

The Local Impact of Wilderness: An Overtime Analysis of Wilderness Designation

Western Political Science Association Conference
Spring 2010
San Francisco, California

Ryan Yonk, Brian C. Steed, and Randy Simmons
Center for the Study of Public Lands and Rural Economics
Jon M. Huntsman School of Business
Utah State University

I Introduction

In 2008, Utah State Representative Aaron Tilton sponsored House Joint Resolution 10 in the Utah State Legislature encouraging the United States Congress “not to designate new Utah wilderness areas” (1). HJR 10 specifically demanded that Congress not designate any additional Wilderness areas in Utah without the unanimous consent of the Utah Congressional Delegation and reaffirmed “the [Utah] Legislature’s strong support for continued public access and multiple use regarding public lands” (HJR 10 2008 1). In support of this position, the resolution asserts that Utah relies on public lands for a variety of economic activities including “oil and natural gas development, mining, outdoor recreation and other multiple uses, rights of way for transportation, waterlines, electric transmission, and telecommunication lines” (HJR 10 2008 2). Each of these activities fuel Utah’s economy and grow the State’s tax base. Removing them from the table is predicted to spell economic doom for Utah’s economy.

In direct contrast to this view, some have alleged that large federal land holdings and protected areas such as Wilderness may attract a different population than in private land counties and thereby may help generate economic growth. The Sonoran Institute recently noted:

“the presence of public lands is good for the economy. Personal income, adjusted for inflation, grows faster in counties with significant percentages of their land base in public ownership. What’s more, counties with protected lands—land set aside for conservation—show an even more marked increase in personal income” (2006).

This paper seeks to investigate the conflicting belief regarding the economic impacts of federally designated Wilderness through empirical statistical analysis of the economic conditions present in Wilderness and Non-Wilderness counties over time.¹ Using U.S. Census Data for all counties across the United States we study the impact of Wilderness by examining whether there is an identifiable difference within the economies of Wilderness and Non-Wilderness Counties

¹While the scope of this paper is limited to the economic impacts of Wilderness designation, this effort represents the beginning phase of a more expansive study exploring how Wilderness and other federally protected lands impact the economies of rural counties and the quality of life of individuals who live therein. Through our research, we hope to shed light on a number of important questions identified in existing literature including whether there are long-term economic benefits from Wilderness designation, whether there are population impacts of Wilderness Designation, and whether Wilderness Counties offer greater quality of life than Non-Wilderness Counties.

over time. Our statistical analysis of economic conditions shows that once federal transfers are controlled for neither total tax receipts nor total payroll appear affected by the presence of federally designated wilderness.

We define “Wilderness Counties” as counties that contain any portion of a federally designated Wilderness area. Such federally designated Wilderness may include Wilderness designated pursuant to the Wilderness Act of 1964 and managed by the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), or National Park Service (NPS), and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). We specifically exempt from our analysis Wilderness Study Areas and other de facto wilderness such as designated Roadless Areas inside National Forests and property managed to maintain “wilderness characteristics” by the BLM. We also exempt from our study other types of protected areas designated by the national government such as National Parks, National Monuments, National Recreation Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Bureau of Reclamation Properties, Wildlife Refuges, National Forests, and non-wilderness areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management. We also do not consider protected areas designated by states such as State Forests, State Parks, and other state protected areas. Finally, we do not include within our analysis properties managed by the U.S. Department of Defense or Indian Reservations. In exempting these other types of land management areas, we hope to better understand the economic impact of federally designated Wilderness over time.

Before delving into our analysis, the next section provides some background on federally designated wilderness and surveys the existing literature on economic impacts of Wilderness. Section III lays out our methods and presents our statistical results. Section IV provides analysis.

II Federally Designated Wilderness

A. Federally Designated Wilderness Introduced

Beginning in the late 1800s, the U.S. Government began setting aside swaths of land under varying degrees of protection. These efforts resulted in the establishment of National Parks in 1887 with the creation of Yellowstone National Park, National Forests starting in 1891 through the establishment of the Yellowstone Timberland Reserve (now the Shoshone National Forest), and National Monuments through the creation of Devil’s Tower National Monument in 1906. The identified statutory purposes of each of these types of land reservations anticipated some degree of human usage. Indeed, the National Forest Service was located in the U.S. Department of Agriculture due to the need to preserve and promote the forestry resource for production of timber throughout the United States.

Despite offering a great deal of protection compared to non-designated lands, some preservationists and conservationists argued that these designations did not sufficiently preserve the wild characteristics found in the land managed by the United States government. These arguments led to early designations of “wilderness” within certain forest reserves. The first of these, created through the creation of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico, set aside some 700,000 acres to be preserved as wild lands in perpetuity. The set asides continued, and by the 1930s, over twenty such wilderness areas had been created. However, the management of these areas was left to regional administrators who chose in some cases to allow grazing, logging, and road building. Even parts of the Gila Wilderness were opened to broader usage in the 1940s and 1950s (Coggins et al. 1993).

Upon the urging of conservationists and preservationists, the U.S. Congress turned its attention to the issue of preserving wild lands in perpetuity in 1964 through the creation of the Wilderness Act. There Congress defined Wilderness as:

an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this chapter an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, which the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value (16 U.S.C.A. § 1131(c)).

In that the Wilderness Act contemplated the preservation of areas “untrammelled by man,” a variety of acts are expressly forbidden within Wilderness Areas. Roads, road construction, and any mechanized travel are strictly prohibited within Wilderness Areas. While mining claims were initially allowed for the twenty years after the passage of the Wilderness Act, mining and mineral exploration are now prohibited within Wilderness Areas. Even when mining and mineral exploration and extraction was allowed, almost no mineral leases were granted by the controlling agencies, indicating a general unwillingness of federal administrators to allow mining, despite the legislative language allowing the activity.

Similarly, while logging was not expressly proscribed by statutory language of the Act, the restrictions on mechanized travel, mechanized equipment like chainsaws, and road construction generally preclude large-scale logging activity (Coggins et al 1993). A review of the legislative history of the Act further indicates that Congress intended to prohibit logging activity in Wilderness Areas with one exception—the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in Minnesota. Grazing is expressly allowed in Wilderness Areas, but administrators are allowed to make “reasonable regulations” regarding the use. This has been interpreted by Congress in at least one instance to mean that livestock grazing may be reduced if necessary to improve range conditions (see generally H.R. 96-617).

In addition to the prohibitory language found in the statute, Courts have acted to aggressively protect Wilderness Areas. Courts have blocked a variety of activities in Wilderness Areas including treatment of beetle infestations to maintain forest health (See *Sierra Club v. Lyng* 662 F. Supp. 40). Uses of land surrounding Wilderness Areas often receive more stringent review. The 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, for instance, upheld an injunction of logging in an area that approached a Wilderness Area (*Parker v. United States* 448 F.2d 793 cert. denied 405 U.S. 989 (1972)). Wilderness Areas often raise review standards under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Under NEPA, land uses near Wilderness Areas may be found to have a more “significant” impact than actions near lands not under federal protection. This may increase the costs associated with county or state activities occurring near wilderness areas and may change the cost calculus in making governance decisions.

Wilderness Areas are created by Congressional declaration. Management of the designated areas remains within the jurisdiction of the original managing agency. In other words, lands with wilderness characteristics within National Parks remain under the jurisdiction of the NPS. Wilderness Areas carved from National Forest lands remain in the jurisdiction of the NFS, Wilderness Areas in National Wildlife Refuges remain in the jurisdiction of the FWS, and BLM Wilderness remains under the management authority of the BLM.

Currently, there are 756 Wilderness Areas in the United States, totaling 109,492,743 Acres. The majority of these Wilderness Areas are managed by the BLM and the NFS. The Areas range in size from six acres in the FWS Pelican Island Wilderness in Florida (managed by the FWS) to 9,078,675 acres in the NPS Wrangle Island Wilderness in Alaska. Due to the stringent restrictions spelling out what determines wilderness characteristics, the majority of Wilderness Areas are found within largely rural counties.

B. Impact of Federally Designated Wilderness

As noted in the introduction, many local government officials bemoan the designation of Wilderness as taking off the table a variety of economic activities which would help bolster local economies. In truth, the academic literature investigating the impact of Wilderness on counties is quite sparse. Much of the literature represents a critique of the efficiency of the Federal Government as land manager (See generally Anderson et al. 1999) and the expansive use of Wilderness Designation as a land management tool in departure from original congressional intent (Osterle 1997).

Some research seems to support at least parts of the claim that Wilderness Areas detrimentally impact local economies. Although their findings largely find limited long-term economic detriment to local economies, Ruzitis and Johnson (2000) find that Wilderness does shut down access to resources traditionally used for extractive economic activities. These losses may be somewhat offset by an increase in service sector activities, but the service sector jobs generally pay less than the extractive jobs which were lost.

The duration of these impacts is somewhat unknown. Power (1991), for instance, conducts a case study examining the stringent rules in place protecting the ecosystem surrounding the Greater Yellowstone Area. He finds that extraction based industries have diminished over time and have been replaced by economic activities specifically dependent on preservation including tourism, permanent relocation to be closer to the natural amenities offered, recreational homes and cabins, and retirement. Even though this study does not exclusively deal with Wilderness, it raises the question of whether there may be temporal effects on local economies within Wilderness designation that merit further investigation.

The results indicating negative impacts of Wilderness are also by no means uniformly verified. Duffy-Deno (1998), for instance, finds no evidence that employment at a county level is adversely effected by the presence of federal Wilderness. Rasker (2006) rejects the notion that federal land ownership negatively impacts counties. Using correlation and regression models to investigate how different management of public lands, including Wilderness, impacts local counties' economies, he finds that public lands are associated with higher personal income tax levels in rural areas. The author rejects the idea that public lands affect counties in a negative way.

Holmes and Hecox (2004) similarly find a positive relationship between economic growth and publicly designated lands. Through studying 113 rural counties, 43% of which contain public lands, the authors find that there is a significant, positive correlation between the percent of land designated Wilderness and population, income, and employment growth. They

also find that growth of investment income and nonfarm self-employment income are correlated with presence of wilderness. Lorah and Southwick (2003) similarly find positive impacts of protected lands. Using county level data, the authors calculate the proportion of protected lands occurring within 50 miles of the center of the county. Applying this metric, the researchers find that the protection of these lands is positively correlated with high population growth and high employment and income growth.

Population dynamics and personal perceptions of Wilderness represent another line inquiry which may have a direct impact on county economics. The perception of Wilderness as a draw to move to or remain in a given area may create diverse economic opportunities and growth. Although Duffy-Deno (1998) finds no significant relationship between federally designated Wilderness and population, a variety of studies find a positive relationship. Rudzitis and Johansen (1991), use a survey of 2670 residents of wilderness counties to measure public opinion regarding public lands including Wilderness lands. They found that 53% moved to an area at least partially because of the presence of wild-lands, 81% felt wilderness was important and 65% were against mineral or energy development in such areas. This finding indicates that Wilderness may create conditions that create economic opportunities in addition to extractive uses. Shumway and Otterstram (2001) similarly find migration patterns toward counties with protected areas.

C. The Contribution of the Current Study

Our study represents a departure from previous work in three ways. First, we depart from much work performed economic impacts of Wilderness by clearly focusing on only officially designated Wilderness. As may be noted from the discussion above, many researchers include Wilderness within a broader category of protected lands or public lands generally. We find this approach may convolute the true impact of Wilderness and fail to provide meaningful information regarding variable impacts of different land designations. Non-Wilderness portions of National Parks, for instance, may be quite different in terms of economic impact due to travel tourism than stand-alone Wilderness within the Forest Service system, which may not be perceived as having the same ability to attract travel tourists.

Second, we focus our analysis on all counties in the United States rather than focusing on only public land states found in the West. We examine all counties for two primary reasons. First, by casting a broader net, we expand the scope of investigation and examine whether there are indeed differences between economic dynamics in Wilderness and Non-Wilderness Counties, while avoiding regional economic phenomena which may be present in the West. Specifically, the Western United States has been undergoing a demographic transformation with significant population and land use transformations throughout the past two decades. By examining all of the United States, we hope to avoid those Western-specific phenomena. Second, many Wilderness areas exist outside of the West. The Charles C. Deem Wilderness Area, for instance, was carved out of the Hoosier National Forest in Indiana, the Citico Creek Wilderness resides in Tennessee, and the Dolly Sods Wilderness is found in West Virginia. Virtually every state in the union now contains at least some federally designated wilderness.

Third, we utilize over time statistical analysis to identify the dynamic economic conditions found within counties. This approach provides more information regarding actual conditions and may identify changes occurring overtime in Wilderness counties compared to Non-Wilderness counties. This approach seems particularly useful in light of the long-term economic impacts of Wilderness. If the declaration of Wilderness may result in short term

negative economic impacts from lost extractive resource opportunities, over time analysis seems to be the best way to identify these claims. If, as claimed, these short term losses are made up over the long-run by economic transitions to different activities, over-time analysis is again the best way to better understand these dynamics.

III Theory Sketch

Our evaluation focuses on one of the most basic assertion presented by proponents of public land designation, that protection of physical lands should over time increase economic prosperity in communities where the protected land is located. This theory runs counter to other approaches that have generally focused on the consumptive extraction of resources in order to power economic development.

In response to these extractive theories and the decline of extractive industries over time an alternative proposition has developed that asserts that potential economic development can come from what is termed in the literature an area's amenities. (Deller, Tsai, Marcouiller, & English, 2003) The amenities theory of economic development asserts that by observing the change in economic activity as extractive industries declined a clear pattern can be indentified where,

“Instead natural amenities, desirable lifestyles and a relatively high quality of life, give some communities an advantage in attracting and benefitting from tourists, retirees, footloose entrepreneurs...environmental amenities ... act as a catalyst in the transformation of stagnating extractive economies into diversified, relatively competitive amenity economies.” (Lorah P. A., 2000)

These assertions claim that future economic development for many rural counties can be found in attracting new residents and tourists thus creating new economic opportunities as these new individuals interact in the community. (Rudzitis & Johansen, 1989) These assertions make good economic sense, as more tourists and residents are attracted to an area they bring with them resources that can be used to improve economic conditions generally, so long as those arriving bring resources with them.

What those who advocate creating an amenity based economy further assert is that in order to attract those tourists and residents that are likely to bring with them the sorts of resources that are needed if this proposition is to succeed, is best accomplished through the preservation of natural amenities that exist in an area.

Again generically this makes good economic sense, residents and tourists are more likely to arrive in areas that have the amenities they desire. What then are these amenities? Here we return to the Public Lands Hypothesis. A number of studies have asserted that natural lands are one of the chief amenities that draw resources to an amenity based economy. In 2006 the Sonoran institute commissioned a large scale report that looked at rural western counties, and concluded that the protection of land in those counties contributes directly to an increase in economic prosperity, operationalized as the real wages of by residents. (The Sonoran Institute, 2006)

The Sonara report which is the culmination of a decade long debate between those who claim that protected lands improve economic conditions, and those that argue they harm them, used only correlated data to identify potential relationships, and did not publically release either the methodology of the report or the root data.

Scholars including John Loomis, Robert Richardson, and Paul Lorah have conducted a number of studies that attempt to tease out the economic effects of wilderness designation on local communities. (Loomis & Richardson, 2001) (Lorah P. A., 2000) These authors conclude that the designation of wilderness in rural areas has a net positive effect on the economic wellbeing of both the community at large and the individual citizen.

A number of scholars have challenged the methodology of these studies, which have primarily relied on correlation and expenditure data to make these claims and suggest that other models would be more appropriate in identifying the effects of wilderness. (Keith & Fawson, 1995) (Dawson, Blahna, & Keith, 1993)

The literature clearly suggests that a relationship should exist between wilderness designation and economic prosperity. We use this assertion to form the central hypothesis of this study. That hypothesis is that the presence of wilderness inside a county's boundaries will have significant effect on the economic conditions.

IV Methods

Much of existent work on the economic impact of wilderness has relied on cross sectional data, and in doing so provides an interesting snapshot of the correlative effects of wilderness and economic development. This approach however fails to capture and model effectively the lag that often exists in predicting economic outcomes. It is our belief that approaches of this sort while interesting, fail to adequately address the question of causality, and that a cross-sectional time series model is the more appropriate approach if the goal is teasing out causation.

As we observed above wilderness designation has most often been investigated as a primarily western phenomena, and most studies have that have investigated these questions severely limit the observations included in the data to a specific region, and at times a specific states. We reject both approaches for theoretic and methodological reasons.

Using a limited non random sample of the US will necessarily paint a different picture of the effect wilderness than will a sample which is either random, or draws on the full population of United States counties. We believe that many of the conflicting results that have been found by other authors can be directly attributed to how they define the universe of their study.

We further assert that most appropriate universe is the full US county population and that the proper reference group for evaluating the effect of wilderness is not non wilderness western counties, which are highly likely to be the very large urban centers in the west, but is instead all non-wilderness counties across the country paint a better picture of the effects of wilderness.

Using these two important methodological changes, we perform four separate regressions using two different dependent variables both of which attempt to capture the economic development. Our first measure of economic development is the total payroll expended in a county. Again we use this to proxy for economic development. This approach has the advantage of not being a direct function of the institutional arrangements that exist. (That is not to say it is not an indirect function of those institutions.) Further it is measure that speaks directly to the economic situation of individuals. We use payroll over total receipts on the assumption that

payroll is more likely to remain within the county and have a direct impact on the geographic area that is the gross receipts of corporation. This measure is not a perfect proxy, and does not capture the capital investment, out of county workers, or most importantly retirees that do not receive payroll.

The second relies primarily on the tax receipts of a particular county to proxy for economic development. Using this dependent variable has a number of advantages, the data is likely largely complete, and in general local governments are required by state and federal statute to correctly report tax receipts, this reality provides some confidence in the data that self-reporting or estimations of economic activity do not provide. This dependent variable, however, is also not a perfect proxy, and there are significant institutional differences across states, regions, and often counties themselves about how, when, and why taxes may be collected. These differences are highly likely to be important predictors of tax receipts, and will exist in our model as omitted variables.

While neither of our dependent variables are ideal proxy's for economic development taken together they paint a relatively complete picture of the economic situation, and the expectation is that the presence of wilderness would affect both in nearly the same way, at the very least the direction should be the same.

V Results

The results from our cross sectional time series analysis find no direct evidence that the designation of wilderness improves or harms the economic situation of a particular area. These results are reported in tables 1 and 2. We include several variables that are designed to control for the significant differences among counties. These variables include Population, Land Area, and number of Households. We also include more traditional controls that that are indicated by the literature as likely to affect economic development. We include Birth Rate and School Enrollment, which act as proxies for the age of the population. Infant Death Rate provides information about the health care system in the various counties. For Table One our control variables are straightforward and include; High School Graduates, Median Household Income, Poverty Rate, Crime Rate, Government Employment, Unemployment Rate, Social Security Recipients.

Table One
Cross Sectional Time Series
DV- Payroll

	Model 1 Payroll	Model 2 Payroll ²
Observations	8417	8412
R-SQ Overall	.8712	.9090
Variables	Payroll (Mill \$)	Payroll (Mill \$)
Wilderness	34.674 (41.346)	-18.13 (33.778)
Population	.0013 (.0077)	-.0026 (.0058)
Land Area	-.0159** (.0073)	-.0128 (.0080)
Households	.0335* (.0203)	.0430** (.0161)
Birth Rate	18.050** (7.194)	6.250 (5.069)

² This model includes Federal Transfers

Infant Death Rate	-.6302 (.5981)	-.4873 (.5359)
School Enrollment	-.0215 (.0141)	-.0025 (.0105)
High School Graduates	-1.614* (.8699)	-.7917 (.7745)
Median Household Income	.0253*** (.0050)	.0048 (.0042)
Poverty Rate	17.757*** (2.699)	9.401*** (2.548)
Crime Rate	-.0976*** (.0262)	-.0708*** (.0194)
Government Employment	.0460 (.0390)	-.0708** (.0277)
Social Security	9.829* (5.188)	1.025 (4.383)
Unemployment Rate	8.669 (5.988)	2.853 (4.197)
Federal Transfers	-	623.009*** (.0001)
Constant	-1233.459*** (225.039)	-387.975** (192.277)

Robust Standard Errors in Parentheses

*P=.10 **P=.05 ***P=.01

Table Two
Cross Sectional Time Series
DV- Tax Receipts

	Model 3 Tax Receipts	Model 4 Tax Receipts ³
Observations	8406	8402
R-SQ Overall	.8700	.9072
Variables	Tax Receipts (Mill \$)	Tax Receipts (Mill \$)
Wilderness	100.696** (39.101)	40.357 (31.736)
Population	.0000 (.0008)	-.0029 (.0061)
Land Area	-.0161*** (.0070)	-.0128* (.0077)
Households	.0364*** (.0210)	.0436*** (.0168)
Δ Households	-9.816*** (1.357)	-8.467*** (1.249)
Birth Rate	20.467*** (7.147)	8.487* (5.018)
Infant Death Rate	-.7317 (.5887)	-.6194 (.5261)
School Enrollment	-.0185*** (.0158)	-.0015 (.0110)
High School Graduates	-3.804***	-2.799***

³ This model includes Federal Transfers

	(.9438)	(.8695)
Median Household Income	.0310*** (.0055)	.0102** (.0048)
Poverty Rate	17.356*** (2.675)	8.756*** (2.566)
Crime Rate	-.0903*** (.0284)	-.072*** (.0279)
Government Employment	.0385*** (.0435)	-.0725*** (.0279)
Social Security	2.355 (4.870)	-4.979 (4.060)
Unemployment Rate	7.881 (6.193)	2.410 (4.257)
Federal Transfers	--	613.374*** (104.694)
Constant	-1030.93*** (218.102)	-222.283 (181.805)

Robust Standard Errors in Parentheses

*P=.10 **P=.05 ***P=.01

In table two we use the same control variables but add change in households as it is likely to affect tax rates that are set under uncertainty about the tax population.

In Model 3, wilderness returns a positive and significant coefficient that seems to indicate that, holding the other variables constant, counties with wilderness designations have increased tax receipts. This result is somewhat puzzling given our expectation that wilderness should affect both tax receipts and payroll totals in the same way, and it does not.

We include one additional variable in models 2 and 4 to test for why some studies have found that wilderness improves conditions, including our own model 3. We find that by controlling for federal transfers, measured in millions of dollars, the wilderness coefficient which was significant in Model 3, is no longer significant when the transfers are controlled for. It seems likely given this result that rather than the designation of wilderness affecting the total tax receipts in a county, it is the presence of federal money that is the active agent. The fact that federal dollars increase total tax receipts is not a particularly interesting finding alone, but the fact that when it is included with wilderness, wilderness ceases to be significant indicates that in many of the previous studies it is possible that it is the influx of federal dollars that is driving the improved economic situation they suggest not wilderness.

Given these results two things seem apparent: First we find no consistent effect of wilderness designation for either of our Dependent variables. Once we control for federal transfers into counties, wilderness is not significant in either model. The second which grows from that reality is that if designation of wilderness comes with significant federal monies then it may have the positive effect asserted by other studies, however it is a rare wilderness that comes with those monies.

VI Analysis and Conclusion

The importance of economic development to those concerned about rural counties cannot be overstated, the extractive industries that have for so long been the life blood of these communities are under increasing pressure as reserves are depleted, cheaper alternatives are developed, and imported extractive resources compete in the market place.

That some would attempt to use the natural features that many of these counties have as a way to leverage economic development is certainly a potentially valuable undertaking. However

those that claim to have a magic bullet like protection designation to improve economic conditions have failed to evaluate and understand the data fully. Only when large scale federal transfers accompany the designation of wilderness does it appear that wilderness designation has a meaningful impact on the economic conditions of an area. That is not to say that for one county, designating an area for recreation whether it be wilderness, a national park or other type of land use, may be a way to improve its economic conditions. Nothing in this study precludes the wisdom of this use for individual counties if it is to their comparative advantage, rather the findings of this study indicate that the value of land protection without consideration of designation type cannot be taken as a given when considering the economic conditions of a particular area.

We instead suggest that the debate over the value of wilderness belongs less to the economists, and more to those who like John Muir contemplate the importance of wilderness and are led to observe about the destruction of wild places; *“One may as well dam for water tanks the people's cathedrals and churches, for no holier temple has ever been consecrated by the heart of man.”*

Works Cited

Anderson, T. L., Smith, V. L., & Simmons, E. (November 1999). How and why to privatize federal lands. *Policy Analysis*, 363. Retrieved from <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa363.pdf>.

Dawson, S., Blahna, D., & Keith, J. (1993). *Expected and Actual Regional Economic Impacts of Great Basin National Park*. Park Recreation Administration.

Deller, S. C., Tsai, T.-H., Marcouiller, D. W., & English, D. B. (2003). The Role of Amenities and Quality of Life in Rural Economic Growth. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* , 352-365.

Duffy-Deno, K. T. (1998). The effect of federal wilderness on county growth in the intermountainwestern United States. *Journal of Regional Science*, 38(1):109–136.

Green, G. P. (2001). Amenities and Community Economic Development: Strategies for Sustainability. *The Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy* , 61-753

Hansen, A., Rasker, R., Maxwell, B., Rotella, J., Johnson, J. D., Parmenter, A. W., et al. (2002). Ecological Causes and Consequences of Demographic Change in the New West. *Bioscience* , 151-162.

Holmes, P., Hecox, W. (2004). Does wilderness impoverish rural areas? *International Journal of Wilderness*10(3). 34–39. Retrieved from http://www.wilderness.net/library/documents/IJWDec04_Holmes.pdf.

Keith, J., & Fawson, C. (1995). Economic Development in Rural Utah: Is Wilderness Recreation the Answer? *The Annals of Regional Science* , 303-313.

Loomis, J. B., & Richardson, R. (2001). Economic Values of the U.S. Wilderness System. *International Journal of Wilderness* , 31-34.

Lorah, P. A. (2000). *Population growth, economic security, and cultural chagne in wilderness counties*. Ogden Utah: USDA.

Lorah, P. and R. Southwick. (2003). Environmental protection, population change, and economic development in the rural western United States. *Population and Environment*, 24(3). 255–272. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27503837>.

McGranahan, D. A. (1999). *Natural Amenities Drive Population Change*. 1-24: Food and Rural Economics Divsion, ERS, USDA Report 781.

Morton, P. (1998). The Economic Benefits of Wilderness: Theory and Practice. *Denver University Law Review* , 465.

Osterle, D.A. (1997). The politics of public lands. *Perspectives*. Retrieved from <http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv20n4/reg20n4-per.pdf>.

Power, T. M. (1991). Ecosystem preservation and the economy of the greater yellowstone area. *Conservation Biology* 5(3). 395–404. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2385911>.

Rasker, R. (2006) An exploration into the economic impact of industrial development versus conservation on western public lands. *Society & Natural Resources*, 19: 3, 191 — 207. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920500460583>.

Rudzitis, G., & Johansen, H. E. (1989). Migration into Western Wilderness Counties: Causes and Consequences. *Western Wildlands* , 19-23.

Rudzitis, G., Johansen, H.E. (1991). How important is wilderness? Results from a United States survey. *Environmental Management*, 15. 227–233.

Rudzitis, G., Johnson, R. (2000). The impact of wilderness and other wildlands on local economies and regional development trends. USDA Forest Service Proceedings RMRS-P-15-VOL-2. Retrieved from http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_p015_2/rmrs_p015_2_014_026.pdf.

Shumway, J. M. and S. M. Otterstrom. 2001. Spatial patterns of migration and income change in the mountain west: The dominance of service-based, amenity-rich counties. *Professional Geographer*, 53(4).492–502. Retrieved from <http://griggs.byu.edu:30125/faculty/shumway/pubs/PG.pdf>.

The Sonoran Institute. (2006). *You've Come a Long Way, Cowboy; Ten Truths and Trends in the New American West*. Sonora Institute.