Recreational uses of the Bighorns is of interest both in terms of local residents' use of the mountain and tourism as an economic activity. Eighty three percent of the interviewees thought the forest should be available for recreational use. Tourism was mentioned positively by ten different interviewees in Johnson County. Negative comments about motorized vehicles were expressed by 38 percent of the interviewees, and there were more negative than positive comments in all four counties. As a related issue, in both Big Horn and Washakie counties, the same number of people thought there should be increased regulation of land use as those

who were opposed to more. In Johnson County, thirteen people wanted more regulation and none mentioned opposition, and in Sheridan County the comments were eight to two in favor of more regulation.

Thirty-eight percent (16) argued that available recreational services should be increased. Only Washakie County had more comments opposed than in favor of increase services. The lowest frequency of this opinion was among interviewees who had been in residence 11-20 years, with higher frequency among more recent arrivals and those who had lived in Big Horn Country longer. The strongest sentiment for increased services came from Big Horn and Johnson counties.

Although fishing was cited in the survey data as the most popular activity by local residents, it was mentioned by only 26 percent of the interviewees, and only 14 percent made strong positive statements about fishing. Thirty-eight percent made positive statements about hunting, and half of them were from Johnson County. Camping was mentioned by 28 percent, 19 percent making strongly positive comments, and hiking/backpacking were mentioned by 24 percent, 14 percent making strongly positive comments. A large proportion of both comments came from Johnson County.

Length of residence in the county was not a strong predictor of many viewpoints, although logging was more likely to be opposed by those who had lived in the counties fifteen years or more, and the longer the residence, the more likely people were to comment on the complications of the federal bureaucracy. The environmental movement was seen more favorably by residents of 5-20 years and unfavorably by residents of less than five years or more than forty years.

While recognizing that the Big Horn National Forest is a national resource, our mandate was to relate the management plans for the forest to local communities. So having summarized the data from both the mail-out survey and the stakeholder interviews, we think it important to report some of the highly articulate statements expressed by Big Horn Mountain Country residents, many of them in disagreement with each other.

While it is the opinion of citizens that Wyoming (and their particular community) is different from other places, including the celebration of the mountain ecosystem and the vitality and energy not only from biological richness but also a diversity of people, those who have lived elsewhere recently “don’t really see differences from living up on a front range town someplace in Montana.” Recognizing that (Sheridan) is a an active community, with lots of land planning issues, wages in a small town are not very good, and without the mountains, it is not unlike any other small town. Still many people referred to the “vitality” of their town, and “quality of life, “ even when they knew it was as term “used to death.” For the most part they celebrated the common goals and aspirations of community citizenry, and even an “interlocking dependency” that sustained their communities at the foot of “the mountain.”

Likewise, while some citizens, especially on the west side regretted the land use decisions of some new absentee landlords, the fact that school populations were declining, as were numbers of volunteers, in the main, Big Horn citizens argued that newcomers brought assets with them, including financial, intellectual and creative talents. They know, as the census data reflects, that young adults leave the area, and they hope that enough jobs and affordable housing will be able to bring them back, as they have in the past. The most important issues facing the communities varies somewhat on the west and east sides. Coalbed methane and suburban sprawl with subsidiary issues are the changes Johnson and Sheridan county people either look forward to or worry about, while the continued operation of longstanding industries, including

agriculture, are the biggest concerns in Big Horn and Washakie counties. But access to public land surfaces as a problem in different contexts in both places.

In terms of forest-community linkages, the greatest overall issue is clearly the increased year-around use of the mountain. While some celebrate the increased tourism as a boon to motels and businesses, and even the growth in government sector employment, others see potential problems and conflict in the various recreational uses, especially motorized vehicle use, and some bemoan the higher costs of cabin leases or grazing permits. There is considerable worry about the impact of a Yellowstone snowmobile ban or restriction on the Bighorn National Forest. Some people worry about the effects of growth on the watershed. Others feel potentially "victimized by natural resource development" in terms of increased crime by newcomers less committed to the community. But note that it is a mistake to draw simple lines between pro- and anti-development people. One astute Sheridan resident, in arguing that the forest is either a primary or secondary emphasis for most people and the common ground of people drawn to this area, says "People in offices can't wait to get outside; people driving a D11 Cat on ten hour shifts go fishing when they are off. It's like people who teach school to support a horse habit."

In terms of resource management for the future sustainability of the communities, almost everyone had quite specific opinions and their range was huge, including a desire expressed by several for designated trails for ATVs, requiring permits for snowmobiles, supporting the roadless plan with local input, and protecting water quality. A few, especially on the west side, worried about grizzlies and wolves as a potential problem, and some recounting an erosion of grazing and timber permits, advocated new types of low impact logging. And again, while public access was a major concern, perhaps no one suggested access should be completely uncontrolled. One person said, "I like limits, rules, referees. I ride my motorcycle to the wilderness boundary; then I hike in where I won't hear motorcycles. I love being where I rarely encounter another human being; it makes me really happy about paying my taxes." In terms of community vulnerability in terms of management shifts, most people mentioned oil and gas development, and the associated problems of subdivisions, water, and waste.

When asked about areas of disagreement among different groups, some people found it easy to enumerate conflicts between various stakeholders or organizations. Still others said, "One imagines so, but I'm not convinced. Differences may be exacerbated to block substantive positive changes." One person said, "Learning to share is hard," and gave an example of multiple use organizations working very very hard for ranches, yet finding little enthusiasm from ranchers for developing ATV trails. Another said he often wished that everybody could "come to the table," and several other people expressed similar sentiments. "Lawsuits stop everything and only help attorneys." And another rejected the question, saying "To pursue it is only to provide a liturgy that fills up a catalog. One doesn't gain any ground if you find more conflicts, formalize them, and then emphasize different slants. The only common denominator then is a lack of tolerance. I was asked if I liked cowpies where I fish. No, but I can walk around them."

Likewise, people have remarkably different views about who are local or non-local groups. While the most people thought some national environmental groups or federal bureaucrats were "non-local," a number of people in Buffalo talked about snowmobilers from Gillette as non-local, and one person in Worland, perhaps jokingly, said that when they see people from Sheridan they wonder what they are doing "on our side of the mountain." Yet a westsider recognized that "people in Sheridan" who work for the Sierra Club were "very fine people," and a Worland resident pointed out that the oil companies were more non-local than the Sierra Club. Some people remembered that this was "everybody's forest," yet there is deep sentiment that while local groups are not very organized, local people tend to take responsibility for the forest on a

daily basis, while non-locals are free to use it and leave. One person even suggested higher use fees for non-residents!

Perhaps the most uniformity of responses was to the questions about federal land managers. Most people agree that they are in general regarded with suspicion, even if most have had good experience with local Forest Service people, and several cited improvements in the local service of the past few years. Specific complaints related to not being "part of the community" enough, to spending too much time in the office "computer-bound" and not enough in the field, to being "outside experts" or even "non-western raised." rather than deeply informed about this particular forest. But one person with a science background talked about forest service people as "such talented biologists--but you need people on the ground with people skills, and scientists don't get that training." And while there was general sentiment for greater enforcement of forest regulations, some recreationists who had received citations found them nonsensical. But a rancher reported a couple of encounters when "We were at fault. Animals got on the BLM. It was quickly resolved, not a big deal." Most would agree that it is not easy to work for a federal agency in Wyoming right now.

Because the comments on the last open-ended question about the future of the Bighorn National Forest ranged so widely, those subjects have generally been integrated into overall content analysis. But this is also where the interviewees' overall philosophy and understanding of complex issues were most coherently articulated.

More than one interviewee expressed very positive impressions of the Forest Service tours conducted in connection with the plan, feeling that they provided a forum for gathering a lot of viewpoints and information out on the land. Recognizing that it is hard to juggle all the interests, one said that her community "will be better off with the maintenance of the biological diversity and integrity of the land."

Others thought the "challenge of weighing community sentiment was a difficult task—the timing horizons change, all the documents will confuse the public and wear people out." And another talked about the fragility of the process of the plan. She said "the studies, the analysis, the cost, the process the [Forest Service] has to go through--by the time it's done, it's outdated. The cost is astronomical. Why does it take so long? What are the guidelines now, while the plan is being done? The average person hasn't a clue."

One rancher described trying to take a holistic view of the community and the forest and private land, saying the best people try to take care of all land, public and private, but argued that what is happening as more permits are revoked is a loss of open space. " I have only beef and land to sell, and I can sell them whole or in part. Subdividing ranch land would have a domino effect that will hurt land, water quality, game, and community. While 40 percent of my tax dollar goes to the county, a subdivision costs $2 for each tax dollar paid, for roads, fire protection, water and sewer, and three horses in a ten-acre pasture that can't support one sheep. People who have lived here learn to live with the environment. People who come in with lots of money want to change things, make lakes, level mountains. Federal and local government ought to work together more closely on all land issues."

Remarkably, only a third of the interviewees mentioned fire suppression policies in their comments: ten were opposed to allowing lightning fires to burn and four were in favor, but most didn't mention the issue even in the hot dry summer of 2001.

The roadless initiative was an important issue in the summer of 2001. And at least one person described it as "such opportunity Clinton presented us with [the initiative], allowing the management of roadless areas and their survival in the face of increasing usage," although several people objected to "mandates from afar," even though they agreed that the Bighorns had too many roads.

A cabin owner from the same county recognized that "when you have a lot of people, you have to manage differently; you have to manage the people. Last week there was a group of 70-100 trailriders, with port-a-potties and live music." In talking about horseback riding in the forest and for hunting, he addressed both timber management and roads in relation to elk habitat. He thought "we have timbered the heck out of [the Bighorns] as far as I'm concerned." And he pointed out that there were a lot of roads that were not forest service roads, remembering one that was first used to haul in salt, then it had jeeps on it, then it became a road. He was "tickled to death" when [the Forest Service] closed it, although there was another along a ledge that was great for elk viewing that he didn't like having been closed. But he thought the forest needs some timbering and some grazing so new grass will come and deer will too, "but there are so many regulations, people on the ground can't do the managing, especially when two or three agencies are involved."

Another landowner talked about access issues, especially with increased tourism since an *Outside* magazine feature a couple of years ago. She described hunting season as the worst part of the year. "People turn berserk. And it's worse if they know you're not here."

On the issue of increased use of the mountain, several people expressed concern about the impact of the Yellowstone snowmobile ban on the Bighorns, but at least one person explicitly said that "the Feds should stand firm on the snowmobile ban, and that motorized and non-motorized recreation should be separated. You can't treat bicycles as ATVs." Another resident who owned two ATVs, two snowmobiles, and a four-wheel drive pick-up said the forest plan was important to future of motorized recreation. "We have excellent snowmobile trails; we need to plan for and develop ATV trails. ATVs and snowmobiles are not going to go away. We need to require stickers for ATVs and use the money for trails, parking lots, maintenance, and restrooms." He, like several others, felt that the Forest Service was short on monitoring, that they need to have more people on the ground and thought people would support higher taxes for field people, "people oriented people," who, of course, would have to be in the business of enforcement.

Only a few people mentioned the Medicine Wheel, and while most of the comments came from people on the west side who felt that their communities as much as American Indian communities had been responsible for preserving the Medicine Wheel one legislator offered that the Crow and the Northern Cheyenne should be recognized as part of the Greater Bighorn area, and that the fact that Little Horn was important to them for microflora and medicinal plants is an unappreciated management issue.

CONCLUSION/DISCUSSION

Demographics of Bighorn Counties:

All four counties have experienced volatile population shifts, but the timing has not been uniform across the counties, mainly because they have different economic bases which have flourished or suffered in different periods The counties all have relatively old populations, with a median of nearly 40, and low numbers particularly in the 20-24 age group, and none have much ethnic diversity. Public land ownership varies from significant to nearly total, but also varies in the relative amount of BLM holdings in relation to National Forest holdings, but all communities justifiably express a heavy dependence on public lands.

Four County Survey

The mailed social survey, drawing a sample from adult property owners and phone listees, had a median age of 55, more than twenty percent of them lifelong residents, and median length of resident in the county of 27.4 years. The occupational distribution was quite broad, with 9.5 percent being educators and 9 percent ranchers. Among the 36 percent retired a very similar proportion had been either educators or ranchers.

Despite the economic, political and cultural differences often touted for various communities, people expressed remarkably similar reasons for living in the area, ranking "wide-open spaces" and its corollary "avoiding the big city as numbers one and two and most saying "appreciating rural lifestyle" was a third reason. These values being strongly held, it is not surprising that they thought federal government should include the opinions of the public, the needs and wants of local communities in management decisions, because those decisions "matter to me." The perceived ownership of "the mountain" outranks even the "balance of recreation, wilderness and commodity use" (often referred to as multiple use) in all counties, and outdistances the recognition of the need to conserve resources for increased public use in all but Sheridan County.

In terms of the public benefits of the forest, however, respondents did recognize the importance of both present and future use. Sheridan and Johnson counties rank "protecting water sources" first and Big Horn and Washakie ranked "making the forest available for future use" as first. All four counties ranked these two priorities first or second. And to further explicate those meanings, "protecting wildlife" outranked "providing a place for people to relax" in all four counties, with "supporting traditional ways of life" and "providing recreational opportunities" outranking commodity uses in all four counties. On these general values, there is remarkable consensus. The things that made their last visit to the forest enjoyable (Table 20) showed similar preferences.

Even looking only at recreational usage, the rank ordering of the first, second, and third favorite thing to do varies relatively little by county, and when combined, the leisure choices of fishing and camping/picnicking are the top two in all four counties (18 percent and 21 percent respectively). Hunting and enjoying the scenery virtually tie in all counties at almost 15 percent. Hiking/backpacking varies more (from 7.3 percent in Big Horn to 15.6 percent in Sheridan) but totals close at 12.9 percent. Far below as favorite

things to do come the motorized sports of snowmobiling and ATV/off road recreation at 3.8 percent and 2.2 percent. Skiing and snowshoeing was a favorite activities of about 3 percent of respondents.

Moreover, when respondents had an opportunity to note all the recreation activities they participate in on the forest, wildlife viewing was listed by 78.4 percent of all responding, fishing by 63 percent of all and picnicking by 60.2 percent of all respondents. Not more than six percentage points separate the counties in either wildlife viewing or picnicking, while a low of 57 percent of Big Horn respondents say they fish in the Bighorns and a high of 68.6 percent of Johnson County residents say they do. 60.9 percent of Big Horn residents go sightseeing, up to 71.5 percent of Johnson county residents view the scenery. On these activities there is widespread consensus about what resident like to do on "mountain."

Potentially more conflictual are the 45.6 percent who day hike and the 25.5 percent who enjoy four wheeling/RVs. In addition the 37 percent who do big game hunting have often expressed objections to ATVs roaring through their favorite hunting spots. Slightly more people (13.7 percent) go snowmobiling than cross-country skiing (11.7 percent), but the relative number engaged in each is not more than four percent different in each county, so the issue is not so much county differences in usage as user group issues.

Not surprisingly, the economic sectors reflect some the largest differences by county. Across the counties the most consensus is found on summer recreation businesses and winter recreation businesses, implicitly recognizing tourists not only as economic assets, but that perhaps the Bighorns are "their mountain too." The greatest difference by county was over grazing and the least overall support was for logging. In the questions about effects of possible changes in Forest Service management decisions Big Horn and Washakie counties expressed the most concerns about possible restrictions on both recreation and commodity uses. Sheridan County reported the most positive effects of possible changes in grazing, logging, winter and summer motorized use.

Recognizing that Sheridan and Johnson County residents chose more possibilities for future desired conditions of the Bighorn National Forest that were people from Big Horn or Washakie, the priorities were sometimes similar and sometimes quite different. Johnson and Sheridan counties ranked plants and animals as their highest priority while Big Horn and Washakie ranked them third. All four rank the "appearance of the forest in making decisions" second, but it is possible that people in the four counties interpreted that question differently or, indeed, that there were major differences among residents of one county on the meaning of "forest appearance." The first priority of Big Horn and Washakie counties was the continued commodity use of the forest, but it was third in Johnson County and sixth in Sheridan County. Other relatively uniformly if not top ranked priorities were "open areas for recreation that are neither wilderness or roaded," "creating separate recreation areas for motorized and non-motorized use," and "Limiting camping to designated sites in heavily used areas." Big differences were reflected in "providing more roads for access," "creating designated ATV trails," and "closing some dispersed recreation sites. While checked by a low of 11.9 percent of respondents (Big Horn) to 27.2 percent (Sheridan) as a future desired conditions, "setting aside more land for wilderness" followed "modern facilities for recreation" and "allowing lightning-caused fires to burn" as the least often chosen desired future conditions.

When the data was reanalyzed by place of residence, rankings changed very little, confirming the findings of the county by county analysis. The biggest difference is the

unsurprising support of farmers and ranchers for continued commodity use of the forest . In fact continuity is the overarching theme of the survey. Regardless of whether the question is setting aside more land for wilderness or building more roads, Big Horn Country people are not in the main asking for very much change in policy, even as there have been significant changes in usage. In the middling ranking of creating separate recreation spaces for motorized and non-motorized use, there is some recognition of that reality.

Stakeholder/Opinion Leader Interviews

Both the format of the interviews and the positions of the interviewees in the communities suggested responses which were less “my favorite things” and “what I like least” and more oriented toward discussing the multiple, increasing and competing interests in the context of forest-linked communities. They were able to wrestle less with their personal interests and more with the ways interests could try to come together. Many had had organizational or political experience with compromise and decision-making. They were as fond of the beauty of the Bighorns and being able to live in their shadow, and equally certain that they wanted to play a role in making management decisions about their future as were the surveyed residents. Their final comments, though, were less likely to be terse and acerbic, more likely to be wide ranging and questioning.

Nearly all talked with concern about the future. Although interviewees were chosen for their diversity, and the futures they envision vary greatly, nearly all recognize that changes in economies, populations, recreation, and technologies mean that the forest cannot go on in the same way it always has, as many of the survey respondents seemed to hope. They were more willing to talk about what they foresaw as inevitable, if regrettable, restrictions on certain forest activities, including their own.