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ABSTRACT

An Analysis of Private Land Transfers
And Other Factors in Rural Utah
Counties during 1969-1971

by

Doyle John Snow, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1975

Major Professor: Dr. Lynn H. Davis
Department: Economics

Apparent increases in sales and price of rural land, recent changes in land taxing procedure and proposed land-use legislation have brought forth a number of land questions among legislators, public officials and the general citizenry of Utah. This study is directed at questions pertaining to land purchases and land buyers in rural Utah counties.

A random sample was taken of the land transfer cards on file at the Utah State Tax Commission. Land buyers whose names appeared on the transfer cards and the returned questionnaires were used in the analysis and are the sole basis of the conclusions of the study.

General conclusions from the study were:

1. Land-use at the time of the transaction was most frequently agricultural or vacant or idle for acreages and was most frequently non-agricultural for lots.

2. Following the transaction there was a tendency on the part of buyers to change agricultural and vacant or idle land to a different land use.

(173 pages)
3. Buyer characteristics such as annual income, buyer age and residence varied among the regions of the state and were important factors in land transfers.

4. About 50 percent of the total dollars spent for land parcels included in the sample went for residential land. Land located near city limits, improved or unimproved, averaged the highest price per acre or lot.

The study's conclusions apply only to recorded land transfers on file at the Utah State Tax Commission for the years 1969 through 1971.
INTRODUCTION

Increased buying and selling of privately owned rural Utah land has attracted considerable attention from Utah citizens. Studies show rapid increases in land values in most parts of the state in recent years.

There appears to be an increasing demand for rural and mountainous land. Possible reasons for the increase in demand, the resultant transactions and higher land values are:

1. Capitalized earning value of land in agricultural use, such as farming and grazing, is below its market value possibly encouraging sales and land-use changes.

2. The number of buyers and potential buyers has increased, coinciding with recent population increases in Utah and the Southwest, particularly the West Coast area. Population density, congestion, high costs of living and environmental factors have enhanced the desire in the urban sector to purchase rural and mountainous property in anticipation of recreation, part-time seasonal use, a place for retirement, lower costs of living in the rural area, less congestion and a cleaner rural environment.

3. Higher disposable income in urban and non-farm sectors in recent years may have increased the proportion of potential buyers.

4. Expectation of the above circumstances may be leading to land being purchased as an investment in anticipation of capital gains. Lack of functional and efficient regulatory ordinances and improper planning may be allowing land developers a greater than normal profit resulting in increasing land prices and number of transfers.
The upward trends in volume of transactions and land values needs to be studied. In the past, land-use in and around Utah communities has been predominantly agricultural. Aging farmers and ranchers may be selling soon or transferring to their heirs. Increasing land prices make it difficult for buyers with agricultural motives to realize an acceptable rate of return on land investments thus encouraging a land-use change as land is transferred. Lack of information concerning the land-use plans of the new landowner, his motives for purchasing the land, his characteristics such as residence, annual income, and occupation, could result in nonfunctional and inefficient land-use policies and regulations at all levels of government in the state.

Where waste disposal, drinking water, and recreation areas have not been problems in rural areas in the past, insufficient public knowledge and interest in planning could result in postmortem alarm being aroused after prime recreation areas are damaged, community water shortages occur, lakes and streams are polluted, and large fiscal burdens are placed on rural counties and communities.

Land-use changes and new residents in rural communities of the state may stimulate community life giving rural Utah a new face where communities were dying out due to off-farm migration of the younger citizens. The apparent trend is not necessarily undesirable and may in fact produce desirable circumstances if care is taken to properly direct the development. New subdivisions could increase the tax base making possible valuable community services presently lacking in most rural areas.
Aging farmers and ranchers, who may have experienced lean years in the past with regard to income, may find a small fortune in their land holdings enabling them to enjoy a comfortable income.

Information disclosing the amount of rural property being transferred, the type of land-use changes taking place, the buyer's characteristics and motives for purchasing, would facilitate public administrators at the state and local levels in planning community land-use regulations, public school facilities, equitable taxing procedures, public roads, and parks. Such information would be useful in helping the apparent trends work as a stimulus to Utah communities. Presently little information is available concerning this subject.
OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study were:

1. To determine the characteristics of Utah lands being transferred such as, location, land-use and improvements on the land.

2. To determine what land-use changes have recently taken place, what land-use changes are anticipated in the future, the improvements added since the purchase and improvements planned in the future.

3. To determine the motives of the buyers for purchasing rural land, their annual income, occupations, residence and age.

4. To determine the effect of location and land-use on land prices.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed was helpful in two areas of the thesis: (1) the development and refinement of the objectives and (2) the organization of the methodology used in the research.

The results and/or conclusions of each piece of literature reviewed are mentioned for the purpose of disclosing the present state of knowledge in this particular area of economic research.

Gilmore and Walsh (1971) made an in-depth study of local costs and revenues of mountain land subdivision activity in 1970 and 1971 of two counties, Alamosa and Costilla, in Colorado. The primary emphasis was to "ascertain the economic effects on public as well as on private sectors" resulting from subdivision activity since 1970. They concluded that "the extent and rate of subdivision activity since 1970 poses a definite challenge to the local and state governments of Colorado."

Gilmore and Walsh recommended that a certain level of development be attained and that future subdivisions be allowed only after all ramifications of the new subdivision are studied. It was suggested that steps should be taken to protect persons buying property advertised by the mail.

McPherson (1973) studied the environmental and economic impacts of recreational subdivisions at the state and local levels. The study was limited to subdivisions located outside of incorporated communities and registered with Utah Real Estate Division, Department of Business Regulation 1962-1972.
From a case study MacPherson concluded that inequities existed between recreational land and other land assessment rates in Iron County, Utah. Consequently, holders of mountain recreational property, mostly California and Nevada residents, and real estate developers operating in Iron County were being subsidized by Iron County residents.

Johnson's study (1973) of Utah's subdivisions observed nine counties of the state to determine the extent of planning, location, number of subdivisions and functional ability of the subdivisions. The subdivisions were classified in four categories: (1) second home recreation, (2) retirement, (3) standard urban development, and (4) nonfunctional. The study found that the rate of subdivision plat recordings had accelerated in the last 3 years of the ten-year study. The study concluded that in the quest for profit, speculators may overlook or deliberately resist standards which are designed to protect the public from unwise use of natural resources. It is incumbent upon local officials to understand the consequences of uncontrolled subdivision activity and formulate wise public policy to satisfy the needs of the public more effectively.

Dopson and Miller (1966) attempted to develop alternative methods to improve tax systems in urban-fringe areas. Types of information sought were:

1. The trend of assessments and taxation in rural-urban fringe areas.
2. Changes in ownership pattern of farm land.
3. Changes in land-use patterns.
4. The assessed valuations of land under varying types of ownership, present-use, and potential future use.
5. Market value of land by size of tract and changes in market value of a tract throughout the transition period from agricultural to urban use.

The study, limited to a section of St. Louis County near the city of St. Louis, Missouri, found urban expansion caused land prices to increase in the urban fringe areas. Assessment rates were found inequitable "within and without the tax jurisdiction."

Munger and Lommer (1964) related the personal characteristics of people owning land to its use and management. Land tracts were classified by use and management criteria and owners of the tracts were classified by certain characteristics presumed to effect the land use. The relationship between the two categories were studied. They concluded that while it is possible to measure the relationship between certain of their characteristics and certain attitudes and practices and attitudes in land management, it is often impossible to measure the economic consequences or decide whether those attitudes and practices should be regarded as generally desirable or undesirable.

Walsh and Parsons (1972) took a new approach in demand analysis for outdoor recreation. They hypothesized that recreation expenditures were dependent upon a household's choice of shelter instead of the type of activities they participated in. The study results were to aid future use policy and recreational development policy. The questions were:

1. How does demand for seasonal housing differ in general recreation areas compared to major ski areas?

2. What are the price and income consequences of different forms of recreation land development control?

3. What would given changes for control of water pollution and restoration of wildlife habitat do to the demand for seasonal recreation
housing use?

4. How much leisure time allocated to seasonal home use has to be increased in the future to lower price per day to the alternative cost of commercial lodging or even campground shelter?

Independent variables of the Walsh and Parsons (1972) demand equation for seasonal-recreation homes include:

\[ X_1 = \text{The total amount fixed costs associated with the ownership and use of a seasonal home.} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{Annual income.} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{Variable price (cost) per day of seasonal home use.} \]

\[ X_4 = \text{Net worth of the respondent.} \]

\[ X_5 = \text{Total value of seasonal home and associated land.} \]

\[ X_6 = \text{Education (6-20) years.} \]

\[ X_7 = \text{Age of seasonal home owner.} \]

\[ X_8 = \text{Distance of seasonal home from regular residence.} \]

\[ X_9 = \text{Estimated number of trips made by members of seasonal home owner's household in trips from regular residence to seasonal home.} \]

\[ X_{10} = \text{Estimated total mileage traveled (two-way) by members of owner's household in trips from regular residence to seasonal home.} \]

\[ X_{11} = \text{Occupational or employment category.} \]

\[ X_{12} = \text{Family size.} \]

\[ X_{13} = \text{Recreation home size category.} \]

The results of the study indicated that public use fees to cover social external costs could be increased without a relatively large decrease in quantity of seasonal home use, but with an overall increase in consumer expenditures and consequently government revenue.
The study results favored the argument that a policy of pricing the public good input into seasonal housing services should play a substantial role in placing seasonal home recreation on a pay-as-you-go basis. Moreover, a policy of public fees would have important efficiency effects by reducing the misallocation of resources associated with the present policy of zero or nominal pricing of external costs of water pollution and wildlife habitat destruction.

Jahns and Smith (1967), after developing, pretesting and revising a questionnaire, mailed it to a two-thirds random sample from water-oriented and non-water-oriented seasonal residents during December 1964 and January 1965. Persons not responding after 3 weeks time were sent a followup letter. Six weeks after the original mailing non-responding persons were sent a second questionnaire.

Data were coded and punched on data processing cards and analyzed at the computer center at the University of Maryland. It was hypothesized that there is a significant difference between seasonal residents attracted to water-oriented resources and seasonal residents attracted to non-water-oriented resources.

In summary, the data presented evidence of substantial differences between the non-resident owners of water-oriented property and upland non-water-oriented property. These data suggest that non-residents who own property in rural areas not only are attracted to the natural resources, but are attracted to the resources for different reasons. Further, it is suggested from the data that the social and economic impact that different non-resident property owners have on the community differs considerably.

Non-residents who are attracted to rural areas are not all alike nor do they make the same contributions to the development and/or stabilization of the rural areas in which they are located.
Reynolds and Timmons (1969) set forth the following objectives in their study:

1. To identify the major variables affecting farmland value.
2. To describe and quantify the relevant variables.
3. To develop a method to test the importance of variables identified, and
4. To apply the procedure to estimate the importance of relevant variables in explaining farmland values.

Their model was useful in identifying several variables that exert significant effects on farm values. Variables identified that are significant to this thesis were farm enlargement, non-farm population density, ratio of debt to equity, and the number of voluntary transfers of land.

Murray and Cissel (1970) researched the level of farm and real estate prices in the state of Maryland. Objectives of their search were:

1. To discover the number of farm and open country real estate transfers in the state of Maryland in each county and each election district.

2. To obtain information on the types of lenders and other pertinent information shown on the property transfer record. The study was limited to parcels one acre or larger in size. Parcels not in a subdivision or municipality and lots were excluded, as were "straw" transactions.

The information was obtained by copying the counties property transfer records at the Maryland State Department of Assessments and Taxation and/or the County Offices of Assessment and Taxation. After
the data were coded and punched they were analyzed with the assistance of a computer.

Sinclair (1969), in an attempt to make a "systematic analysis of average prices paid for rural land of all types of uses," took a sample of representative towns in the state of Vermont. The economic base of the sample towns and regions were defined. Data were only collected from sales of undeveloped land by enumerators from people assumed to be knowledgable about each particular town land market. General analysis was performed according to area and time period. Subsorts were made according to parcel size, location of the buyer, and planned use.

The study found the major planned use of land by buyers was recreation or vacation purposes. Out-of-state buyers were an important factor in the land market, but Sinclair found out-of-state buyers were assumed to be a much more important factor in the land market by local residents than was actually the case.

Marsh, Torres and Raup (1970) studied the rural real estate market for Minnesota for the years 1968-1969. Data were collected by mail questionnaires sent to "farm real estate dealers, agricultural loan representatives, bankers, lawyers and others with specific first hand knowledge of the real estate market situation." Data included sale price, characteristics of buyers and sellers and methods of financing.

They found farm expansion buyers dominated the 1969 land market. The most popular method of financing in 1969 was the contract of deed.
METHODS OF PROCEDURE

Procedures to identify land transfers began by consulting with the Utah State Tax Commission. Permission was obtained to copy the side of the Assessment Level Study card on file at the Tax Commission containing the name and address of the grantee and grantor, the legal description of the property, and the date of transfer. The reverse side of the card contained confidential information and was not copied (see Appendix A). The years 1969 through 1971 were chosen for the study since transfer cards for years prior to 1969 were not complete for every county. Due to the timing of the study, the 1972 transfer cards were not yet on file for every county included in the study. Counties not included in the study because of their urban characteristics were Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah.

The transfer cards were inspected to determine those with sufficient information to be used in the study. To be used in the study cards needed to contain a complete name and address of the grantee, a complete legal description of the property, and the date of the transfer. Cards with sufficient information were numbered consecutively for each county. Each county started in a different number range. For example, Daggett County may have ranged from numbers 100 to 356, Duchesne County from 400 to 678, and so forth, until each card in each county included in the study had a unique number. A 30 percent random sample of the transfer cards with sufficient information was taken from each county. Grantees listed on the sample cards were surveyed by mail questionnaire.
A questionnaire was developed, pretested and revised. The questionnaire contained questions pertaining to land-use, improvements, location of the property, and general characteristics of the purchase and of the grantee (see Appendix A).

A cover letter to be mailed with the questionnaire was developed to explain the purpose and source of the study, the parcel of land in question, the year, and county in which the parcel was located. The letter was signed and enclosed in an envelope with the questionnaire and a return address envelope. A number was placed on the return envelope corresponding to the number on the transfer card. This step was necessary to correlate the questionnaire response with the information on the transfer card. Responses were recorded as they were returned. Persons not responding were mailed a second cover letter, questionnaire, and return envelope. Frequently letters were returned because of a wrong address. The address was checked with the transfer card to assure it was typed properly. If the address was typed correctly, it was assumed the grantee had moved since the transfer, resulting in a change of address, and an attempt was made to locate the new address of the grantee by checking the local telephone directories where the land was purchased. Numerous addresses were found and a good response resulted from the resultant second mailing of questionnaires.

Data contained on the transfer card were coded, such as number of acres or number of lots, date of transfer, county in which the parcel was transferred, residence of the grantee, and number of the transfer, and punched on data processing cards. Information on all transfer cards included in the 30 percent sample were punched on data processing cards.
A coding system was developed for the questionnaire. Data from returned questionnaires, with sufficient information for analysis, were recorded on data processing cards.

Computer programs to analyze the data were prepared by the Utah State University computer center under the supervision of the author. The information was checked for consistency. Corrections were made in the computer programs and data cards when errors were observed.

Objective One

The computer was used to sum the number of parcels, number of acres, number of lots, mean number of acres and mean number of lots for each pertinent category. Data for the objectives were taken from the transfer cards and sections I and II of the questionnaire. The number of acres or lots in each land use at the time of transfer was determined by multiplying the percentage of each parcel in each particular land use times the number of acres or lots in the parcel and summing the results for each land-use category.

Objective Two

To accomplish Objective Two the computer was used to determine land-use changes with the same procedure described previously in Objective One. Land use or anticipated use was summarized for three periods of time: former (at time of purchase), present (at the time of the survey in 1973) and future.

The improvements on the land at the time of purchase, those added since the purchase, and those planned in the future were summarized from Section II of the questionnaire.
Objective Three

The computer was used to perform analyses on regional and state levels. Counties were grouped into regions according to their geographic location to facilitate the analysis, since useful responses for most counties were too small in number to be of significance at the county level. The least squares linear regression equation, \( y = a - bx \), was used to study the relationship between buyer income and the mean parcel size. Where appropriate sections of the questionnaire, such as land use, location of the property, and purchase motives were related to buyer characteristics.

Objective Four

The computer was used to analyze the effect of location and land use on average land prices at regional and state levels. To eliminate the influence of improvements on the land, it was necessary to separate improved land parcels from unimproved land parcels. Analysis was performed on both improved and unimproved parcels. Also, since it was not possible to determine the proportion of the total price or consideration paid for land in each use in a parcel with multiple uses, it was necessary to analyze only those parcels with only one land use at the time of transfer.

Limitations of the data

The Assessment Level Study Cards on file at the Utah State Tax Commission for the years 1969 through 1971 represented land transactions recorded at the county level during those years. Land transactions in which the deed was kept in escrow until the terms of the agreement have been met cannot be recorded until the delivery of the deed. The
The transactions studied were those that were begun and recorded during 1969-1971.

The 30 percent random sample was taken from the usable recorded transactions. About 40 percent of the buyers in the sample responded to the mail survey. Therefore, analysis was done on responses from less than 12 percent of the buyers of the recorded transactions.

The results of the study can only be used to make inferences about recorded transactions during 1969 through 1971. No inferences can be made about the land or buyers involved in transactions that took place during the study period but were not recorded.
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Characteristics of Recorded Transfers of Rural Utah Land for the Years 1969 through 1971

The objective of this section is to describe the recorded transfers of land in rural areas of Utah from 1969 through 1971.¹

The number of recorded transactions observed

A 30 percent sample consisting of 2,184 transactions was taken from transfer cards for rural Utah counties on file at the Utah State Tax Commission for 1969-1971.² The distribution of the transactions over the study period and the transaction index for the study period appears as follows:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of transfer</th>
<th>Number of sample transactions</th>
<th>Transaction index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Rural areas of Utah are defined as all the counties of the state excepting Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties. Unfortunately, Uintah County was not included in the study because of the lack of transfer cards at the State Tax Commission for the study period.

²Usable transfer cards had the name and address of the buyer (grantee), the date of the transaction, and a legal description. Some of the transfer cards did not have the complete information.

³The transaction index measures the percentage increase in the number of transfers in 1970 and 1971 compared to the base year 1969.
The 2,184 transfers included in the sample were divided into two groups according to the property description; transfers described as an acreage and transfers described by a lot and block number. The distributions of the sample transfers over the three years of the study for each of the two categories appears in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of transfers and amount of land transferred, by acreage and lot transfers, 2,184 sample transfers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of transfer</th>
<th>Acreage transfers</th>
<th>Lot transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of transfers</td>
<td>Number of acres transferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>5,478.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>6,487.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>10,842.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>22,808.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mail questionnaire was sent to the grantees at the address appearing on each of the 2,184 sample transfer cards. The number of returned questionnaires with sufficient information for analysis in this thesis chapter is shown in Table 2.

Distribution of land transferred

Duchesne and Iron Counties accounted for 43.9 percent of the total number of acres in the sample. Eight counties had less than 1 percent of the total acreage in the sample. Counties in this category were Beaver, Carbon, Piute, Rich, Sanpete, Sevier, Wasatch and Wayne (see Appendix B).
Table 2. Usable responses to a mail questionnaire survey of 2,184 buyers of land, acreage and lot transfers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of transfer</th>
<th>Acreage transactions</th>
<th>Lot transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>Percent responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot transfers in the sample were considered separately from transfers with an area description because of the difficulty of finding the area of any given lot. Lots were measured by the number transferred. No attempt was made to determine the acreage of the lots transferred.

Iron County had the largest percentage of the lot transfers in the sample (16 percent). Sevier County recorded the least number of lot transfers with Piute, Sanpete, San Juan, and Wayne Counties as close followers.

Counties with the most active land market, considering all descriptions of parcels transferred, were as follows: (The number appearing in each column are percentages of the sample total for each particular category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percent of acreage transactions</th>
<th>Percent of acres transferred</th>
<th>Percent of lot transactions</th>
<th>Percent of lots transferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>59.21</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>34.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land use at the time of transfer**

The use of land at the time of transfer was an area of interest in this study. Land in agricultural use accounted for about 60 percent of the acreage transferred during the study period, Table 3.
Table 3. Land use at time of transfer, 6,277.7 acres and 667 lots, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at transfer</th>
<th>Percent of acres</th>
<th>Percent of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated cropland</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated cropland</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural land</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total agricultural land</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational land</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential land</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial land</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle land</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain of land use</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total c</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Several of the respondents to the questionnaire did not respond to the land use section of the questionnaire. The buyers had purchased 137.8 acres and 20 lots.
bLess than 0.1 percent.
cColumn may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Among the agricultural lands transferred, grazing was the predominant use of acreage transactions. About 37 percent of the 6,277.7 acres were categorized as grazing land.

Agricultural land not categorized as irrigated, non-irrigated, or grazing land was described as "other agricultural land." Feed lots are an example of such agricultural land.
Next to agricultural land, vacant or idle land was the most frequent category of land changing owners during the three year period. Of the acres represented by a mail questionnaire, about one-third were vacant or idle land.

About 32 percent of the lots in the sample were vacant or idle and 26 percent were in residential use at the time of transfer. Twenty-three percent of the lots were agricultural land, 14 percent in grazing and about 7 percent in irrigated cropland.

The number of acreage transactions, number of acres, and mean parcel size of acreage transactions in each land-use category are shown in Table 4. Agricultural land and vacant or idle land transferred as large parcels compared with land transactions in other categories.

**Location of the land transferred**

As shown in Table 5, 55 to 60 percent of the transfers, both acreages and lots, were of land located inside city limits. Open farming countryside had the next largest number of acreage transfers. The next largest category for lot transfers was land located in mountain areas.

The largest number of acres transferred were in open farming countryside, Table 6. Most of the lots transferred were located in city limits. The second largest location category for acres of land and number of lots transferred was mountain area.

Acreage transactions in the "other" location category averaged the largest number of acres per parcel, Table 7. Parcels located in open farming countryside average the next largest number of acres per parcel transferred. Transactions of acreages located in mountain area averaged 26 acres per parcel. The number of lots per parcel did not vary greatly due to location.
Table 4. Number of transactions, number of acres, and mean parcel size of acreage transactions, by land use at time of transfer, 370 acreage transactions, 6,277.7 acres, rural Utah 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at transfer</th>
<th>Number of transactions</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Acres per transaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated cropland</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>912.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated cropland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>364.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2,332.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural land</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential land</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial land</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle land</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2,039.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain of land use</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>370.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>6,277.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of transactions do not sum to 370 because several transactions involved parcels with more than one land use.
### Table 5. Location of land transferred, by percentage of transactions, 370 acreage and 496 lot transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of the land</th>
<th>Percent of acreage transfers</th>
<th>Percent of lot transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City limits</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated town</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aColumns may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

### Table 6. Location of land transferred, by number of acres and lots transferred, 6,415.5 acres and 687 lots, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of the land</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City limits</td>
<td>427.4</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated town</td>
<td>741.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>609.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>3,122.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>883.6</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>505.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid*a</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,415.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>687</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSome of the questionnaire responses did not indicate the location of the property. The number of responses in this category are unknown due to the program procedure.

*bColumns may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.
Table 7. Average size of parcel transferred, by location of land transferred, 370 acreage transactions, 496 lot transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of the land</th>
<th>Number of acres per parcel</th>
<th>Number of lots per parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City limits</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated town</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Near or adjacent amenities of land transferred

It appears that most of the parcels of land transferring ownership were near or adjacent hunting areas, fishing, public land, and public streams. The smallest percentage of parcels were located near or adjacent non-public lakes and non-public streams. Forty-nine percent of responses indicated the land parcel was not near or adjacent any of the amenities.  

The largest parcels and the largest number of acres were near or adjacent public lands, hunting or fishing areas (see Table 9). The average parcel size was smallest near or adjacent skiing resorts and public lakes. The least number of acres were transferred near or adjacent non-public lakes. Responses indicated 2,096.8 acres with an average of 9.9 acres per transfer were not near or adjacent any amenities.

1 If the land purchased was near or not near certain amenities was a decision left up to the judgement of the buyer.
Table 8. Percent of acreage and lot transactions near or adjacent each amenity, 370 acreage and 496 lot transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of land transferred near or adjacent</th>
<th>Percent of acreage transfers</th>
<th>Percent of lot transfers</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public lands</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public streams</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lakes</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public streams</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public lakes</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing resorts</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting area</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property improvements at the time of transfers

Property improvements were categorized in three categories: utilities, buildings and structures, and street and road conditions.

Utilities. Electricity, culinary water, and sewer systems appeared to be the predominant utilities present on rural Utah land transferred during 1969-1971, Table 10. About 48 percent of the parcels, both acreages and lots, had electricity, about 48 percent had culinary water, and 41 percent had a public or private sewer system.
Table 9. Mean parcel size and number of acres near or adjacent each amenity, 370 acreage transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of land transferred near or adjacent</th>
<th>Mean parcel size</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public lands</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>3006.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public streams</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1010.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lakes</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>407.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public streams</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>445.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public lakes</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>122.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing resorts</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>270.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2007.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting area</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>2715.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2096.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Percent of utility improvements at time of transfer, 370 acreage and 496 lot transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Percent of acreage transfers</th>
<th>Percent of lot transfers</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culinary water</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (Public)</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (Private)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buildings and structures. Year-around-personal residences were the most frequent structures on land parcels transferred during the study period, Table 11. Fences and irrigation systems were the next most commonly found improvements. Commercial and industrial structures were the least prevalent.

Table 11. Percent of building and structural improvements, 370 acreage and 496 lot transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings &amp; structures</th>
<th>Percent of acreage transfers</th>
<th>Percent of lot transfers</th>
<th>Grand total (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year around personal residence</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time seasonal residence</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or industrial</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm buildings</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation system</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Streets and roads. The majority of parcels, about 52 percent, transferred in rural Utah counties during the study period had access to paved road (see Table 12). About 26 percent reported gravelled road and 20 percent reported unimproved road conditions at the time of transfer. Purchasers of lots reported gravelled road and unimproved road conditions more frequently than did acreage buyers. About 21
percent of the parcels had curb and gutter; and around 18 percent of the parcels had sidewalk. Buyers of lots reported curb and gutter and sidewalk improvements more frequently than did acreage purchasers.

Table 12. Street and road conditions at time of transfer, 370 acreage and 496 lot transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street and road conditions</th>
<th>Percent of acreage transfers</th>
<th>Percent of lot transfers</th>
<th>Grand total (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravelled road</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved road</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and gutter</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean parcel size of acreage transfers was smallest for parcels having access to paved road (see Table 13). Parcels with unimproved road averaged the largest parcel size. The smallest mean parcel size was reported for parcels with curb and gutter and sidewalk improvements. Eight buyers of acreages, averaging about 54 acres per parcel, reported other street and road conditions.
Table 13. Mean parcel size and number of acres transferred by street and road conditions at time of transfer, 370 acreage transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street and road condition</th>
<th>Mean parcel size of acreage transfers</th>
<th>Total acres transferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1361.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravelled road</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>1747.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved road</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>2135.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and gutter</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>33.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>38.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53.89</td>
<td>431.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in Land Use

The objective of this section is to describe changes in use of land transferred during 1969-1971 as indicated by responses to a mail questionnaire. Questionnaire recipients were asked to indicate the use or uses of the parcel of land purchased. The time periods of interest were:

1. Former use, i.e., how the land was being used when it was purchased.
2. Present use, i.e., how the buyer was using the land when he was surveyed.
3. Future use, i.e., how the buyer plans to use the property in the future.

Returned questionnaires with sufficient information for analysis purposes were received for 866 transactions representing 6,277.7 acres and 670 lots.

Agricultural land

In general the number of acres and lots in agricultural use at the time of transfer declined with the passage of time, Tables 14 and 14a. At the time of the mail survey (1973) acreage buyers had changed 12 percent of the agricultural land purchased during the study period to non-agricultural uses. By 1973 buyers of lots in agricultural use had changed 62 percent of the lots to non-agricultural uses. Buyers planned, at the time of the mail survey, to change 26 percent of the acres and 36 percent of the lots remaining in agricultural use to non-agricultural uses. (See Figures 1 and 2.)

Irrigated cropland. Buyers had increased irrigated cropland acreage by the summer of 1973 (Figure 3). Buyers planned to reduce irrigated
Table 14. Changes in use of land, 370 acreage transactions representing 6,277.7 acres, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Number of acres in each use period</th>
<th>Percentage change in use from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated cropland</td>
<td>912.9</td>
<td>944.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated cropland</td>
<td>364.8</td>
<td>122.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>2332.5</td>
<td>2078.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural land</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>143.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total agricultural land</td>
<td>3739.6</td>
<td>3288.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational land</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>119.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential land</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>823.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial land</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>160.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle land</td>
<td>2039.8</td>
<td>1278.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain use of land</td>
<td>370.1</td>
<td>519.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6277.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>6276.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a^\)There is a slight variation in the totals due to a rounding effect.
Table 14a. Changes in use of land, 496 lot transactions representing 670 lots, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Number of lots in each use period</th>
<th>Percentage change in use from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated cropland</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated cropland</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural land</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total agricultural land</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational land</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential land</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>266.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial land</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle land</td>
<td>210.7</td>
<td>153.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain of land use</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>667.2</td>
<td>665.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals for each use period varies slightly from other use periods due to rounding.
Figure 1. Trend in use of land for agricultural purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 2. Trend in use of land for agricultural purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 3. Trend in use of land for irrigated crop purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
cropland acreage, by 23 percent sometime in the future. Irrigated cropland had the lowest rate of land use change of the three major agricultural use categories.

Sixty percent of the irrigated cropland lots purchased during the study period had had the land use changed by 1973 (see Table 14 and Figure 4). The buyers had made most of the planned land use changes by the time of the mail survey.

**Non-irrigated cropland.** Buyers of non-irrigated cropland, as shown in Table 13 and Figure 5, had changed 66 percent of the land to a different land use by the time of the mail survey in 1973. Plans of the buyers would have the number of acres in non-irrigated cropland changed only slightly in the future.

New owners of lot parcels of non-irrigated cropland had made a 60 percent change in the use of the lots by the summer of 1973 (Table 14 and Figure 6). The plans of the buyers would further reduce the number of lots in non-irrigated cropland use in the future.

**Grazing land.** Grazing land was unique among the major agricultural land-use categories. Most buyers of land in other categories made the greatest percentage of land-use change immediately following the land title transfer. Table 13 and Figure 7 show buyers of acreages of grazing land acted differently; 11 percent of the acres were immediately changed to a different land use. Of the grazing land purchased and still remaining as grazing land at the time of the survey, buyers expected to change 24 percent of the acres to a different land use in the future. Of the 2332.5 acres of grazing land represented with questionnaire responses, 758.8 acres were purchased with the intent of changing the land use. By the summer of 1973, 254.1 acres had had the land-use
Figure 4. Trend in use of land for irrigated crop purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
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Figure 5. Trend in use of land for non-irrigated crop purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 6. Trend in use of land for non-irrigated crop purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 7. Trend in use of land for grazing purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
changed. The area of grazing land purchased with the intent of changing the land use is 2.07 times larger than the next largest category.

As shown in Table 14 and Figure 8, the number of lots transferred as grazing land was considerably larger than the next largest agricultural land category. Of the lots transferred in grazing use, 69 percent had been changed to a different use by the time of the mail survey in 1973. Of the lots remaining in grazing use in 1973, buyers expect 65 percent to be used differently in the future.

Other agricultural land. All agricultural land transferring title not categorized in the three major categories of irrigated, non-irrigated, and grazing land was categorized in the "other agricultural land" category.

The number of acres of "other" agricultural land was increased 11 percent from the time of transfer to the summer of 1973 (see Table 13 and Figure 9). However, buyers plan to change 84 percent of the acres to different uses in the future.

As shown in Table 14 and Figure 10, 40 percent of the lots transferred were changed to different uses by 1973. Of the lots in the "other" agricultural land category, 12 percent were expected to be used differently in the future.

Vacant or idle land

Vacant or idle land was a predominant use of land transferring ownership during the study period of 1969 through 1971 (see Table 13 and Figure 11). Of the 6277.7 acres in the entire sample, 2039.8 acres were classified as vacant or idle land (34 percent). Of the land classified as vacant or idle, 37 percent was being used differently by 1973. Buyers planned for 48 percent of the land transferred remaining vacant or idle 1973 to be used differently in the future. Only 67 percent of the land
Figure 8. Trend in use of land for grazing purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 9. Trend in use of land for other agricultural purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969–1971.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Number of Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Use</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Use</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Trend in use of land for other agricultural purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 11. Trend in use of land for vacant or idle purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
transferred as vacant or idle land was purchased in anticipation of changing the land use. Respondents indicated 33 percent of the land had had no use change or planned a use change in the future.

The number of lots transferred as vacant or idle exceeded all other land-use categories. Buyers of vacant or idle lots planned to use 83 percent of the lots differently. However, by 1973 only 27 percent of the lots were in a different land-use (see Table 14 and Figure 12).

Uncertain of land-use

The land-use category of "uncertain" was added to the list of use categories since some of the respondents to the questionnaire did not give a complete accounting of the land-use of the parcel of land. When a respondent did not account for 100 percent of the property in the various use categories in each of the land-use periods, the remaining percentage was accounted for in the uncertain category. When respondents failed to indicate the land use in each time period the uncertain category was used so as to have a complete accounting. For example, if a respondent indicated 50 percent of the parcel purchased should be in residential use in the future, but did not indicate how the rest of the parcel was to be used, the remaining 50 percent of the parcel was counted as uncertain in future use. If a respondent indicated that the parcel was 100 percent vacant when he purchased it and is presently 100 percent vacant but did not respond to the future use category, then for the future use 100 percent of the property use was credited to uncertain. Uncertain means that as interpreters of the questionnaire we were uncertain as to the future use of the property. To some degree the "uncertain" category could be interpreted as the respondent being
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Use</th>
<th>Present Use</th>
<th>Future Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210.7</td>
<td>153.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Trend in use of land for vacant or idle purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
uncertain of the land use. To a slighter degree uncertainty could be interpreted as an error term.

Uncertainty of land-use increased 40 percent from the time of transfer to the summer of 1973 (see Table 13 and Figure 13). From 1973 future uncertainty increased 257 percent. The number of acres involved in the percentage are 370.1 acres "at the time of transfer," 519.7 acres "at present," 1852.8 acres "in the future." The large number of acres in the "future" category make uncertain land use the predominant category for that time period.

Uncertainty of land use had decreased slightly from the time of transfer to the present but was increased 193 percent from the present into the future (see Table 14 and Figure 14). The number of lots in the uncertain category were 71.7 at the transfer, 67.9 at present, and 198.8 in the future.

The effect of the uncertain classification is significant to this study. As the future is uncertain, one would expect the question of future land use to increase in uncertainty. The effect of a large number of acres and lots with an uncertain use plan is to make the area in other land use classifications subject to a greater future variation than is now indicated by the trend analysis. The use that may be declining in acreage or number of lots may be sharply reversed to the extent that land in the uncertain category is capable of filling that particular use. A large number of acres and lots with an uncertain future use could also explain some of the trends found in residential, commercial and industrial use categories.
Figure 13. Trend in use of land for uncertain purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 14. Trend in use of land for uncertain purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Recreational land

Land in recreational use partly accounts for the trend for the agricultural lands. Table 13 and Figure 15 show that recreational use of land was increased 313 percent by the time of the mail survey. Buyers planned to increase the acreage used for recreational purposes 461 percent sometime in the future.

Lots are being brought into recreational use at an even higher rate than acreages (see Table 14 and Figure 16). The number of lots used for recreational purposes increased 558 percent from the time the lots were purchased until 1973. Future plans should increase the number of lots in recreational use 558 percent from the time of transfer to 1973 is a result of the small number of lots in recreational use transferred during the study period. There were 10.6 lots listed as being in recreation land-use at the time of transfer. By 1973, 59.2 of the lots in the sample changed to recreational use from the former use. In 1973, 41.2 lots not in recreational use were expected to be changed to recreational use in the future.

Residential land

Residential use follows an unexpected pattern from former use through future use plans (see Figure 17). Table 13 shows residential land increased 770 percent from the time of transaction to 1973. It was expected that future plans would maintain the level of use of residential land or increase the amount of land in residential use. However, the data show buyers planned a 43 percent decline in acres used for future residential purposes.
Figure 15. Trend in use of land for recreational purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 16. Trend in use of land for recreational purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 17. Trend in use of land for residential purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Lots in residential use followed a more consistent pattern than did acreage transactions. Lots used for residential purposes increased 50 percent over the number of residential lots at the transfer period. Future use of residential lots show a decrease of 4 percent (see Figure 18 and Table 14).

Commercial land

Recorded transactions of commercial land were minimal during the study period (2.2 acres), Table 13 and Figure 19. By 1973 the acreage used commercially had increased to 9.5 acres (335 percent). Buyers planned to use 51.9 acres commercially in the future, a 2259 percent increase over the number of commercial acres in commercial use as of 1973.

Lot parcels in commercial use increased from 15.0 lots at the time of transfer to 27.3 in 1973 (82 percent). However future plans will reduce the number of lots to 12.3, a 55 percent decline from the 1973 number of lots used commercially (see Figure 20 and Table 14).

Industrial land

Land in industrial use follows a sporadic pattern probably as a result of the small number of responses for this particular land-use. The number of acres vary from 1.1 (former use) to 160.3 (present-use). See Figure 21 and Table 13. Lot parcels show a decline over the use period (see Figure 22 and Table 14).

Other land

Land in the "other" land category increased from 1.3 acres (former use) to 76.7 acres in 1973. Buyer responses show possibly 101.6 acres may be in this category in the future (see Figure 23 and Table 13).
Figure 18. Trend in use of land for residential purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 19. Trend in use of land for commercial purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 20. Trend in use of land for commercial purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 21. Trend in use of land for industrial purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 22. Trend in use of land for industrial purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 23. Trend in use of land for other purposes, transferred as an acreage in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Lots in "other" uses increased 96 percent from former to present use. Buyers planned a 10 percent increase in the number of lots in the "other" category from the 1973 level (see Figure 24 and Table 14).

For detailed results of each year of the study concerning land-use changes see Appendix C.

**Improvement Changes on Land Parcels**

The purpose of this section is to describe the changes in improvements on land parcels since their purchase and those planned for the future.

Questionnaire recipients were asked to indicate what improvements had been added since the purchase and what improvements they planned to add in the future. Improvements existing on the land at the time of purchase were discussed in a previous chapter. There were 370 acreage and 496 lot responses used in the analysis.

Changes in improvements on rural Utah land since the transfer were grouped into three general categories: utilities, buildings and structures, and street and road conditions.

Changes in the improved condition of the acreages and lots used for analysis are shown in Tables 15 and 16.

The base period at the time of purchase enables a measurement of changes in improvements from the transfer period to the "present," 1973, and a measurement of changes in improvements from the transfer period through the future.
Figure 24. Trend in use of land for other purposes, transferred as lots in rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Table 15. Improvement index for 370 acreage transfers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Buildings and structures</th>
<th>Street and road conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements on the land at purchase</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements added since the purchase</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to be added in the future</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Improvement index for 496 lot transfers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Buildings and structures</th>
<th>Street and road conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements on the land at purchase</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements added since the purchase</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to be added in the future</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilities

As shown above, utilities on acreages and lots were increased 65 percent and 49 percent, respectively, from the time the buyers purchased the land until they were surveyed in 1973. Buyers planned to increase the number of utilities on acreages by 12 percent and 15 percent on lots. The overall addition of utilities from the transfer period through the future was expected to be around 85 percent for acreages and 77 percent for lots.
Electricity, telephone, culinary water and sewer were the most frequent utilities added to parcels since their purchase (see Tables 17 and 18). According to the buyers plans, the most frequent utilities to be added on acreages or lots in the future are private or public sewer systems, culinary water, and electricity. Private sewer on both acreages and lots appears to have been the most consistent improvement installment.

Buildings and structures

As shown in Tables 15 and 16, the number of buildings and structures were almost doubled from the time of transfer until 1973. Land buyers expected the buildings and structures of acreages and lots to be increased in the future by 31 percent and 44 percent, respectively.

The most frequently added improvements in this category on both acreages and lots were personal residence and fences (see Tables 17 and 18). Farm buildings and irrigation systems were the next most frequently added improvements on acreages. Part-time seasonal residence was the next most frequently added improvement on lots. Acreage buyers reported fences, irrigation systems, and personal residence to be the most frequent improvements planned for the future. Lot buyers expected part-time seasonal residence and personal residence to be the most frequent improvements in the future.

Streets and roads

Street and road conditions of acreages were improved 32 percent after their purchase according to the improvement index (see Table 15). Street and road conditions of lots were improved 27 percent after their purchase (see Table 16).
Table 17. Improvements on 370 acreages, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities:</th>
<th>Improvements on the land at time of purchase</th>
<th>Improvements added since the purchase</th>
<th>Improvements to be added in the future</th>
<th>Percentage changes to present</th>
<th>Percentage changes to future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary water</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (public)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (private)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and structures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal residence</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time seasonal residence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm buildings</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation system</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street &amp; road conditions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravelled road</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved road</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and gutter</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Improvements on 496 lots, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities:</th>
<th>The number of transfers in each category</th>
<th>Percentage changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements on the land after purchase</td>
<td>Improvements added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at time of purchase</td>
<td>since the purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary water</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (public)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (private)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &amp; structures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal residence</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time seasonal residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or industrial</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm buildings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation system</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and road conditions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravelled road</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved road</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and gutter</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paved road was the most frequent improvement added after the purchase of acreages (see Table 17). Unimproved road was also the most frequent improvement added after the purchase of lots (see Table 17). Buyers of acreages expect curb and gutter and sidewalks to be the most frequent improvements in the future. Buyers of lots expect gravelled road and paved road to be the most frequent street and road improvements in the future.

Characteristics of Rural Utah Land Buyers

The objective of this section is to describe some of the basic characteristics of buyers who purchased land in rural Utah during 1969-1971.

To facilitate the analysis, the state was divided into six geographic regions--the Northwest Region consisting of Cache, Box Elder, and Tooele Counties; the West-central Region consisting of Juab, Millard, Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, and Wayne Counties; the Southwest Region consisting of Iron, Beaver, Washington, Garfield, and Kane Counties; the Southeast Region consisting of San Juan, Grand, Emery, and Carbon Counties; the Northeast Region consisting of Duchesne and Daggett Counties; and the Northern Mountain Region consisting of Wasatch, Summit, Morgan, and Rich Counties (see state map, Figure 25). Factors used to determine regional divisions of the state were the economic base, population concentration, geographic location, and the terrain of the counties.

Annual income

It was determined from 888 responses to a mail questionnaire that the average annual income of rural Utah land buyers was about $13,000 dollars. Buyers of acreages averaged an annual income of about $11,800 dollars. Buyers of lots had a slightly higher mean annual income of
Counties not included in the study.

**Figure 25. Geographic regions in the state of Utah, 1969-1971.**
about 14,000 dollars. Of the 888 buyers of land parcels, 555 (65 percent) had mean annual incomes between 5 and 20 thousand dollars. Table 19 shows two modal income groups for the questionnaire respondents. The number of buyers peak at the 5 to 10 thousand dollar income bracket and the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket. Dividing the buyers according to the property description shows a difference among acreage purchasers and lot purchasers (see Figure 26).

The acreage buyer distribution is skewed to the left in comparison to lot buyer distribution. There are two modal income groups. The largest group, 98 buyers, is in the 5-10 thousand dollar income bracket and a small group of buyers (81) is in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket.

The distribution of lot buyers is skewed to the right in comparison with acreage buyers. The most distinct modal group of buyers is in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket. The summation of the number of acreage buyers and the number of lot buyers result in the two distinct modal groups for the entire sample distribution.

The 30 to 50 thousand dollar income bracket shows a slight rise in the number of buyers for both acreage and lot buyer categories.

The largest number of acres and lots were purchased by the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income group. High income groups, 20 thousand dollars and above, appeared to have purchased larger acreages of land than lower income groups (see Figure 27). The number of lots purchased per transaction was not a function of annual income (see Figure 28).

The annual income of land buyers at the regional level was similar to the state level. However, the regional geographic breakdown does show
Table 19. Annual income of land buyers, 888 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket (dollars)</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
<th>Acreage transactions</th>
<th>Lot transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of acreage buyers</td>
<td>Number of acres per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No responses</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>997.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0- 5,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>914.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>742.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>716.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-20,000</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,530.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-25,000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>345.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001-30,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>420.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-50,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>473.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>273.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>6,415.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26. Number of acreage and lot buyers by annual income, rural Utah, 1969-1971.
Figure 27. Mean parcel size of land transfers, compared to buyers annual income, rural Utah, 1969-1971.

\[ y = 8.50 + 6.70x^a \]

\[ ^a \text{Significant at the 20 percent level.} \]
Figure 28. Mean number of lots per transaction, to buyers annual income, rural Utah, 1969-1971.

\[ y = 1.06 + 125x^a \]

\(^a\)Insignificant at the 20 percent level.
more particularly the large number of acres purchased per number of
buyers in the top three income brackets (see Appendix D; particularly
Table 48).

Annual income and land use

The number of buyers in each annual income bracket for each land
use are shown in Table 20. Buyers of irrigated cropland were most
frequently in the 5 to 10 thousand dollar income bracket. Buyers of
agricultural land except for irrigated land buyers were most frequently
in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket. A relatively large
proportion of the buyers of grazing land were in the 30 to 50 thousand
dollar income bracket. Buyers of residential land reported incomes most
frequently in the 5 to 10 and 10 to 15 thousand dollar income brackets.
Vacant or idle land buyers were most frequently in the 15 to 20 thousand
dollar income bracket. A considerable proportion of the buyers of vacant
or idle land were in income brackets of 20 thousand dollars and above.

There was some variation among the geographic regions of the state
with respect to the number of buyers in each annual income bracket for
each land use (see Appendix E).

The Northwest region was similar to the state land market.

The West-central region was characterized by the number of residential
land buyers in the 5 to 10 thousand dollar income bracket and number of
buyers of vacant or idle land in the 20 to 25 thousand dollar income
bracket.

The Southwest region of Utah had the largest number of vacant or
idle land buyers in the 10 to 15 thousand dollar income bracket. The
majority of residential land buyers were in the 5 to 10 thousand dollar
income bracket. Grazing land buyers were most frequent in the 15 to 20
Table 20. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 888 buyers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfer</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buyers in each income bracket</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers do not sum to 888 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
thousand dollar income bracket. Higher income buyers usually purchased vacant or idle land and grazing land.

The noticeable characteristic of the Southeast region was the number of residential land buyers in the 10 to 15 thousand dollar income bracket.

The Northeast region was characterized by vacant or idle land buyers in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket.

The Northern Mountain region had the largest number of high income buyers (25 thousand dollars and above). The predominant group among the high income buyers were buyers of grazing land having annual incomes of 30 to 50 thousand dollars. The dominating group for the region were buyers of vacant or idle land in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket.

Purchase motives

Land buyers were asked to consider a list of possible purchase motives and then check all those that applied to them.

As shown in Table 21, the most frequent motive for people buying rural Utah land during 1969-1971 was for investment purposes. A considerable number of buyers indicated "other" purchase motives. The next most frequent motive for buyers having purchased land was future retirement. A considerable number of buyers said "cleaner environment" was a motive for having purchased rural Utah land. Thirty-nine of the 888 buyers purchased land for current retirement. The same number of buyers indicated lower costs in Utah was a reason or motive for having bought the land.

Among the six regions of the state, buyers consistently indicated investment as the prevailing motive among buyers for having purchased land. The Southwest region had the greatest percentage of buyers who purchased land in anticipation of future retirement. In the same region
Table 21. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 888 buyers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Thousands of dollars</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buyers in each income</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bracket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers do not sum to 888 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
a considerable number of buyers responded to "cleaner environment" and "Utah is less congested" as being purchase motives. (See Appendix F for purchase motives on a regional basis.)

Purchase motives and annual income

A cross comparison was made between the purchase motives of the buyers and their annual income to determine if motives were associated with annual income.

All income groups except two of the high income groups indicated investment was a motive for purchasing the land 33 to 38 percent of the time (see Table 21). Of the buyers with annual incomes of 25 to 30 and 50 thousand dollars and over, 56 to 60 percent purchased land as an investment. The largest number of buyers who purchased land for investment reasons were in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income group.

Persons who bought land for current retirement were nearly all in lower income groups. Persons having purchased land in anticipation of future retirement were quite evenly distributed percentagewise throughout the different income groups. The largest number of persons who bought land for future retirement were in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income group.

Age

Rural land buyers were asked their age at the time of the mail survey. As shown in Table 22, the average age for the 888 buyers surveyed was about 45 years. Most of the buyers ages ranged between 40 and 50 years. Older buyers appeared to have purchased land in the Southwest and Northeast regions. The average ages of the buyers in the two regions were about 49 years and 48 years, respectively. The youngest average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motives</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West-central</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South-east</th>
<th>North-east</th>
<th>Northern Mountain</th>
<th>Rural Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of buyers</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>246</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>888</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age for buyers was in the Northwest region at about 40 years followed by buyers in the Southwest region who averaged about 44 years old.

**Age and purchase motives**

As can be seen in Table 22, the oldest group of buyers were those persons indicating "current retirement" as a motive for having purchased the land. The next oldest group of buyers were persons buying land for
future retirement. There was also a tendency for older buyers to indicate "income producing" and "Utah has lower costs" as motives for having purchased the land. Younger buyers averaging age 40, indicated a "social" motive for having purchased the land. Persons indicating "investment" and "development" as motives were of the average age of 42 years as were buyers who purchased land for "other" motives.

At the regional level the oldest age group of buyers, average age 67, were in the West-central region; they purchased land for current retirement. The youngest group of buyers, average age 31, purchased land for income producing reasons in the Northeast region. The next youngest group of buyers indicate a "social" motive for having purchased land in the Northwest region. Also a young set of buyers in the Northwest checked "Utah is less congested" as a motive for having bought land.

Residence of land buyers

The sample of land buyers was divided into three groups according to their address appearing on the transfer card on the file with the Tax Commission. Local buyers were buyers having an address within the county in which they purchased the land. Non-local buyers were buyers having an address within the state of Utah but not within the county where they purchased land. Out-of-state buyers were buyers having an address outside of the state of Utah.

The number of buyers in each residential category for the entire state sample and at the regional level can be seen in Table 23.

Local buyers purchased 58 percent (516) of the 888 parcels transferred. Non-local buyers bought 19 percent (172) of the parcels, and out-of-state buyers purchased 23 percent (200) of the parcels. There were some noticeable regional differences in the residence of buyers. The Southeast region,
Table 23. Buyer residence, regional comparison, 888 buyers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Utah Local</th>
<th>Non-local</th>
<th>Out-of-state</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-central</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mountain</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number</strong></td>
<td><strong>516</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>888</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northwest region, and West-central region had a higher percent of local buyers than the state average. The percent of local buyers for each region was 89, 84, and 69, respectively. The Northeast and Northern Mountains had the lowest percent of local land buyers. Local buyers accounted for 25 percent of the sales in each region. Thirty-five percent of the land buyers in the Southwest region were local.

Non-local buyers were the predominant buyers in the Northern Mountains and Northeast region. Sixty-nine percent of the land buyers in the Northern Mountain region were non-local and 59 percent were non-local buyers in the Northeast region. The Southeast region had the lowest percentage of non-local buyers (3 percent). The remaining three regions had from 10 to 13 percent of the buyers from non-local areas.

Out-of-state buyers were in the majority in the Southwest region (52 percent). More than 60 percent of the out-of-state buyers in the sample had purchased land in the Southwest region. Out-of-state buyers
made up a substantial proportion of the land buyers in the West-central region.

Buyer residence and annual income

There was a difference in the annual income of local buyers, non-local buyers and out-of-state buyers as can be seen in Table 24. Local buyers had a mean annual income of $11,400 dollars. Non-local buyers' mean annual income was $15,700 dollars. Out-of-state buyers' mean annual income, $14,300 dollars, came between that of local and non-local buyers.

As is shown in Figure 29, the most distinct modal income group of buyers were in the 5 to 10 thousand dollar income range. Non-local and out-of-state buyers' modal income groups were both in the 15 and 20 thousand dollar income bracket.

There was slight variation from the total sample on the regional level but generally modal income groups remained the same. The 5 to 10 thousand dollars was the most frequent income for all buyers in the West-central region. The Northern Mountain region differed from the norm with a modal group of out-of-state buyers in the 30 to 50 thousand dollar income bracket. (See Appendix G for regional detail.)

Occupations

Buyers were asked to indicate their occupation as a part of the mail survey. The responses were categorized into nine occupational categories using the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, 1965, Volume II.

The most frequent occupational category of buyers responding to the mail questionnaire was the professional, technical, and managerial occupational category (see Table 25). Thirty-six percent (324) of the buyers were in occupations so categorized. The next most frequent category of
buyer occupations was clerical and sales occupations. Seventy-six buyers had clerical or sales occupations representing only 9 percent of the 888 buyers. The least frequent number of buyers were in processing and benchwork occupations.

Farming, fishery and forestry-related occupations accounted for 7 percent of the buyers. The percentage appeared to be small for this occupational category since it was expected that rural areas would have a larger percentage of buyers in farming related occupations.

There were some buyer occupational differences at the regional level. In the Northwest and Northern Mountain region the largest percent of buyers were professional, technical, and managerial occupations. The West-Central
Figure 29. Number of local, non-local and out-of-state buyers by annual income, rural Utah, 1969-1971.
region had the largest proportion of buyers in farming, fishery, and forestry occupations. Also the region had the highest percentage of non-respondents and lowest percentage of buyers in professional, technical, and managerial occupations. Non-response to the occupation question varied between 19 and 24 percent among the other regions.

Table 25. Occupations and residence of buyers, 888 buyers, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Residence of buyers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof., tech., manag.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; sales</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm., fish., forestry</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of buyers</strong></td>
<td><strong>516</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>888</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupations and residence**

Buyers in professional, technical, or managerial occupations were the dominant occupation group regardless of buyer residence except for the West-central region. Farming, fishery, and forestry, and miscellaneous
were the next most frequent occupations of local land buyers. Barring professional, technical, and managerial occupations, non-local buyers were most often in clerical and sales, or service occupations. Out-of-state buyers were most often employed in machine trades, service and clerical and sales occupations.

Regional buyer occupational and residential differences were noticeable. (See Appendix H.)

The Northwest region was characterized by the large number of local buyers in professional, technical, and managerial occupations. Noticeably lacking were non-local buyers.

Local buyers with farming occupations dominated the buyer market in the West-central region. Thirty-eight percent of the local buyers responding to the occupation question were in farming or related occupations. The West-central region was also characterized by its lack of buyers in professional, technical and managerial occupations.

The Southwest region was characterized by the large number of out-of-state buyers. Forty-seven percent of the out-of-state buyers were in professional, technical and managerial occupations. A large number of buyers, in comparison with other regions, were in machine trades; most resided out-of-state. Professional, technical and managerial, clerical and sales, and farming were the most frequent occupations of local buyers in the Southwest region.

Local buyers typified the Southeast buyer market (89 percent). The buyers were in professional, technical, or managerial occupations and miscellaneous occupations such as mineral extraction and transportation.

Non-local buyers in professional, technical, and managerial occupations, such as medicine and law, were the most frequent buyers in the Northeast.
region. Twenty-two percent of the non-local buyers were in service occupations.

The Northern Mountain region land was sold most frequently to non-local buyers in professional, technical, and managerial occupations. Among these buyers, most were educators or managers. There was also a large group of non-local buyers in salesman occupations. The majority of all the buyers were non-local residents.

**Average Prices of Land**

Questionnaire recipients were asked to indicate the price of the parcel of land purchased. Of the respondents to the questionnaire 78 percent answered to the question concerning the purchase price of the land parcel. Response to the question was higher for buyers of lots than for buyers of acreages. Of the buyer responses to the price question, 51 percent had purchased improved lots, 33 percent had purchased improved acreages, 9 percent had purchased unimproved lots, and 7 percent had purchased unimproved acreages.

Buyers surveyed reported having spent 6,066,600 dollars for land. About 56 percent of the total was spent for improved lots, 36 percent for improved acreages, 4 percent for unimproved lots, and 3 percent for unimproved acreages.

Parcels were considered improved if any utilities, residential structures, commercial or industrial structures, or farm buildings were on the land at the time of transfer. Land having fences or irrigation systems was considered unimproved if there were no structures or utilities existing on the land at the time of transfer.
Land prices and location

Improved lots located in city limits averaged the highest price per lot (see Table 26). Improved lots near city limits were next highest followed in order by lots located in open farming countryside, mountain area, unincorporated towns and other locations. The price per parcel of land followed the same order. The largest share of dollars were spent on improved lots located in city limits. The next largest area of spending was on improved lots located in mountain areas.

Improved acreages averaged the highest price per acre when located in city limits (see Table 27). The next highest price per acre was paid for land near city limits followed in order by land in mountain areas, open farming countryside, and unincorporated towns. However, land parcels may have averaged a higher price per acre when located in unincorporated towns than Table 27 indicates since two responses in the Southwest region reported a purchase of 640.5 acres at the average price of 6 dollars per acre. Were these two responses considered invalid, the average price of improved land in the sample transferred in unincorporated towns would be 1,282 dollars per acre.

As is shown in Table 28, unimproved lots were transferred most frequently in mountain areas and in city limits. Transfers in the remaining locations were much less frequent. Two unimproved lots near city limits averaged 7,300 dollars per lot. Lots in city limits averaged 3,313 dollars per lot. Unimproved lots in mountain areas averaged 2,947 dollars per lot. The largest number of dollars were spent on unimproved lots in mountain areas.

Unimproved acreages were most frequently located in city limits. However, the largest number of acres transferred were located in open
Table 26. Price or considerations for improved lots, location effect, 348 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses reporting the amount of considerations</th>
<th>Total questionnaire responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of parcels</td>
<td>Number of lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In city limits</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In unincorporated town</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27. Price or considerations for improved acreages, location effect, 228 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses reporting the amount of considerations</th>
<th>Total questionnaire responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of parcels</td>
<td>Number of acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In city limits</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>140.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In unincorporated town</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>711.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,950.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>488.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>260.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3,672.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Price or considerations for unimproved lots, location effect, 60 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses reporting the amount of consideration</th>
<th>Total questionnaire responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of parcels</td>
<td>Number of lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In city limits</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In unincorporated town</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
farming countryside (see Table 29). The largest number of dollars were spent on transfers in city limits followed closely by transfers located in mountain areas. Unimproved land located in mountain area averaged 7,850 dollars per parcel and 1,691 dollars per acre. Unimproved land in city limits averaged 1,248 dollars per acre.

As shown in Table 30, the 686 buyers reporting the price paid 6,069,200 dollars for 4,254 acres and 529 lots. The average price per parcel in the state, all parcels combined, was 8,847 dollars. The average price per acre was 568 dollars and 6,907 dollars per lot.

Fifty-one percent of the 6,069,200 dollars paid for rural Utah land during 1969-1971 was spent in the Northwest region. The region averaged the largest number of dollars spent per parcel of land and the highest price per lot. The highest average price per acre and next highest average price per parcel and lot was paid in the Southeast region. The Northeast region averaged the lowest price per acre and lot.

**Land prices and land-use**

In comparing the price for land with its use, only those land transactions with a single use were used in the analysis. It was impossible to determine what proportion of the total price for multiple-use transactions was intended for each type of land. Of the 888 buyer respondents, 766 had purchased land in a single use at the time of transfer. Of the 766 single use transactions, 595 buyers reported the price.

Table 31 shows that buyers of improved lots spent 61 percent of the dollars spent for land in the sample. Improved lots of residential land were the most frequent type of lot purchased. Average price per residential lot was 12,838 dollars. Vacant or idle lots were the next most frequent use of improved lots, however, the average price per lot of
Table 29. Price or considerations for unimproved acreages, location effect, 49 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of parcels</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Total number of dollars</th>
<th>Dollars per parcel</th>
<th>Dollars per acre</th>
<th>Number of parcels</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In city limits</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57.86</td>
<td>72,200</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In unincorporated town</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76.39</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open farming countryside</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>436.24</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>754.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>6,939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>608.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>$194,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,978</strong></td>
<td><strong>$320</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>952.91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30. Price or consideration for all acreages and lots, location effect, regional comparisons, 686 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of parcels</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
<th>Total number of dollars</th>
<th>Dollars per parcel</th>
<th>Dollars per acre</th>
<th>Dollars per lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>470.75</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3,085,800</td>
<td>14,155</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>11,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-central</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>953.66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>340,700</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1,613.17</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>956,600</td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110.36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>749,500</td>
<td>8,517</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>6,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>880.97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>202,700</td>
<td>4,826</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mountain</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>225.57</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>733,900</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>4,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>686</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,254.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>529</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,069,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,847</strong></td>
<td><strong>$568</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,907</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31. Price or considerations for improved lots, land use effect, 320 transactions involving 409 lots, regional comparison, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at transfer</th>
<th>Number of transactions</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
<th>State average</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West-central</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South-east</th>
<th>North-east</th>
<th>Northern Mountain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average price per lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,833</td>
<td>19,550</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12,338</td>
<td>17,522</td>
<td>4,814</td>
<td>8,657</td>
<td>13,595</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>11,035</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>4,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,460</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,633</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>$7,787</td>
<td>$12,874</td>
<td>$3,897</td>
<td>$4,984</td>
<td>$8,319</td>
<td>$1,428</td>
<td>$4,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4,200 dollars was considerably lower than most of the lots in other uses. Improved lots of non-irrigated cropland and grazing land both averaged nearly 10,800 dollars per lot.

Improved acreages sold at an average of 589 dollars per acre. Average parcel size was 15.9 acres (see Table 32). The most frequent type of improved acreage purchased was residential land at an average price of 37,732 dollars per acre. However, the average parcel price was 14,173 dollars. This shows that the high average price per acre was largely a consequence of the value of improvements on parcels of land less than an acre in size. The improvement value was increased proportionally when the per acre price was calculated. Non-irrigated cropland averaged 22 dollars per acre, the lowest value per improved acre. Grazing land averaged 155 dollars per acre.

As shown in Table 33 most unimproved lots were vacant or idle, or grazing land. Unimproved vacant or idle land sold for an average of 3,818 dollars per lot. Grazing land buyers paid an average of 1,383 dollars per lot, the lowest average price per lot. Thirteen of the 52 buyers of unimproved lots were not sure of the use of the land when they purchased it or did not indicate the use of the land on the mail questionnaire.

Unimproved acreage buyers, as shown in Table 34, paid relatively high per acre prices when compared with the average prices of improved acreages. The high prices are partly explained in that the mean parcel size was less than 1 acre for all uses of land except grazing and vacant or idle land. However, unimproved grazing and vacant or idle land averaged higher per acre prices than improved land in the same use. Also, there was a large proportion of the buyers in the uncertain category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at transfer</th>
<th>Number of transactions</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>State average</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West-central</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South-east</th>
<th>North-east</th>
<th>Northern Mountain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>6,504</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(^b)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,126.4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural uses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>16,207</td>
<td>42,857</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>46,154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>37,732</td>
<td>51,804</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>42,857</td>
<td>42,007</td>
<td>59,677</td>
<td>56,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>72,358</td>
<td>130,588</td>
<td>61,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,352.4</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11,285</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21,951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>63,939</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>921.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$589</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>$236</strong></td>
<td><strong>$221</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,596</strong></td>
<td><strong>$121</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,251</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Extremely high per acre values occur in certain categories as a result of expanding the number of dollars paid for parcels less than an acre in size to a per acre value.

\(^b\) A parcel of 80 acres was reported to have been purchased for 100 dollars, the report is questionable.
Table 33. Price or considerations for unimproved lots, land use effect, 52 transactions involving 67 lots, regional comparison, rural Utah 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at transfer</th>
<th>Number of transactions</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
<th>State average</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
<th>Average price per lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North-west</td>
<td>West-central</td>
<td>South-west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$2,933</td>
<td>$4,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34. Price or considerations for unimproved acreages, land use effect, 39 transactions involving 526.5 acres, regional comparison, rural Utah, 1969-1971a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at transfer</th>
<th>Number of transactions</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>State average</th>
<th>North-west</th>
<th>West-central</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>South-east</th>
<th>North-east</th>
<th>Northern Mountain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4,548</td>
<td>11,212</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>36,842</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>483.8</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural uses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>526.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$298</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,427</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>$146</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,822</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49</strong></td>
<td><strong>$328</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aExtremely high per acre values occur in certain categories as a result of expanding the number of dollars paid for parcels less than an acre in size to a per acre value.
Regional results were presented in Tables 31 through 34.

The largest amount of buyer spending took place in the Northwest region of Utah. Buyers who purchased land in that region reported having spent $1,674,200 dollars for improved residential parcels. More than 72 percent of that sum was spent for improved residential lots. The region had the highest average price for improved lot and acreage parcels of all rural regions in the state. Improved lot parcels averaged $16,395 dollars and improved acreage parcels averaged $13,506 dollars each. Acreage parcels averaged about 8.1 acres each and lot parcels averaged about 1.3 lots each.

Of the 52 respondents in the West-central region the majority purchased improved residential land. The range for all improved parcels was from 100 dollars for a non-irrigated land parcel to $27,000 dollars for a parcel in "other" use. The 25 unimproved acres averaged 91 dollars each. There were no unimproved lots included in the analysis.

The Southwest region was characterized by the number of buyers purchasing improved vacant or idle land. The average price paid for vacant or idle lots was $2,576 dollars. Vacant or idle acres sold for an average of 72 dollars. Unimproved vacant or idle lots averaged $3,100 dollars per lot. Unimproved grazing lots averaged $1,064 dollars per lot. Most of the unimproved acreage transfers were in grazing use or in the uncertain category. Grazing land averaged 117 dollars per acre and about 94 acres per parcel.

The Southeast region was typical of most of the other regions of the state having the majority of the improved land in residential use. Improved residential parcels averaged slightly higher than $14,000 dollars per parcel. There were a considerable number of improved parcels
classified as vacant or idle. Lot parcels averaged 2,800 dollars each. Unimproved parcels transactions were scarce. Of those transferred the majority were unimproved acreage transfers as vacant or idle and grazing land. The vacant or idle land sold for an average of 875 dollars per parcel and 4,118 dollars per acre. The grazing parcels averaged 967 per parcel and 2,661 dollars per acre.

The Northeast region was unusual because of the proportion of the transfers classified as vacant or idle for both improved and unimproved land parcels. Improved lots averaged a lower price than did unimproved lots.

The Northern Mountain region was characterized by the majority of transfers in grazing use and improved vacant or idle lots. Improved acreage parcels in grazing use averaged about 8,500 dollars with about 4.6 acres per parcel. Improved lots in grazing use averaged about 3,473 dollars per lot. Improved vacant or idle lots averaged 4,284 dollars per lot.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The apparent increase in demand for rural Utah land has created potential problems for rural Utah communities and counties. Rural areas in Utah have been predominantly agricultural in the past. The increasing land prices make it difficult for farmers and persons desiring to farm to purchase farm land and realize an acceptable rate of return on their investment. Persons employed in the non-agricultural sectors are receiving a higher return for their services making it possible for such persons to invest in rural land. The motives for purchasing land are often non-agricultural, thus encouraging a land-use change.

Land-use changes could have a variety of effects upon rural Utah communities. Possible problems could be increased public expenditures in such areas as road maintenance and law enforcement without a sufficient increase in the tax base to pay for such expenditures. Positive results could come about if appropriate action is taken to properly direct the market forces.

To study the extent of the problem or potential problem, permission was obtained from the Utah State Tax Commission to copy the land transfer cards on file for the years 1969-1971. A mail questionnaire was developed and mailed to a 30 percent sample of the grantees (buyers) whose names and addresses appeared on the transfer card. The information on the transfer cards included in the sample and the returned questionnaire were coded and punched on data processing cards for computer analysis.

The findings of the study objectives were summarized. The explanation of the results and implications of the results will follow.
Objective one

The number of recorded land transactions on file at the Utah State Tax Commission increased significantly in number each year of the study. Using 1969 as the base year, the number of transactions per year had increased 68 percent by 1971. About 43 percent of the land parcels were acreages and 57 percent were lots.

Sixty percent of the land transferred as acreages was in agricultural use. About 24 percent of the lots were in agricultural use. Acreages reported as being vacant or idle accounted for 33 percent of the land transferred. Vacant or idle lots accounted for 32 percent of the lot transfers. Twenty-seven percent of the lots transferred were in residential use.

The largest number of parcels, both acreages and lots, were located within city limits. The next largest number of acreage transfers were located in open farming countryside whereas the largest number of lots were located in mountainous areas. Parcels of land transferred in open farming countryside were the largest and averaged about 54 acres each. Parcels of land in mountainous areas were considerably smaller with an average of 26 acres per parcel.

The largest number of parcels, according to questionnaire responses, were most frequently located near or adjacent hunting areas, fishing, and public land. The mean parcel size was smallest for land parcels near or adjacent skiing resorts and public lakes. The mean parcel size was largest for parcels located near or adjacent hunting areas and public land. Nearly 50 percent of the acres were transferred near or adjacent to public land.
Almost 50 percent of the land parcels had culinary water, electricity, and a sewer system. About 33 percent had homes. Nearly the same percentage had telephones. Most of the parcels had access to paved roads. Twenty percent had unimproved roads.

Objective two

It was found that over time land transferred in agricultural use was being changed to non-agricultural uses. Vacant or idle land was also being changed to different uses. About one-half of the acreage leaving agricultural uses was accounted for in the increased acreage in recreational use. Residential and in general almost all non-agricultural land uses showed positive increases in land area.

Uncertainty of land-use had the largest increase in acres of any category. The large number of acres in the uncertain category made all the other land-use trends subject to extensive change.

The improved condition of the parcels increased greatly after the transfer. Only 18 percent of the buyers did not add or plan to add utilities after the transfer of the property. Personal residence and fences were frequent improvements. Street and road conditions were improved after the transfer.

Objective three

Buyers of rural Utah land averaged around 13,000 dollars annual income. Sixty-five percent of the buyers had annual incomes between 5,001 dollars and 20,000 dollars. There were two modal income groups of buyers in the buyer-income distribution, one at the 5 to 10 thousand dollar income bracket and another at the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket. The largest number of acres and lots were purchased by the
15 to 20 thousand dollar income group of buyers. High income buyers purchased larger tracts of land.

The distribution of land buyers to land use and annual income showed that the largest group of buyers purchased residential land and were more frequently in the lower income brackets. The largest number of high income land buyers ($20,001 and over) purchased vacant or idle land. Twenty-three percent of the grazing land buyers had high annual incomes.

"Investment" was reported as being the most frequent motive for persons buying Utah land. Thirty-nine percent of the buyers said "future retirement" plans and "lower costs in Utah" had motivated them to purchase land. Four percent of the buyers, the smallest group, purchased land for "current retirement."

In comparing the purchase motives of buyers to their annual income, it was found that "investment" was the predominant motive among all income levels for having purchased land. Buyers with annual incomes of 25 to 30 thousand dollars and 50 thousand dollars and over purchased land for an investment a greater percentage of the time than did buyers with annual incomes in other brackets. Buyers purchasing land for "current retirement" were mostly in lower income brackets. Their annual income averaged around 7,300 dollars, considerably lower than the 13,000 dollar state average.

Rural land buyers averaged around 45 years of age. Persons purchasing land in the Southwest and Northeast regions averaged the oldest age, 48 years. Buyers in the Northwest region averaged 40 years, the youngest age group.

When age was compared to the purchase motives it was found that the oldest age group of buyers had purchased land for "current retirement."
The youngest age group of buyers purchased land for "social," "investment," "development," and "other" motives.

Non-local and out-of-state buyers accounted for 42 percent of the grantees in land transactions in rural counties. Out-of-state buyers were more frequent than were non-local buyers. Local buyers accounted for 58 percent of the grantees in rural land transactions.

In the comparison of the buyers residence to their annual income it was found that local buyers averaged the lowest income ($11,400). Non-local buyers averaged the highest annual income ($15,700).

The largest share of rural Utah land buyers in 1969-1971 were in professional, technical, or managerial occupations. Fifty-four percent of the professional, technical, or managerial buyers were local residents, 19 percent were non-local, and 24 percent were out-of-state.

Objective four

Seventy-eight percent of the questionnaire respondents reported the price paid for the land. Of those responding 51 percent had purchased improved lots, 33 percent had purchased improved acreages, 9 percent had purchased unimproved lots, and 7 percent had purchased unimproved acreages. Respondents reported having spent 6,066,000 dollars for the land. About 56 percent of the total was spent for improved lots, 36 percent for improved acreages, 4 percent for unimproved lots, and 3 percent for unimproved acreages.

The largest number of dollars was spent for land in city limits. The highest average price per parcel was paid for improved lots in city limits. The average parcel price was 13,007 dollars.

Where a large number of transactions have taken place, the mean prices are good descriptions of the market value of the land. Keeping
this in mind, the highest per acre price for unimproved land was paid for land near city limits ($6,939/acre). Mountain land averaged 1,691 dollars per acre. The lowest average price per unimproved acre was 66 dollars for land located in open farming countryside.

Buyers of unimproved lots paid the highest price per lot for lots located near city limits ($7,300).

Lots in city limits averaged 3,313 dollars per lot and lots in mountain areas averaged 2,947 per lot.

Fifty-one percent of the 6,069,200 dollars was spent in the Northwest region. The next most active region was the Southwest region. The least number of dollars were spent in the West-central region.

About 3 million dollars, nearly 50 percent of the total dollars in the sample, were spent on residential land. Vacant or idle land in the sample sold for about 800,000 dollars.

Explanation and implications of the results

The most influential group of buyers, in terms of the number of acres and lots purchased, was the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income group. Sixty-three percent of the parcels purchased by the group were either residential land (23 percent), grazing land (15 percent), or vacant or idle land (25 percent). Non-local and out-of-state buyers were most frequently in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income bracket.

Buyers with high annual incomes ($20,001 and over) purchased almost the same number of acres and lots as the 15 and 20 thousand dollar income group. The use of the land purchased was similar to the 15 to 20 thousand dollar income group with a tendency to purchase more vacant or idle land. The high income group had the highest percentage of
persons buying land for income producing, investment, and development motives.

It is apparent from the study that a considerable amount of agricultural land purchased in Utah during 1969-1971 was taken out of agricultural use. The average prices of the different agricultural land in most instances were high reflecting the demand for land from the non-agricultural sector of buyers. The land prices and land-use changes show a considerable demand pressure for recreational land and housing development. Therefore, persons desiring to purchase agricultural land and farm, especially those with a relatively low annual income, may find it difficult to do so.

Rural communities, especially in the Southwest, Northeast and Northern Mountain regions, should take care to see that new recreation and housing developments are accomplished in such a manner so as to assure the protection of the aesthetics and natural resources in their communities and surrounding area. Local citizens, community and county leaders should acquaint themselves with the implications of agricultural land being changed to non-agricultural uses such as the resultant tax burden of road maintenance, protection, and public sewer systems.

The efficiency of the property taxing procedures at the local level should be reviewed. It may be found in many rural communities that land buyers should pay a larger proportion of the public expense associated with land-use changes and land development. Every effort should be made at all levels of government in the state to assure equitable taxing procedures are in use or are being formulated for future use. Such efforts will greatly assist a "desirable pattern" of development in the rural communities of Utah.
It is recommended that the subject of land use be given more consideration in future studies. If the change of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses is not desirable from the public viewpoint, studies should be undertaken to determine the most efficient, effective and acceptable ways and means to check the current trend in land use. A possible method of land-use regulation that may be effective in a free market system would be tax incentives and tax penalties to encourage desired uses of particular classes of land. A variation of a deferred tax law may take into account the class of land, location and availability of public services.¹ The Green Belt Act in 1969 and the 1973 amendment were significant steps for the state of Utah in achieving an efficient and effective land-use regulation system.

¹A deferred tax law is one in which land is taxed according to current use value. But, when land use changes, a penalty tax is levied against the land or its owner. (U. S. Department of Agriculture. State programs for the Differential Assessment of Farm and Open Space Land, Agricultural Economic Report No. 256. Washington, D. C. (1974).)
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Appendix A

The Transfer Card on File at the Utah State Tax Commission

The Cover Letter and Mail Questionnaire Mailed to Sample Members Drawn from Recorded Land Transfers on File At the Utah State Tax Commission for the Years 1969-1971
The Economics Department at Utah State University is conducting an analysis of land (real estate) transfers in rural areas of Utah. There has apparently been an increase in purchases and sales of property. We are studying how these transfers will affect productivity of the land and the need for community services such as roads, culinary water, electricity, etc.

Public records show that you purchased

during 19 in County Utah. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire with this parcel on land in mind and return it in the enclosed postage paid envelope. Experience shows the questionnaire can be completed in about 10 minutes.

I assure you your answers will be held strictly confidential. Information from yourself and others who have purchased property recently will be grouped and summarized in such a way that no individual's information will be revealed.

Sincerely,

Lynn H. Davis
Professor of Agriculture Economics

P.S. Your response is requested since we are only taking a small sample of property buyers.
# QUESTIONNAIRE

## I. Land Use

In this section we would like to know how the property was used by the former owner, how you use the property now, and how you plan to use the property in the future. (Fill in the appropriate percentages of land use in each column.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use by the former owner</th>
<th>Your present use</th>
<th>Future planned use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated cropland</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated cropland</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation (cabin, etc.)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Property Improvements (check the appropriate boxes.)

### A. Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements existing on the property when you purchased it</th>
<th>Improvements you have added</th>
<th>Improvements you plan to add</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culinary water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (public)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer (private)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Buildings and Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements at the time of purchase</th>
<th>Improvements once the purchase</th>
<th>Anticipated improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year around personal residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time seasonal residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C. Street and Road Conditions

- Paved road: [ ]
- Gravel road: [ ]
- Unimproved road: [ ]
- Curved and gutter: [ ]
- Sidewalk: [ ]
- Other (specify): [ ]

## III. The Location of the Property

### A. Which of the following is most correct?

- In city limits [ ]
- In unincorporated town [ ]
- Open farming country-side [ ]
- Near city limits [ ]
- Mountains area [ ]
- Other (specify): [ ]

### B. Is the property near or adjacent any of the following? (Check one or more)

- Public land [ ]
- Skiing resort(s) [ ]
- Non-public stream(s) [ ]
- Public stream(s) [ ]
- Fishing [ ]
- Non-public lake [ ]
- Public lake [ ]
- Hunting area [ ]
- None of the above [ ]

## IV. The Purchase of the Property

### A. What was the total price or consideration? $ [ ]

- Please continue even if this information cannot be provided.

### B. How was the property financed? (Please fill in the appropriate percentages.)

- Cash [ ]% Contract with seller [ ]% Other [ ]% Lending institution(s) [ ]% Property exchange [ ]% Down payment [ ]%

### C. How did you learn the property was for sale?

- Real estate agency [ ]
- Personal search [ ]
- Advertisement (pamphlet, etc.) [ ]
- Relative [ ]
- Friend or neighbor [ ]
- Other (specify) [ ]

### D. Did you buy this property through a broker? [ ] Yes [ ] No

### E. Which of the following purposes best describes your motive in purchasing the property? (Check all that apply)

- Income producing property [ ]
- Future retirement [ ]
- Investment [ ]
- Cleaner environment [ ]
- Development [ ]
- Utah has lower cost [ ]
- Social (friends, religion, etc.) [ ]
- Utah is less congested [ ]
- Current retirement [ ]
- Other (specify) [ ]

## V. The buyer's (your) characteristics in general. (If the buyer is a business such as a corporation, etc., respond only to questions 1 and 2 below.)

1. Are principal owners Utahns [ ] or out of state [ ]
2. If out of state, what is the residency of the principal owners?
3. What is your combined annual family income? (Check the bracket containing your income figure.)
   - $ 0 - $ 5,000 [ ]
   - $ 5,001 - $ 10,000 [ ]
   - $ 10,001 - $ 20,000 [ ]
   - $ 20,001 - $ 30,000 [ ]
   - $ 30,001 - $ 50,000 [ ]
   - $ 50,001 - $ 100,000 [ ]
   - $ 100,001 - $ 150,000 [ ]
   - $ 150,001 - $ 200,000 [ ]
   - $ 200,001 - $ 250,000 [ ]
   - $ 250,001 - $ 300,000 [ ]
4. Were you born in Utah? [ ] Yes [ ] No
5. Have you lived in Utah before? [ ] Yes [ ] No
6. What is your education? [ ]
7. What is your age? [ ] years
8. When do you plan to retire or when did you retire? [ ] years
9. How many dependent children do you have? [ ]
10. If the property is used for year-around or part-time seasonal residence did you begin residing on the property at the time of purchase? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   - a. Do you presently reside on the property? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   - b. Do you plan to reside on the property in the future? [ ] Yes [ ] No
11. If you have children will they be attending school in the county in which the property is located? [ ] Yes [ ] No
12. Which of the following choices describes your residency at the time the property was purchased?
   - Arizona [ ]
   - California [ ]
   - Colorado [ ]
   - Other (specify) [ ]
   - Nevada [ ]
   - Utah [ ]
   - Wyoming [ ]
   - Idaho [ ]
13. Have you resold the property? [ ] Yes [ ] No Date [ ]
Appendix B

Characteristics of Acreage and Lot Transfers Included

In the Random Sample of Recorded Land Transfers

In Rural Utah Counties During 1969-1971
Table 35. Number of acres in the random sample by rural county, 22,809.9 acres and 1002 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of acres transferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>72.35</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>141.51</td>
<td>214.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>418.28</td>
<td>388.37</td>
<td>1996.91</td>
<td>2803.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>194.42</td>
<td>316.53</td>
<td>178.04</td>
<td>688.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>184.30</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>203.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>706.06</td>
<td>766.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>2136.91</td>
<td>608.68</td>
<td>2519.55</td>
<td>5265.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>231.21</td>
<td>219.54</td>
<td>83.56</td>
<td>534.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>344.14</td>
<td>316.12</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>721.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>292.61</td>
<td>298.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>755.02</td>
<td>1974.83</td>
<td>2022.66</td>
<td>4752.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab</td>
<td>548.43</td>
<td>84.72</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>653.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>122.30</td>
<td>37.89</td>
<td>254.45</td>
<td>414.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>67.13</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>780.54</td>
<td>857.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>128.51</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>476.20</td>
<td>617.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>80.52</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>141.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>1668.09</td>
<td>362.28</td>
<td>2039.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pete</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>33.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier</td>
<td>95.28</td>
<td>62.04</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>211.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>173.00</td>
<td>365.47</td>
<td>591.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>76.77</td>
<td>81.77</td>
<td>421.17</td>
<td>579.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>85.84</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>112.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>158.48</td>
<td>86.77</td>
<td>274.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>36.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample total</td>
<td>5478.34</td>
<td>6487.05</td>
<td>10842.74</td>
<td>22809.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36. Number of transactions in the random sample, 2184 transactions, rural Utah, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of acreage transfers</td>
<td>Number of lot transfers</td>
<td>Total transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pete</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Total 276 331 395 1002 268 392 520 1180 2184
Appendix C

Changes in the Use of Land Transferred

In Rural Utah, 1969–1971
Table 37. Changes in land use, 1303.0 acres, rural Utah, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Number of acres in each use period</th>
<th>Percentage change in use from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>241.5</td>
<td>259.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>566.3</td>
<td>566.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>386.2</td>
<td>256.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>131.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1303.0</td>
<td>1303.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 38. Changes in land use, 136 lots, rural Utah, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Former</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Former to present</th>
<th>Present to future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>Undef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>11200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Undef.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The variation in the total is a result of rounding.*
Table 39. Changes in land use, 2003.8 acres, rural Utah, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of acres in each use period</th>
<th>Percentage change in use from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343.1</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.7</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665.1</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514.6</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>2,003.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe variation in the total is a result of rounding.
Table 40. Changes in land use, 244 lots, rural Utah, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of lots in each use period</th>
<th>Percentage change in use from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>241.3</td>
<td>242.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe variation in the total is a result of rounding.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Former</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Percentage change from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former to present</td>
<td>Present to future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>328.3</td>
<td>456.2</td>
<td>426.4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>1101.1</td>
<td>987.9</td>
<td>779.4</td>
<td>-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>691.0</td>
<td>403.3</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>470.0</td>
<td>9933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>1139.0</td>
<td>529.9</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Undef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>204.3</td>
<td>789.6</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2970.9</td>
<td>2970.4</td>
<td>2971.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation in the total is a result of rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Former</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Percentage change in use from each period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former to present</td>
<td>Present to future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Irrigated</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Undef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>285.9</td>
<td>287.1</td>
<td>290.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe variation in the total is a result of rounding.*
Appendix D

Annual Income of Buyers for Each Region

Of Rural Utah, 1969-1971
Table 43. Annual income of land buyers, 281 buyers, Northwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
<th>Number of acreage buyers</th>
<th>Number of lot buyers</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96.63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - $5,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>156.80</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>378.18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional totals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>754.86</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44. Annual income of land buyers, 67 buyers, West-central region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
<th>Number of acreage buyers</th>
<th>Number of lot buyers</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>709.84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - $5,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119.03</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>967.23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45. Annual income of land buyers, 246 buyers, Southwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
<th>Number of acreage buyers</th>
<th>Number of lot buyers</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>804.20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>227.21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>448.28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>686.53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>343.50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2617.32</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 46. Annual income of land buyers, 112 buyers, Southeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
<th>Number of acreage buyers</th>
<th>Number of lot buyers</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86.68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>211.39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66.45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>380.32</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income bracket</td>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td>Number of acreage buyers</td>
<td>Number of lot buyers</td>
<td>Number of acres</td>
<td>Number of lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109.83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - $5,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>180.15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>230.59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1310.95</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48. Annual income of land buyers, 118 buyers, Northern Mountain region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
<th>Number of acreage buyers</th>
<th>Number of lot buyers</th>
<th>Number of acres</th>
<th>Number of lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>119.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.05</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>384.46</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Number of Buyers Per Annual Income Bracket and Land-Use Category,

For Each Region of Rural Utah, 1969-1971
Table 49. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 281 buyers, Northwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfer</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 28, 16, 75, 57, 67, 16, 7, 14, 1, 281

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers does not sum to 281 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
Table 50. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 67 buyers, West-central region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfer</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 15 7 24 7 10 0 2 1 1 67

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers do not sum to 67 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
Table 51. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 112 buyers, Southeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfer</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket | 11 | 11 | 25 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 112 |

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers does not sum to 112 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
Table 52. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 246 buyers, Southwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfers</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural uses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 24 30 48 45 57 21 8 11 2 246

\(^a\)Number of buyers does not sum to 281 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
Table 53. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 64 buyers, North-east region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfer</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket

|                        | 10 | 8  | 8  | 9  | 16 | 8  | 4  | 0  | 1  | 64  |

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers does not sum to 64 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
Table 54. Number of buyers per annual income bracket and land-use category, 118 buyers Northern Mountain region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use at time of transfer</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-irrigated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or idle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 9, 7, 18, 20, 34, 9, 6, 10, 5, 118

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers does not sum to 118 since a parcel of land may have had more than one land use.
Appendix F

Purchase Motives of Buyers and Annual Income Comparison

For Each Region of Rural Utah, 1969-1971
Table 55. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 281 buyers, Northwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of number of buyers in each income bracket

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 28 16 75 57 67 16 7 14 1 281

$^a$Number of buyers does not sum to 281 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
Table 56. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 67 buyers, West-central region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 15 7 24 7 10 0 2 1 1 67

^aNumber of buyers does not sum to 67 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
Table 57. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 246 buyers, Southwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buyers in each income bracket</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Number of buyers does not sum to 246 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
Table 58. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 112 buyers, Southeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of number of buyers in each income bracket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 11 11 28 33 21 4 0 4 0 112

aNumber of buyers does not sum to 112 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
Table 59. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 64 buyers, Northeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of number of buyers in each income bracket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket: 10 8 8 9 16 8 4 0 1 64

*Total number of buyers* does not sum to 64 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
Table 60. Purchase motives of land buyers, annual income comparison, 118 buyers, Northern Mountain region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase motive</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
<th>Total number of buyers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of number of buyers in each income bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current retirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future retirement</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner environment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah has lower costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah is less congested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers in each income bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-50</th>
<th>50-over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income producing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of buyers does not sum to 118 since a buyer may have had more than one motive for purchasing the land.
Appendix G

Buyer Residence and Annual Income for Each Region
Of Rural Utah, 1969-1971
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out- of- state</td>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 62. Buyer residence and annual income, 67 buyers, West-central region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>West-central</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 63. Buyer residence and annual income, 112 buyers, Southeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Non-local</th>
<th>Out-of-state</th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 64. Buyer residence and annual income, 246 buyers, Southwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of buyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of buyers: 89, 32, 127, 246
Table 65. Buyer residence and annual income, 64 buyers, Northeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income bracket</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income bracket</td>
<td>Northern Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>of-state</td>
<td>number of buyers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 5,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of buyers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Occupation and Residence of Buyers for Each Region

Of Rural Utah, 1969-1971
Table 67. Occupation and residence of buyers, 281 buyers, Northwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Non-local</th>
<th>Out-of-state</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, tech., manag.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 68. Occupation and residence of buyers, 67 buyers, West-central region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Buyers residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, tech., manag.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 69. Occupation and residence of buyers, 246 buyers, Southwest region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Buyers residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, tech., manag.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 70. Occupations and residence of buyers, 112 buyers, Southeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Buyers residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, tech., manag.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 71. Occupation and residence of buyers, 64 buyers, Northeast region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Buyers residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, tech., manag.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72. Occupations and residence of buyers, 118 buyers, Northern Mountain region, 1969-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Buyers residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, tech., manag.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishery, forestry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchwork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>