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ABSTRACT

Some Implications of Changing Natural Resource Use
On Leadership Structure and as a Source of Conflict
In the Bear Lake Area of Utah and Idaho
by
William C. Dunaway, Doctor of Philosophy
Utah State University, 1976

Major Professor: Dr. Wade H. Andrews
Department: Sociology

Several problems have arisen in recent years as the Bear Lake area of Utah and Idaho has rapidly changed from an agricultural center to a recreation center. Some of these problems have included increased pollution of the lake, rising taxes, damages through fluctuations in the level of the lake and increased crime and traffic problems.

To test the assumptions and theoretical framework of this study, five hypotheses and three sub-hypotheses were formulated. Basically, these hypotheses stated that changing land and water uses; (1) disrupt the status quo of existing social systems and that incompatible values held by different vested interest groups associated with these resources will serve as a potential source of conflict; and (2) will result in a change in the community power structure, i.e., the local community power structure will change from a monistic to a pluralistic power structure.
To test the hypotheses all elected or appointed community leaders living within six miles of Bear Lake were personally interviewed and a mailed questionnaire was sent to a random sample of 462 owners of property within six miles of Bear Lake.

Property owners were identified as belonging to three different vested interest groups; (1) full and part-time farmers living within six miles of the lake year round; (2) non-farmers living within six miles of the lake year round; and (3) owners of property within six miles of the lake who have permanent residence out of the Bear Lake area (absentee property owners). These three groups were found to have several values that are considered to be incompatible and which could serve as potential sources of conflict. In particular, the local farmers, as well as the local non-farmers, prefer seeing the Bear Lake area remain relatively undeveloped, whereas the absentee property owners feel less strongly about seeing additional recreational development, and many indicate having plans to build a recreational home in the Bear Lake area.

The Utah area around the lake which has undergone more recreational development than has the Idaho side of the lake, was found to have a more pluralistic community power structure than was found in the Idaho communities near the lake.

(184 pages)
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Historical and Geographic Characteristics of the Area

The social characteristics of the inhabitants of Bear Lake Valley located on the Utah-Idaho state line have undergone several landmark changes in the past 125 years. Prior to the early 1860's, the area was used for fishing and as a rendezvous site for trading by the Bannock and Shoshone Indians that roamed the area. In 1819-1820 Donald McKenzie, leader of the first recorded white party to visit the area, reported the gathering of approximately ten thousand Indians in a camp extending seven miles along both banks of the Bear River.1 Two other trappers, Jedediah Smith and Milton Sublette, reported ten thousand Indians gathered on the shore of Bear Lake in 1826.2 Many thousands of people passed through the north end of the valley with the wagon trains on the Oregon Trail but almost none stopped to settle.

The influx of hundreds of Mormon settlers into Bear Lake Valley beginning in 1863 resulted in the first major social change in the area as the Mormon settlers rapidly replaced the roaming tribes of Indians that had intermittently occupied the area.

The arrival of the Union Pacific Railroad running along the Oregon Trail route through the northern corner of Bear Lake Valley in the early 1870's while providing more contact with outsiders and conveniences to

1Bonnie Thompson, Folklore in the Bear Lake Valley (Salt Lake City: Utah Printing Company, 1972), p. 3.

2Ibid., p. 19.
Figure 1. Bear Lake in relation to Intermountain states.
the people living in the northern part of the valley, affected little change on the small agriculture-oriented Mormon villages adjacent to the lake.

For approximately the next 50 years, social change in the lake area remained relatively stable until the advent of the automobile after World War I. At this time there was some development of the area related to recreation as lake-side cabins and resorts began appearing. However, agriculture remained the major economic force of the area and the Mormon Church and public education dominated the social and institutional life of the people. Recreation at this time was an important but non-dominating element in the area. In more recent years, as roads and automobiles have become greatly improved and generally available, commercial functions except those related to tourism in the lake area have declined. Residents' shopping which was done in local stores and shops is now done principally in larger towns and cities out of the area.

A combination of factors has given impetus to the most recent major social change in the Bear Lake area. The increase in leisure time of the American worker, improved transportation, and the rapid population growth of the Wasatch Front of Utah—an area within two to two-and-a-half hours driving time of Bear Lake with a population of over half a million people—has resulted in increased use of Bear Lake Valley as a recreational area. Swimming, boating, water skiing, fishing, and sailing are major attractions in the summer, while snowmobiling and fishing for Cisco—a fish found nowhere else in the world—are major attractions in the winter.

Large development corporations have bought land surrounding Bear
Lake for recreational developments. The two largest such corporations (one is located in Utah, the other in Idaho) together own over 10,000 acres, with most of the land located on the surrounding mountains overlooking the lake. Recreational development of the lake, however, has developed to a much greater extent in Utah than in Idaho. Less than 15 percent of the shoreline in Idaho has been developed into cabin sites and tourist facilities, while over 40 percent of the Utah shore has been developed. The largest and most developed recreation complex on the lake is Sweetwater, located on the southern end of the lake in Utah. Sweetwater Corporation has a resort complex on the shore of the lake which contains approximately 250 condominiums, a convention center, two restaurants, and recreational facilities such as tennis, golf course, swimming pool, boat rentals, and horseback riding. The majority of Sweetwater's land, however, is on the side of a mountain above the lake. Over 7,000 acres of land have been divided into ten subdivisions to have recreation housing or cabins built on the property by the buyers.

Several problems have resulted as recreation has become a major use of the land and lake. Due to natural conditions of the soil, waste disposal is a problem, and there is an increasing threat of pollution. As Chambers notes:

The soil surrounding the lake is, in most cases, unsatisfactory for effluent disposal. This is because the basin consists primarily of lacustrine sediments consisting of poorly graded particles, alternating clays, silts, sands and gravel with a fertile cover. As a result liquid wastes flow into (as well as away from) the lake through this clean, porous structure with little or no filtration.

In the Bear Lake Basin the misuse of the septic tank is commonly known. During the spring the water table and the lake level are very high which contributes to the ground water storage. Because of excess water, leaching fields and septic
tanks become flooded. Along the shoreline of the lake, bad (septic) odors and dark pools of polluted water can be found in front of many homes.\(^3\)

At the present time an inter-state sewer system is being considered for the entire west side of Bear Lake. While this would conceivably solve the waste disposal problem it would create others inasmuch as it would allow further development of the area on a larger scale. Such development at the present time is somewhat retarded by lack of an adequate sewage system.

A sharp increase in taxes on property has been another problem in recent years. The increase in value of land has resulted in sharply increased property taxes for area property owners. Property around the lake in Idaho was re-evaluated for tax purposes in 1973 which greatly increased the taxes for many of the local farmers and ranchers whose land is now taxed as recreational property rather than agriculture property. This in time may influence many farmers and ranchers to sell out to recreational development interests.

A problem is also raised with the fluctuation of the water level of Bear Lake. Inasmuch as the level of Bear Lake is controlled by the Utah Power and Light Company, a potential for conflict between the different users of Bear Lake water exists. Although the Utah Power and Light Company now develops very little electricity from water held in Bear Lake, the power company is under contract to supply irrigation water for over 65,000 acres of farm land outside Bear Lake Valley. The resulting fluctuation of the elevation of the lake is distracting to the recreationist.

who is desirous of seeing the lake maintained at a nearly static level, as too much water causes property damage and too little water makes recreational activities less accessible and aesthetically less attractive. The resolution of these and other problems are faced by leaders and property owners in the Bear Lake area.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine some of the implications of changing water and land uses as a source for conflict. A secondary purpose is to examine some of the implications of changing land and water uses on the local power structure. Through changing and conflicting uses of land and water resources in an area, the existing power structure is likely to undergo pressure for structural elaboration as the social characteristics of the area become more heterogeneous. The relationship between changing water and land uses and the power structure of a community will be ascertained by studying that portion of Rich County, Utah and Bear Lake County, Idaho that lie within six miles of Bear Lake, a 100 square mile lake that is becoming an increasingly popular recreational area. Inasmuch as the Rich County, Utah area surrounding the lake has been developed to a much greater extent into a recreational site than that portion of Bear Lake County, Idaho near the lake, the portion of these two counties lying within six miles of the lake will be compared with respect to possible differences in power structures and possible oppositions to changing water and land uses.

In particular, this study will attempt to answer the following key questions:
1. What are the areas of conflict associated with changing uses of Bear Lake area natural resources (i.e., land and water resources)?

2. Do changing uses of the natural resources of land and water in an area tend to be accompanied by changes in the form of the power and decision making structures? That is, is there an increasing proliferation of the power structure?

3. To what extent if any, does change in the power structure tend to modify the focus of leadership? That is, do leaders tend to become less parochial in their style (focus) of leadership, do they receive more assistance from outside their communities?

**Importance of the Problem**

Due in large part to a seemingly constant stream of national and international crises, the significance of decisions made at the local level are often ignored. However, decisions made at the local community level often involve the allocation of essential resources and facilities which directly involve the comfort and safety of community residents. Furthermore, decisions made concerning such vital items as water and land use can determine the form and size that a community will take.

In communities characterized by a high rate of social change, traditional patterns of decision making and leadership structures may become strained and ineffective or changed. While this study is concerned with structural change in a primarily agriculture community that is rapidly becoming a leisure and recreational center, similar changes
and problems may be found in other rural areas that are receiving rapid population increases due to industrialization or urbanization such as the current industrialization and population boom occurring in the Uintah Basin of eastern Utah as a result of oil exploration and development.

Several problems can arise when recreational land development of rural areas results in a large number of absentee property owners (seasonal users who own property in the area but reside outside the county). Problems include high demands (that are seasonal) on services such as police, garbage collection, sewage, water, etc., as well as lack of representation of absentee property owner's interests in the local power structure. Also, in close-knit communities these outsiders (absentee land owners) may be considered a threat to community solidarity. 4

A high percent of absentee property owners in an area raises several questions with respect to local leadership such as: Do local elected leaders primarily reflect the values and attitudes of full time area residents or are their values and attitudes closer to those of the absentee owners who are in the majority? How knowledgeable are county residents and absentee property owners with respect to area leaders and issues? Do absentee land owners and county residents recognize different individuals as leaders? What inputs if any do absentee

---

or seasonal owners have in the community? Answers to these questions while not a focus of this study, would also aid in the decision making process as attempts are made to deal with environmental and social problems in the Bear Lake area.

The problems mentioned above as well as others could be compounded by rapid population growth in the Bear Lake area. Past population projections for the Bear Lake Valley could be too conservative as Earth Sciences, Inc., a Golden, Colorado based mine exploration and development company is presently carrying out advanced field work on its Paris-Bloomington Phosphate-Vanadium project in Bloomington Canyon less than six miles from the shore of Bear Lake. Currently field work is being done to test whether or not the vanadium (a source of phosphate for fertilizer) should be extensively mined. If the test drillings do prove positive the mining operation would employ approximately 300 people with wages estimated at eight million dollars annually and would increase the area's population by approximately 1,600 people. If mining does begin on a large scale basis (one and a half million dollars is presently being spent on explorations) there is sufficient mineral to mine for the next 50 years.

5Public hearing held jointly by the Bear Lake Regional Commission and Earth Sciences, Incorporated in Paris, Idaho, February 27, 1975
CHAPTER II

PAST AND PRESENT USES OF BEAR LAKE WATER

To aid the reader in better understanding the present social and physical conditions of the Bear Lake Valley, a more detailed historical look at the Valley for approximately a 100 year period (1860's - 1960's) is included. Present development and current water related problems are also discussed in the second section of this chapter.

Early History and Water Related Conflicts

As previously mentioned, the earliest human uses of Bear Lake was that of a trading and fishing site for roaming tribes of Bannock and Shoshone Indians. The first permanent white settlers to the valley were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormons). In September 1863, under the request of Mormon President Brigham Young, a group of Mormon settlers led by Charles C. Rich entered Bear Lake Valley and settled in what is now Paris, Idaho. The following years saw an influx of hundreds of more Mormon settlers (700 settlers arrived into the valley the following year in 1864).

The early settlement of the area had a distinctly Mormon character. Counsel from the leaders of the Church was generally followed and extended into all aspects of social and spiritual life as is noted by the following excerpts of a sermon given by Brigham Young to the early Bear Lake settlers:

We cannot live without law.... Every good person wants to
live under law and order... . Be sure to say your prayers morning and evening. If you forget your prayers this morning, you will forget them tonight, very likely, and if you cease to pray you will be very apt to forget God! When you build your permanent dwellings, build nice, commodious habitations ... have the brethren build upon the block until every lot is occupied. Then if you should be attacked by Indians, one scream will arouse the whole block... . Be sure you do not let your children go away from this settlement to herd cattle or sheep, but keep them at home. Send them to school... . When the brethren go into the mountains, better a few go together ... let every father and mother make their homes so interesting that their children will never want to leave it... . Make your homes pleasant with foliage and beautiful gardens ... above all, teach them (the children) to remember that God must be in all our thoughts.¹

Conflicts arose with the influx of the settlers into the previously undisputed realm of the Indians. Probably as a result of Brigham Young's policy that it was better to feed the Indians rather than to fight them, there were never any open wars with the Indians in the immediate Bear Lake area.

Charles C. Rich was the Government Indian Agent in 1864. He could see that war was inevitable unless somehow he could pacify the Indians. He and a few other leading white men arranged a meeting with the Indian chiefs... . The agreement decided upon was that the settlers could occupy the valley provided that the south end of the lake, the Laketown and Round Valley areas were to remain as camping grounds for the Indians.

It was also agreed that the whites were to contribute what they could from their crops to visiting Indians. In return, the chiefs would do all they could to keep their people from stealing from the white men or otherwise molesting them.²

The immediate uses of the water in Bear Lake and the local surrounding streams and the larger Bear River were primarily for fishing and irrigation. During the first few years when day by day survival could


²Thompson, p. 3.
not be counted on, settlers had little time for recreation. The early
water resource development in the Bear Lake area had a distinctly Mormon
character which was quite different from the pattern found in other
semi-arid regions. Irrigation projects were developed under the leader-
ship of church officials with local ward bishops directing projects
while each man contributed labor in proportion to the amount of land
he was going to irrigate.

Although not frequent, conflicts did arise occasionally among the
early Mormon settlers over water allocations. The Church leadership
intervened to settle these disputes between individuals and also
disputes between groups. A dispute between individuals occurred in
Laketown when one man appropriated more water than he could use and
sold the excess to water-short neighbors.\(^3\) The intervention of Apostles
Francis M. Lyman and Marriner W. Merrill was finally required to
resolve the problem. An example of Church intervention between groups
occurred in an 1883 Bear Lake water dispute between two Mormon congre-
gations:

The Ovid and Liberty wards were at odds over the division
of the waters of Mill Creek and Liberty Creek. The bishops
of the two wards went to the stake authorities to present their
sides in the case. The stake president made the decision in
the case, granting Ovid three-quarters of the stream flow to one-
quarter for Liberty, and referred it to his council, which u-
animously sustained his ruling. Both parties accepted the
ruling as binding and the decree was followed until it was super-
ceded.\(^4\)

After irrigation, the second use of water in the Bear Lake Valley

\(^3\)Rich, p. 92.

\(^4\)Scott R. Wrenn, "A History of Water Resources Developemnt in
the Bear River Basin of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming" (Unpublished masters
was for water power. The first grist mill was completed in 1865 and
the first water powered saw mill was built in 1886. There were no con-
flicts, however, between these two early uses of water as the mills never
depleted the water which could still be used for irrigation. With
respect to the water level of Bear Lake, the early irrigation prac-
tices never affected the water level to any significant extent nor, of
course, did the use of water mills along the lake's tributaries.

A new era in the development of the area occurred with the com-
pletion of federal surveys in the 1870's and the subsequent change of
the Mormon system of land and water tenure to fit the requirements of
federal laws. It then became important and acknowledged that the
Bear River Basin was part of three territories; Utah, Idaho, and
Wyoming and that the lake lay in both Idaho and Utah territories.
The transcontinental railroad passed through the basin during this
same period and brought a significant number of non-Mormons in the area
for the first time. As the easily irrigated land was appropriated, the
irrigation of new land required more sophisticated construction tech-
niques and a demand for a greater increase in the amount of water to be
used.

Several large canals were built in the Bear River Basin below
Bear Lake around the turn of the century. Experiments in raising beets
down stream from the lake had proved highly successful and the Utah-
Idaho Sugar Company bought stock in several existing canal companies
that were having financial problems. The Utah-Idaho Sugar Company
had rights to the Bear River for power production as well as for ir-
rigation. With the purchase of their hydro-electric property by the
Utah Power and Light Company in 1912, the Utah Power and Light Company had virtual control of the Bear River waters below the Bear Lake.

The Utah Power and Light Company further assured its control of the Bear River and also the Bear Lake in 1912 when it purchased the Telluride Power Company which had been working on developing electricity from Bear River water and making the Bear Lake into a storage reservoir. Work was completed in 1914 by the Utah Power and Light Company on the inlet and outlet canals to Bear Lake which made the Lake into a storage reservoir. These canals were originally begun by the Telluride Company in 1902. Prior to this time, waters from the Bear River did not flow directly into the Bear Lake. The feasibility of constructing these canals was noted in a United States Department of Agriculture study completed in 1899:

At the north end of the lake are the lagoons and marshes which border its outlet, and which extend toward Bear River a distance of 6 or 7 miles. Between these marshes and the lake proper is a narrow and almost level ridge of sand, known locally as "The Turnpike", which extends from the hills on one side of the valley which the lake fills to the hills on the other. About half way across this separating ridge, which is in effect a natural dam, is the outlet of the lake, a channel which connects Bear Lake and the Marshes. This channel is only 38 feet wide, and all that is required to convert Bear Lake into a reservoir is the building of a set of headgates to regulate the discharge of water, and the raising of the low place in "The Turnpike" throughout the 2 or 3 miles of its length. If this were done a rise of 5 feet in its water level would add over 400,000 acre-feet to the low water supply of irrigators below. It is doubtful if the streams which empty directly into Bear Lake would furnish this, but an additional supply could be secured by the construction of a ditch from Bear River emptying in the lake. This would not have to be more than 15 miles long, and it could be made large enough to divert practically the entire discharge of the river for March, April and May of each year.5

With the completion of the canals thus making Bear Lake into a reservoir, a new area for conflict was opened. For the first time the actual level of the lake was under direct control of man. During dry years the Utah Power and Light Company could drain 20 vertical feet off the top of the lake to produce electricity and supply irrigation water downstream. Approximately 1,500,000 acre-feet of Bear Lake storage capacity is within the limits of gravity releases and pump drawdown. 6

The virtual control of the entire flow of the Bear River and the water in Bear Lake resulted in several Idaho irrigators questioning the Utah Power and Light Company's water rights in court. The legal proceeding was held in 1920 before Judge Frank S. Dietrich in the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho, Eastern Division. The final decree was in the favor of the Power Company and gave them the right to impound and store in Bear Lake all the waters of the Bear River to the extent of 5,500 cubic feet per second as well as the right to all waters naturally flowing into or rising in Bear Lake. The Power Company was also allowed to divert and impound water in Bear Lake at any time of the year as long as it did not interfere with the prior rights established in the decree. 7

During the only two drought periods (1919 and 1934 - 1935) that have occurred since 1914 in the lower Bear River region the relationship between the Utah Power and Light Company and down-stream irrigators has been mutually useful to both parties. The water that was pumped from the Bear Lake during these periods not only provided the Power Company

---

7 Wrenn, p. 83.
with electricity but also provided desperately needed water to drought-struck farmers.

A conflict that did arise during this time occurred between the lake shore property owners and the Power Company. By lowering the lake, the Power Company left what were once lakeside residences high and dry. However, in recent years the Power Company has made fewer drawdowns of the lake:

Prior to 1932 the Utah Power and Light Company made year-round drafts on Bear Lake for power generation in addition to seasonal releases for irrigation. These drafts, together with a prolonged drought, resulted in a gradual lowering of the lake surface during the 1930's.8

 Owners of the lakeside property considered taking legal action against the Power Company but the Idaho Attorney General noted that the state could not interfere in a private matter between land owners and the Utah Power and Light Company. 9 This possible source of conflict is still in existence today. The problem has lain semidormant inasmuch as a series of wet years dating back through the last two decades has provided a surplus of water. Also, "Except for infrequent releases to provide storage capacity for spring runoff, the company now releases large amounts of water from the lake only during the irrigation season... . Since 1950, the lake has been maintained at comparatively high levels."10

Current Uses of Bear Lake Water and Land

A more in-depth look at the present major uses of water and land

---

8U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, p. 37.
9Wrenn, p. 87.
10U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, p. 38.
and the special interest groups associated with the principal uses will now be made. The three principal uses of Bear Lake water at the present time are agriculture (irrigation), electrical power production, and recreation.

Agriculture

The total water of Bear Lake available for irrigation is 1,421,000 acre feet, which is the volume of the lake that can be drained (21.65 vertical feet) through utilization of Utah Power and Light Company's pumping facilities. The effects of this maximum drawn down on the shallow north and south shores of Bear Lake can be seen in Figure 2 and Figure 3. The water rights for irrigation are dispersed among many subscribers with most of the land that is irrigated from water stored in the lake lying outside the immediate Bear Lake Valley. Water users and their rights have been defined in the Bear River Compact (with representatives from Utah, Idaho and Wyoming) and through court decisions.

With respect to agriculture practices in the immediate Bear Lake area, the selling of farm and ranch lands to recreational developers has resulted in a subsequent decline in the farm population. As noted in the "City and County Data Yearbook" for 1952, 1962, 1972, the farm population of Rich County decreased markedly in a twenty-year period. The farm population dropped from 969 in 1952, to 361 in 1972 (no figures available for 1962). While the farm population was decreasing, the rural non-farm population was increasing. During the same time period, the rural non-farm population rose from 704 to 1,234 in Rich County.
Figure 2. Water levels of Bear Lake
Figure 3. Water levels of Bear Lake.
From 1952 to 1962, the farm population of Bear Lake County dropped from 2,511 to 1,136 and then rose back up to 1,511 in 1972. As with Rich County, Utah, the rural non-farm population increased, rising from 1,641 in 1952 to 2,291 in 1972.

The total number of farms in Rich County decreased over a twenty year period from 243 in 1950 to 168 in 1969. In Bear Lake County, Idaho during this time span, the number of farms also decreased. In this case the total number of farms decreased from 712 in 1950 to 480 in 1969.

Inasmuch as the number of farms and the farm population has dropped considerably, and the rural non-farm population has increased considerably, one can notice that agriculture in the area is slowly giving way to recreational and housing developments.

Recreation

For this discussion of recreationists, the various categories of people using the Bear Lake area for diversion and relaxation will not be categorized into just one large group labeled "recreationists". The interest and service demands of particular groups using the area may differ in several ways; for example, the interests and demands of university students visiting the lake for an afternoon's outing would be quite different than the interests and demands of individuals owning $65,000 condominiums along the lake shore. For practical purposes then, this discussion of recreation will divide recreational users of the Bear Lake area into three major categories: Permanent Residents, Visitors, and Summer Home Residents. The population numbers in these
three groups is noted on a table developed by Street,\textsuperscript{11} reproduced as Table 1. A "local user" in the table is defined as a person living within a 150 mile radius of the Bear Lake Valley, a "tourist" is defined as a person residing outside of the 150 mile radius of the valley. As noted in Table 1, the number of recreational users is projected to double by 1980.

1. **Permanent residents.** The 1970 census indicated 868 people living in the five municipalities that are either located on the lake or within five miles of the lake shore (see Table 2). While the recreational uses of the area by these permanent residents would likely be similar to those uses of other recreationists, because of their permanent residence, these people probably more than any other group are affected by changes in elevation of the lake level, increases in the number of tourists, land and recreational developments, and rising taxes. While many of these residents are still farmers and ranchers, a major factor that keeps them there could be the aesthetic and recreational advantages the area offers.

2. **Visitors.** Recreationists coming to the lake for short visits have a choice of using private rental facilities, a limited amount of unposted and undeveloped private land and beaches, and state owned facilities in Idaho and Utah. In Idaho the only developed park operated by the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation is located on the northern end of the lake near the Lifton Pumping Plant of the Utah Power and

\textsuperscript{11}Hayden Street, "Water Quality as a Land Use Determinant for the Bear Lake Valley" (Unpublished masters thesis, Logan, Utah: Utah State University, 1973), p. 43.
Table 1. Projected number of permanent residents and visitors to the Bear Lake area of Utah and Idaho.\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>232,600b</td>
<td>453,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Users</td>
<td>360,800b</td>
<td>587,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Home Residents</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595,412</td>
<td>1,046,918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{b}Riley's 1964 figure last available.
Table 2. 1970 Population of Bear Lake area municipalities.\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>1970 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Haven\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleville\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laketown\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>868</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{b}Located on the shore of Bear Lake.
and Light Co. The property the park is on is leased from the power company. The total user days during the summer months for this facility as recorded in the "Use and Statistics Log" of the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation for the last five years is noted in Table 3.

As noted in Table 3, there was a rapid increase in the number of users of the park until 1973. Prior to this time the North Beach Park was managed by the power company as a public service and overnight camping was allowed. The rapidly increasing number of users of the park resulted in an increase in sewage, litter, vandalism and policing problems for the power company. Beginning in 1973 no overnight camping was allowed and the total operation of the North Beach Park was turned over to the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation. Comparing the 1973 figures with those for 1974 would indicate that the facilities are becoming increasingly popular. There was an increase of 64 percent for the total user days and a 56 percent increase in the number of boats launched at the North Beach ramp between 1973 and 1974.

The only fully developed public park in Utah is located along the main highway on the eastern side of the lake near the Idaho border. Although overnight camping is not allowed, there are facilities for over 150 boats within an enclosed harbor. The number of users is counted on a calendar year basis and as of September 1974 there had been 84,436 user days at the park, this is up from the 81,155 user days recorded for the entire calendar year of 1970. The higher number of visitors for 1974 is more significant when viewed in the light that most major parks in the West had suffered declines in the number of visitors due to economic and fuel reversals (telephone conversation with Gordon Tenney.
Table 3. Total user days at Idaho's North Beach Park: 1970-1974.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>43,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>50,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>90,000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>26,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>716 Boats Launched(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>41,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,290 Boats Launched</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^b\)Figure is estimated by Park official, no records available.
\(^c\)First year boats were counted.
Utah State Parks and Recreation Information Officer, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 14, 1974). The rapidly increasing number of boat registrations in Rich County, Utah is shown in Figure 4.

3. Summer home residents. Both Rich County and Bear Lake County have one dominant private recreational complex located on the lake, Sweetwater and Bear Lake West respectively. The largest and most developed recreation complex on the lake is Sweetwater, located on the southern end of the lake in Utah. Sweetwater Corporation's complex on the lake contains approximately 150 condominiums, a convention center, two restaurants, and recreational facilities such as tennis, golf, swimming pool, boat rentals, and horseback riding. The majority of Sweetwater's land, however, is on the side of a mountain above the lake. Over 7,000 acres of land have been divided into ten subdivisions to have cabins built on the property by the buyers. Sweetwater has avoided the sewage problems faced by many would-be developers by constructing their own $150,000 sewage system (lagoons). By far the vast majority of Sweetwater property owners are absentee owners, that is, they do not live year round in Rich County but own property there. Of the 271 Sweetwater property owners listed in the Rich County Courthouse in July 1974, all but one had mailing addresses outside of Rich County.

Although written in part for public relations purposes, a publication made by Sweetwater indicates part of the impact the company has had on Rich County, the one page summary given in this publication is quoted below:

**SUMMARY:**
The creation of Sweetwater Park, the first true destination resort in Rich County, in the first few years of operation, has
Figure 4. Number of boat registrations in Rich County, Utah, 1959-1972.*

*Data obtained from the Utah Division of Parks and Services Table (Utah Boat Registrations), Salt Lake City, Utah.
provided a very positive economic stimulus for the Rich County economy with the promise of an even more favorable impact. The impact can be seen in several areas:

**Employment** - Sweetwater Park has reversed the traditional erosion on non-agricultural employment in Rich County, and in turn, the erosion of total population in the County. Sweetwater Park is the largest non-agricultural, non-government employer in Rich County and is moving towards becoming a stable and not just a seasonal employer as its four season nature is recognized.

**Wages** - The wages paid by Sweetwater Park comprise a significant 24% of the total non-agricultural wages paid in the entire County. The multiplier effect of wages paid to Rich County residents who in turn spend these wages in Rich County, benefits other merchants in Rich County and increases total tax revenues for Rich County.

**Taxes** - Sweetwater Park pays a significant amount of property taxes to Rich County. These taxes have reversed the trend of total decreasing property taxes in Rich County.

**Education** - Rich County enrolled 408 students this year in three levels of educational institutions. Figuring the mil levy for 1973 of 36.739 mils, Sweetwater contributed $19,665.00 to the District Schools. Breaking this down, Sweetwater paid $48.28 toward the education of each student in Rich County in 1973.

**Tourism** - Through the construction of a first class destination resort at Bear Lake, Sweetwater Park has been able to turn Rich County and Bear Lake from a transient visitor attraction to one that has the ability to provide a diverse and attractive recreational experience for a longer stay. Even more significant is the fact that this is the first resort to be located on the Utah (Rich County) portion of Bear Lake. This means that those tourists who have been using the highways, protective services, utilities and other government services provided by Rich County as they visit and stay at the Idaho resorts along Bear Lake, will finally start staying in Utah where their tax dollar will be returned to Rich County, not to Idaho.12

The largest land development in Bear Lake County, Idaho is Bear Lake West which owns approximately 4,000 acres, almost all of which is located on the mountainside above the lake. Although Bear Lake West is not as developed as Sweetwater, it does have its own golf course and has plans for building what would be the largest marina on the lake. As with

---

Sweetwater, the majority of property owners are absentee owners, having permanent residence outside of Bear Lake County.

Hydroelectric power production

Unlike most storage reservoirs, hydroelectric power is not produced immediately as it leaves Bear Lake. In fact, the Lifton pumping plant at the north end of the lake in Idaho, consumes electricity as it pumps water from the lake into a canal which connects with the Bear River. Hydroelectric power is produced when the water held in the lake along with the natural flow of the Bear River passes through five downstream hydroelectric plants. About 94 percent of the hydroelectric generating capacity in the Bear River Basin is provided by these five plants.

Through operation of the Lifton plant's pumps and gates, 21.65 vertical feet of water can be drawn down from the maximum 5,923.65 level elevation of the lake (1,421,000 acre feet of water). Figure 5 indicates the route in which water is diverted to and from Bear Lake.

From Figure 2, the profile of the lake can be ascertained if the lake were to be lowered to the maximum drawdown. In this case the present shoreline facilities of the North Beach Park in Idaho would be nearly two miles from the water.

The maximum elevation of the lake has been held generally within a four foot range for the last ten years. The low elevations of the lake during the 1930's resulted from a drought and from power generation drawdowns. At the present time, except for release during the fall and winter months to provide storage capacity for spring runoff, the company now releases large amount of water from the lake only during
Figure 5. Flow of Bear River water into and out of Bear Lake.
the irrigation season. In recent years the annual fluctuation of the lake has averaged 3.2 feet.  

By not making year-round drafts on the lake, the energy outputs of the Bear River power plants has been substantially reduced:  

... with their water supply thus limited, the Bear River powerplants are now used principally for peaking operations. The Power Company's base load is supplied largely from fuel-electric plants and other sources. Under the new plan of operation the level of Bear Lake again rose in an irregular pattern, reaching full stage in 1950 for the first time since 1923. Since 1950 the lake has been maintained at comparatively high levels.  

---

Summary of Current Uses of Water and Land as Sources of Conflict in the Bear Lake Area

There are three basic interest groups formed around the three principal uses of water held in the lake. These three groups and their principal demands on Bear Lake water are:

1. Downstream Agriculturalists: Downstream irrigators require water during the dry fall months which is likely to result in the lowering of the lake.

2. Power Officials: Power officials need to be able to raise and lower the lake so as to provide water for downstream irrigation and hydroelectric power production. They also need to be protected from vandalism from the large number of recreationists using Idaho's North Beach Park which is

---

13 Utah Power and Light Company, "Bear River--Bear Lake Project" (Pamphlet, no date), p. 5.

located on their property.

3. Recreationists: Recreationists need the lake to remain clean and desire having the lake's water level relatively stable so as to avoid making access to the lake difficult and making the shoreline aesthetically unattractive.

As previously discussed, agricultural and power interests can be collapsed into one user group as the power company now produces little electricity from water held in Bear Lake but is still under legal contract to store irrigation water. The principal source of conflict over uses of Bear Lake water exists then, between recreational interests and downstream agricultural interests and power interests. As was also previously noted, this source of conflict has lain relatively dormant as three consecutive decades of abundant snow and rainfall in the surrounding mountains has resulted in a supply of water to adequately satisfy differing user demands.

With respect to possible conflicting land uses around the lake, property owners can be divided into two principal interest groups; property owners who primarily have agriculture interests and property owners who primarily have recreational interests. As previously noted, several problems have developed between these two interest groups. Local farmers and ranchers in the immediate Bear Lake area are in conflict with recreationists over rising taxes. Much of the agricultural land along the lake that has been used the past century for grazing cattle and for growing hay is now being taxed as recreational property thus having the effect of forcing many farmers and ranchers to sell out. Another problem is that the high price of land in the area has limited the ability of
ranchers to expand their operations to make larger and possibly more profitable operations. Recreational property owners on the other hand are concerned with animal pollution reaching the lake from streams flowing through farmer's feed lots and grazing areas. Also, in several areas there is a seepage problem in homes near the lake when farmers on higher ground irrigate and some of this water eventually seeps into their basements. A further problem of the farmers in the area is the vandalism done to their property by recreationists as well as traffic problems during the summer months.
CHAPTER III
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Inasmuch as the present study focuses on some of the implications of changing land and water uses in the Bear Lake area as a source of conflict and also for its possible effects on the local community power structure, the review of literature deals with two main areas of concern, (1) changing land and water uses as a source for conflict, and (2) studies of community power structure.

Changing Land/Water Uses as a Source for Conflict

Jessie Bernard\(^1\) has noted two basic questions to be answered by all communities, (1) if there is not enough of a thing, how can we decide who gets what there is? And, (2) if there are many goals, values or interests, which shall prevail? Bernard notes that the first of these two questions refers to a problem of scarcity, which leads to competition. The second deals with the problem of incompatible interests which leads to conflict. Whereas some authors\(^2\) have distinguished competition from conflict on the grounds that it is less personal, less direct, and more continuous, the basic differences are considered

---


by Bernard to be, "... the distinction between two stubborn and inexorable conditions of living: (1) scarcity and (2) the incompatibility of certain values."³

It is evident that these two terms - competition and conflict - may shade into one another and overlap thereby making it sometimes difficult to distinguish between them. For example, problems arising over changing uses of water resources can be seen as a source of competition as well as a source for conflict. Competition can result as different individuals and groups compete for a scarcity of water and conflict can occur where the changing water uses results in an incompatibility of interests and values over priorities of water uses such as not being able to lower the level of a lake to take out irrigation water because it would spoil recreational use of the lake.

If one accepts the premise of Bagley that:

It is virtually impossible to identify an unused water supply that is not valued by some sector of society in its present use. Thus, the problem of increasing the utility of water does not consist of making water useful where it was formerly useless, but of reallocating it to uses having higher values in terms of increased social efficiency.⁴

Then, changes in the uses of these water supplies will likely serve as a source of conflict as the values of all sectors of society are not the same with respect to water use priorities.

³Bernard, p. 47.

In noting that conflict takes place on different levels, Bernard (see Figure 6) developed a generalized scheme of the conflict or accommodation continuum. As noted in Figure 6, the converging lines represent a logical, though not necessary continuum varying from the widely divergent interests, wishes, wills, or goals at the bottom to the identical interests, wishes, wills, or goals at the apex. Quoting from Bernard a brief description of each of these stages is given below:

**Elimination.** Since conflict represents the presence of incompatible interests, wishes, wills, or goals, one of the simplest and most direct ways of trying to get rid of conflict is to get rid of your opponent.

**Exploitation.** If elimination of the opponent is not feasible or desirable, then exploitation is an effective way to handle incompatible interests. You take advantage of your opponent's weaknesses.

**Equilibration.** If the conflicting parties are of about equal strength, or if for some other reason it is neither possible nor desirable to eliminate or to exploit one of them, their interests, wishes, wills, or goals must be modified in the direction of compatibility. The conflicting parties become amenable to mediation and conciliation or—if these approaches fail—to arbitration and adjudication.

**Coalescence of interests.** We may handle a conflict by actually rendering the interests, wishes, wills, or goals of our opponents compatible, or even identical with our own.

**Assimilation.** When conflicting parties become close enough to one another to make deliberate cooperation possible, it is not such a far cry to assimilation, in which goals and ends are identical. At the level of assimilation, conflict is over so far as the constituent elements are concerned.  

While these five levels should not be thought of as a value scale, the equilibration level is assumed to be the most desirable stage with respect to resolving conflict over changing water/land uses, since goals become less incompatible, compromise is more likely. Each party becomes willing to sacrifice something in order to gain something else:

---

5Bernard, p. 48-53.
The converging lines represent the conflict continuum, the vertical line, the competition continuum. Both range from a level of elimination of opponent to a level of assimilation or monopoly.

Figure 6. Bernard's Conflict or Accommodation Continuum Model*

The conflicting parties become amenable to mediation and conciliation or, if these approaches fail, to arbitration and adjudication. Violence and force may occur incidentally at this level but the usual weapons are words, reason, argument, logic. Most American communities place great emphasis on this way of handling conflict.6

The purpose of the remaining review of literature is to look at past research that has dealt with some of the problems associated with changing water/land uses, and to note the values involved in these changes that might be incompatible, and how these changes can serve as a possible source of conflict. With respect to shifting water uses in a rural area, two principle sources of potential conflict will be discussed, these are:

1. Differences between rural-urban values and leisure/work patterns.
2. Differences between values and behavior of special interest groups.

Rural-Urban Values and Leisure/Work Patterns

There are several non-economic values associated with water resource use and development that involve broad aspects of quality of life, these values appear to be growing in importance. Recreational needs are growing as the country becomes more mobile and as citizens have greater amounts of money and time to spend on leisure-time activities. The increased mobility of the American population has developed an interest in the people in what is being done in other regions far away from where they live. For example, people living in the eastern part of the country are becoming highly conscious of the West

6Bernard, p. 50.
as a vacation and recreation area while Westerners have likewise become more aware of such leisure opportunities in the East.

Another non-economic value associated with water resource use that is increasing is the growing concern for aesthetics which affects water resource development:

This interest affects water resource development in that it requires planning to preserve beauty or points of interest in the process of water development. It will likely be harder to develop rural water resources that affect the landscape in the face of opposition from aesthetic interests. Aesthetic interest must be given appropriate weight in planning water resource development.

These growing noneconomic interests of water resources can serve as a source of conflict inasmuch as the economic and noneconomic uses of a water resource are not always compatible (such as lowering a lake to provide irrigation water and thereby leaving recreational facilities above the water level) and are held unequally by different groups.

Differences in the value or conception as to what is the most beneficial or desirable use of a natural resource (such as water held in a lake or reservoir) can be noted between rural and urban populations. These differences can be noted in particular with respect to the environmental as well as leisure orientations of these two groups.

Environmental orientation is a concept which deals with a continuum of perspectives including preserving, conserving and utilizing natural environment resources and can also serve as a source of conflict. Possible differences in environmental or conservation orientations resulting from urban or rural occupations have been noted by Harry, Gale, and Hendee:

---

7 Bagley, p. II-158.
... we infer that holding an urban occupation, which typically does not involve direct exploitation of the natural environment, is a condition permitting the development of a non-utilitarian attitude toward nature... Since a utilitarian attitude toward nature is associated with rural residence and since rural occupations are mainly based upon the exploitation of nature, we suggest that, for ruralities, nature is primarily significant as a utilitarian object. 8

An example of a recent study which throws light on the postulated differences between farmers and nonfarmers is by Andrews and Geertsen, 9 who made comparisons between the two categories on five items regarding land use and conservation opinions. The items were concerned with:
(a) mining vs. recreational use of land, (b) forest vs. grazing priority of land, (c) ranching vs. public use of BLM held land, (d) public vs. private control of land where erosion and other run-off problems affect the water supply, and (e) public vs. private control of stream run-off. On all five items farmers were more utilitarian in orientation and also showed a smaller support for public and governmental controls than did nonfarmers. For example, farmers favored private farming or ranching uses of public lands, while town nonfarmers and metropolitan-urban respondents favored public uses.

To measure environmental orientation, Andrews, Madsen and Dunaway 10


used a nine-item Likert type scale which focused on attitudes toward three environmental factors: (1) economic vs. protective uses of natural resources, (2) aesthetic vs. functional uses of resources, and (3) perception of pollution of natural resources as being a problem vs. not a problem, and found differences between full-time, part-time, and nonfarmers. The study indicated that nonfarmers are more environmentally oriented than either farmers or part-time farmers. Differences between mean scores of farmers and part-time farmers were small and not statistically significant. However, differences between these two groups and nonfarmers were statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level:

It appears that the milieu of farm work and farm culture does have a bearing on an individual's attitudes toward the environment. By the nature of their work farmers and part-time farmers are involved in "manipulating" or using natural resources. It may be that their use of natural resources for a livelihood has resulted in full and part-time farmers viewing natural resources more from a utilitarian or economic use perspective than from an aesthetic one.11

These findings suggest then, that farmers and part-time farmers were more utility oriented than the nonfarmers. The attitudes of nonfarmers may be derived from a view of nature as a place for recreation related to use of areas of natural beauty, or from a romanticizing of the natural environment and resources. The latter may derive from several elements such as the qualities of nature being little known to them because of highly limited or differing experiences. The romanticizing concept possibly grows from an aesthetic view or position, or from an aura of feeling about nature developed by the diffusion of

conservation and preservation movements since before the turn of the century.

An overview by Kronus and Van Es\textsuperscript{12} of the results comparing the pollution attitudes, knowledge and behavior of urban and rural men in central Illinois showed statistically significant differences on four of five variables. The sample of urban men in the study were concerned about local pollution, accord spending on pollution a higher place in relation to other social problems, and adhere to more household practices designed to lower pollution levels. They were also more informed about the last issue than were the sample of farmers in the study even though this issue (pollution of a near by lake) is decidedly farm related in origin, if not in consequence. Only for the value of "voluntarism" did the authors find that the differences between the farmers and the urban men were insufficient to be statistically significant.

In an area that has traditionally been economically agriculture oriented, differences in the recreational orientation between the local agriculturalists and the newly arrived recreationists can serve as a source of conflict.

The "Protestant Ethic" in which systematic labor was viewed by the Puritans as the means to salvation, while leisure and enjoyment was the deadliest of sins, appears to be diminishing.\textsuperscript{13} However, remnants

\textsuperscript{12}Carol L. Kronus and J. C. Van Es, "Pollution Attitudes, Knowledge and Behavior of Farmers and Urban Men" (Unpublished paper, no data).

\textsuperscript{13}Dean R. Yoesting and Dan L. Burkhead, Sociological Aspects of Water Based Recreation in Iowa (Ames, Iowa: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Sociology Report 94, 1971).
of the Protestant ethic are still visible today especially in rural areas.\textsuperscript{14,15} Rural areas appear to have internalized more of the values associated with work and are therefore expected to hold less favorable attitudes toward leisure than their urban neighbors.

Beers\textsuperscript{16} found farmers to be more work oriented and the ORRC Report \textsuperscript{17} showed that farmers participated less than nonfarmers in outdoor recreational activities. In a study done on a sample of residents in central Utah, Dunaway, Madsen and Andrews\textsuperscript{18} found nonfarmers to have the highest leisure orientation with part-time farmers having the second highest and full-time farmers the lowest leisure orientation. With respect to actual behavior, differences between farmers and nonfarmers have been noted and several studies suggest important differences between recreational behavior and place of residence, i.e., rural vs. urban place of residence. In an inventory of behavioral propositions

\textsuperscript{14}Rabel J. Burdge, "The Development of a Leisure-Orientation Scale" (Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1961).


\textsuperscript{17}Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, "Participation in Outdoor Recreation: Factors Affecting Demand Among American Adults", Study Report \#20, 1960.

implied in recreation studies, Nielson\textsuperscript{19} identified 86 propositions in 20 articles that suggest the importance of rural-urban differences in recreation behavior.

\textbf{Differing Values/Behavior of Special Interest Groups}

Change affects people and groups differently as some gain and some lost by the change. Thorstein Veblen coined the term "vested interests\textsuperscript{20}" to denote those who lose in the event of change i.e., those persons who have a vested interest in the status quo. Vested (special) interests are not only held by business interests for economic reasons but may also be held by communities as residents develop vested interests in what occurs in their neighborhood. Residents often ban to protect themselves against such changes as: highway development, bussing of school children to promote racial integration, zoning, etc. An important factor in the development of a powerful vested interest group is that the various groups or organizations perceive that their interests are in jeopardy from the change being made. Allen has noted, "...we must amend our generalization to the effect that vested interests are often a powerful resisting force to innovation, provided they are surely aware that their interests are being jeopardized by the change."\textsuperscript{21}

Smith in discussing the affects of reservoir construction has


noted that:

A great influx of immigrants to an area resulting from the stimulus of a reservoir causes internal problems which are not easily solved. New ideas and values are brought in--ideas foreign to the native population which often clash with existing modes of thought. ... A sudden change of this nature can be extremely disruptive to a society.22

Smith further notes the general division which can be considered to represent vested interests in the community which he was studying that was going to have a reservoir built, between those in favor of the dam and those opposed to the dam.

Those in favor:

1. Businessmen
2. Farmers down-river who are flooded every few years
3. Young people
4. Big Town pleasure seekers

Those opposed to the dam:

1. Older rural citizens
2. Individuals who will be relocated
3. People who fear change
4. Individuals who will lose portions of their farms but will retain their homes.

Besides affecting the groups listed above, Smith saw future changes resulting from reservoir construction affecting the following areas:23

1. Schools—the anticipated influx of new permanent residents from Big Town will cause changes in the school system as the future migrants have been accustomed to urban schools which have broader programs and superior facilities. There is even talk of the necessity of building a new school.

2. Churches will have to adjust their programs to the influx of not only permanent residents, but also the pleasure seekers. Presently no plans are being made, but one church sees this as a potential problem.

3. The government structure, county and city, will have to become more professional as tax revenues increase and the increased problems associated with the migrants become a reality. This is particularly true in the area of law enforcement and zoning regulations.

4. The economy will undergo drastic changes as farm land is taken out of production and new sources of revenue come to the forefront.23

A community may not perceive that its interests are in jeopardy as a change is being made. For example, rapid population growth in a rural community is often not perceived by the local residents (a vested interest group) as a threat to their life style. However, rapid population increases in a rural area and the resulting demand for more public services has been noted as a potential source for conflict in a study by Albrecht24 of power plant development in the Four-Corners area of the Southwest. The development of the power plants and their promise of an increased employment and tax base appeared promising to the people of an area that had been losing its youth to out migration. However, Albrecht notes that communities experiencing rapid growth also frequently experience strain on the public purse, that while public services increase, the property owners' tax bills will often increase even faster.

23 Ibid., p. 151-153.

Derr and Kasper\textsuperscript{25} in a study of the effects of growth on local services and public finances found that costs frequently increased faster than benefits gained from new services. This source of conflict can be compounded inasmuch as the authors also noted differences between new comers and the older residents over expected public services. New residents were found to be accustomed to a higher level of public services than the local community had been providing. Increased numbers, plus a demand for new and more complete services resulted in an expansion in the costs of education, public safety, streets and roads, health and welfare, and recreational services. It would appear then, "While development that promises more jobs and public services appears attractive, it almost always brings with it side effects of air, water, and noise pollution that sometimes contribute to an overall decrease in quality of life."\textsuperscript{26} As with the proposed power plant development, recreation development in an economically depressed area can at first be noted by local residents as a panacea for the cure of the community's ills. But as noted in a longitudinal study by Dunaway\textsuperscript{27} of the Park City, Utah ski resort, the degree of anomia (discouragement and despair) of the permanent residents was actually higher four years after the development of the recreation complex than when the complex was first started.

\textsuperscript{25}Don A. Durr and Victor Kasper, \textit{Urbanization and its Effect on Land Use, Local Services and Public Finance} (Economic Information Report, Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing, Rutgers U., no date).

\textsuperscript{26}Albrecht, p. 8.

As would be expected, communities in their manifestation of vested interests do not always win. Cottrell\textsuperscript{28} has described the efforts of a railroad town to stop the railroad from bypassing their town due to the change over from coal burning engines (the town was a water and coal service stop) to diesel engines. Although the community fought the change determinedly, in the name of progress the town was bypassed by the new diesel fueled trains.

Napier\textsuperscript{29} has noted the disruption that watershed development can have on vested interests in a rural community. Inasmuch as people within rural communities establish patterns of interaction which are functional for their particular social situation, interaction patterns become standardized or become the way people perceive that things should be done within the group. If change is implemented within such groups, especially change implemented from the outside area by external groups, the interaction patterns may become disrupted, "If the change results in severe social disruption, the individuals within the affected group may develop negative attitudes about the changing social situation to the extent that they become alienated from the changed community.\textsuperscript{30}

Napier further notes that physical displacement of a portion of a community will undoubtedly have some type of disruptive influence upon the social cohesiveness of the group.

In their evaluation of the social impact of reservoir construction


\textsuperscript{29}T. L. Napier, "The Social-Psychological Impact of Watershed Development Upon Rural Community Groups," (Columbus, Ohio: Department of Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology, Ohio State U., no date).

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 4.
on the residential plans of displaced persons in Kentucky and Ohio, Ludtke and Burdge focused on the role of vested (special interest groups):

The submodels tested involving vested interests yielded strong and consistent results. People who have their interests benefited by the construction of such projects have more favorable attitudes toward the projects and consequently are less apprehensive over moving and more willing to accept social separation. It is also worth noting that although this variable was derived inductively from previous empirical generalizations, it is basically compatible with coercion (or conflict) theory as represented by Dahrendorf (1959).31

These authors found that identification with place of residence and vested interests were the key variables in problems associated with social separation due to reservoir construction.

Bultena, Rogers, and Webb32 have noted several problems with how the public might play a larger role in environmental decision making. First of all, there usually is a plurality of individuals and groups representing different vested interest groups and therefore holding widely divergent views on appropriate action. A second problem in determining the public interest lies in deciding which publics should appropriately be involved in decision making inasmuch as a resource program may legitimately concern only local vested interests, but more likely involves multi-county, state, regional, or national populations.


Once appropriate publics have been identified, Bultena, Rogers, and Webb have further noted that an additional problem is the determination of effective and appropriate means of securing their input into the decision making processes. The use of public hearings has been challenged inasmuch as the geographical dimensions of most natural resource programs in crossing political lines may make public referendums unrealistic within present legal systems. Likewise advisory panels have been criticized as being "window dressing" and as not offering realistic opportunities for citizen involvement. Public opinion polls have also been used by some agencies but have had to face the problem that a substantial number of persons may be poorly informed on a given policy.

These authors note an additional problem in reflecting public sentiment on environmental programs in that sentiment of vested interest groups seldom remains stable:

Significant changes are occurring, for example, in public thinking as to the proper use and development of environmental resources. Recreation, appreciative, and aesthetic concerns in resources management are of growing importance and are challenging traditional and more dominant philosophies of resource use emphasizing utilization, material production, and economic growth. ... These emergent environmental orientations often seriously conflict with established resource uses such as timber production, mining, cattle grazing, flood protection, and water quality programs.33

Bagley has noted some of the affects that values of vested interest groups can have to promote or inhibit social action:

When one person's values are in conflict with values held by others, they become the cause of differing choices and the differences in choices become obstacles to social

33 Ibid., p. 8-9.
action and constructive communication. ... An added factor in making decisions is the perception the individual has of a particular situation. For instance, people may be in agreement on a certain issue, but if they perceive at a particular time that they are in disharmony, until they are able to communicate, social constraints to action are likely to develop. In the case where values are correctly perceived to be in conflict, whether these values are held by planners or users, social action is likewise inhibited.34

Bagley has also pointed out the importance of communication, as an individual's "definition of the situation" concerning a problem may be contrary to what reality would indicate, there is a need to communicate this definition with others so as to further resolve the problem. The ability for rural and urban populations to communicate with each other is compounded by the actual physical separation of these two groups as well as their having somewhat different values and behavior patterns with respect to use of natural resources such as lakes and reservoirs.

Not only is there often a lack of communication between rural and urban populations but in many cases there is also a communication problem between the local leadership and the seasonal (absentee) property owners who are only in the area part of the year. Because they are not in the area for extended periods, it is generally difficult for absentee property owners to work with the local leadership in solving problems. It would also be expected that the absentee property owners would feel that their interests are not being met by local leadership inasmuch as they were not able to vote for these leaders.

The value of cooperation between governmental agencies and local

34Bagley, p. 78.
Property owners in resolving water-related problems have been noted by several authors. Heard and MacNaughton\(^\text{35}\) have described the importance of cooperation between governmental agencies and local property owners in organizing a flood prevention project. In another study of a flood prevention project, Smith\(^\text{36}\) found that members of a small community working with local leadership were able to successfully promote a flood prevention project. Peterson\(^\text{37}\) found a positive relationship between the degree of community leadership and participation and effectiveness of organizing rural water systems in 27 communities.

**Community Power Structure**

Social power has been defined by Weber as, "The chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action."\(^\text{38}\) This study is based on the assumptions that social power is present and is exercised in patterned ways in all social systems.\(^\text{39}\)


including communities, that certain individuals play key roles in the exercise of community leadership, and that community leaders can be identified by using certain techniques. 40 In focusing on community power, "community power structure" will be used in the present study as a blanket concept referring to related phenomena of political process and decision making on the local level with no assumption made about the stability or integration of any structure. 41

In a study of community power structure there are four principal questions to be answered: First, what is the basis of social power? Secondly, what are the varieties of power structures, that is, what form does the power structure take--unidimensional or multidimensional? Thirdly, what are the sources of this variation of power structures? And finally, who are the leaders in the community?

Basis of social power

In locating sources of social power, Bierstedt 42 notes that power would seem to stem from three sources; (1) numbers of people, (2) social organization, and (3) resources. With respect to the first source, number of people, "Given the same social organization and the same resources, the larger number can always control the smaller


and control its compliance." The power of numbers can be seen in the election process when the majority is conceded the right to institutionalize its power as authority. The second source of social power, that of social organization is of vital importance inasmuch as an organized minority (such as a police force) can control a much larger unorganized majority (a crowd). The importance of the third source of power, that of resources, can be seen in a situation of two groups nearly equal in number and in organization, the one with access to greater resources will have the superior powers. "Resources may be of many kinds—money, property, prestige, knowledge, competence, deceit, fraud, secrecy, and of course, all of those things usually included under the term 'natural resources'." Other resources such as access, morality, obligation, respect, success and time have been noted by Paul A. Miller.

The importance of resources has been further noted by Burr who developed the following propositions concerned with resources and power:

Proposition 9.1: The amount of resources an individual has positively influences the power the individual has in a relationship and this is a positive, monotonic relationship.

Proposition 9.2: The value of resources is related to the amount of influence in proposition 9.1, which states that

43 Ibid., p. 737.
44 Ibid.
resources influence power, and this is a positive, monotonic relationship.\textsuperscript{46}

These two propositions note that it is not just the amount of resources that is important but also value of these resources.

Having thus noted the sources of social power, the question arises; what form does community power structure take—is there a well defined ruling group which dominates local policy-making or are there several centers of power?

\textbf{Varieties of community power structures—monolithic vs. pluralistic}

For simplicity, throughout this study, power structures will generally be referred to as monolithic or pluralistic. Some familiar synonyms for monolithic are "concentrated," "elite," "pyramidal," "integrated," and "stable." Intermediate forms have been referred to as "weak elite," "quasi-elite," "multi-pyramidal," and "factional." Pluralistic power structures have also been referred to as "fluid," "multidimensional," "unconcentrated," "unintegrated," and "amorphous."

As previously indicated, two broad hypotheses have been made with respect to the leadership structure of the United States, the "multi-influence" hypothesis and the "economic-elite-dominance" hypothesis. Findings of both Hunter\textsuperscript{47} who did a study of the leadership structure of the entire United States and Mills\textsuperscript{48} who wrote a general analysis


\textsuperscript{47} Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1953).

of elites and social structure in the United States, supported the economic-elite-dominance hypothesis. Mills found three dominant elite groups, with the economic elite (which included the military elite) superordinate over the political elite and all three superordinate over an inert mass. Hunter's basic assumption and main conclusion supporting the "economic-elite-dominance" hypothesis was that, "... I assumed that the most influential men in national policy making would be found residing in the larger cities, manning the larger corporate enterprises, and using their influence to get the government to move according to their interests."49

In contrast to the major theses of Mills and Hunter—that there is a hierarchical, and unified power structure in the United States headed by an economic elite, that the political elite occupies only a secondary position on the whole in the power structure, and that the masses are apathetic and act in terms of false consciousness of their interests—Rose offers the following propositions supporting a "multi-influence" hypothesis of the social power structure of the United States:

1. There is a power structure in every organized activity of American life and at every level—national, regional, state, and local.
2. There are varying degrees of relationship and agreement among these varied power structures.
3. Within each power structure, a small number of persons hold the largest amount of power.
4. Each elite manifests its power mainly within its own domain. That is, the strongest powers of businessmen are exercised within their own businesses, and the strongest powers of politicians and public administrators are exercised within government.

49 Hunter, p. 7.
5. The economic elite has its greatest success in influencing government where there are no counterpressures—from other sectors of the economic elite, from other non-economic elites, and from public opinion.50

Rose summarizes the statement of the multi-influence hypothesis which guided his research of the power structure of the United States by noting that:

Segments of the economic elite have violated democratic political and legal processes, with differing degrees of effort and success in the various periods of American history, but in no recent period could they correctly be said to have controlled the elected and appointed political authorities in large measure. The relationship between the economic elite and the political authorities has been a constantly varying one of strong influence, co-operation, division of labor, and conflict, with each group influencing the other in changing proportion to some extent, and each operating independently of the other to a large extent.51

By viewing leadership as a continuum,52 most communities in the United States fall somewhere between the unidimensional and multidimensional extremes. But it should be noted that while most communities have competing claiments to the source of decision making there are still other communities where single industries, political parties, religious institutions, etc., prevail.

Sources of variations of power structures

To ascertain where a community's power structure would fall on a


51Ibid., p. 493.

monistic-pluralistic continuum, a model developed by Clark\textsuperscript{53} can be used. The model using secondary data, attempts to explain the form of a community's power structure---either monistic or pluralistic---as a dependent variable of demographic, economic, legal and political, organizational, and cultural variables. Eight of the propositions developed by Clark that deal with power structure will be noted and discussed as well as the writings of other authors on these same propositions.

1. Demographic variables:

   The larger the number of inhabitants in the community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

   Clark notes that while a pluralistic system would be expected to be found in a larger community it could also be expected in a very small community: The simple factor of size in a small enough community (in an industrial, democratic society) may lower what might be termed the "influence threshold" to a point where almost any active and interested citizen could exert a substantial amount of influence and perhaps even become entrenched in the community power structure.\textsuperscript{54}

   Schulze\textsuperscript{55} notes that the size of community population is related to differences in power structures and Rogers\textsuperscript{56} predicts the association


\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., p. 307.


of large population size with pluralistic systems and small population with monolithic systems. Gilbert has further noted the importance of population size and also growth rate:

Overall results indicate that population size is important because it is highly associated with other variables that predict power structure and participation. ... Population growth rate, though less frequently theorized about, should become a relevant variable in its own right as it is correlated with political features of communities more often and more strongly than is size.\(^{57}\)

Clark also notes the importance of social homogeneity, "The larger the community, the more socially heterogeneous its population."\(^{58}\)

With respect to the monistic-pluralistic continuum, Dant has suggested the following proposition: "The more homogeneous a community is, the more monistic its power structure will be."\(^{59}\)

2. The educational variable:

The higher the educational level of community residents, the more pluralistic the power structure.

Clark's logic is that the longer an individual remains in school, the greater is the strength of democratic values (which favor pluralism) in his normative system. Without suggesting how this might be done, Clark qualifies the previous statement by acknowledging that in order to measure accurately how much school contributes to the development


\(^{58}\)Clark, p. 297.

of democratic norms in the individual, a measure of school emphasis on democratic values is needed.

3. The political variable:

The greater the number of effective competing political parties (or factions within a single party in a one-party community), the more pluralistic the power structure.

Using measures of power structure, Gilbert found this proposition of Clark's to be supported:

Cities which are dominated by one political party tend to have very concentrated power structures. Fifty-four percent of cities dominated by one political party have pyramidal power structures, whereas twenty-eight percent of cities not dominated by one party are pyramidal.60

4. The organizational variable:

The greater the density of voluntary organizations in the community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

Introducing this proposition, Clark notes that heterogeneity of the population can provide a structural context favorable to a pluralistic community power structure, but in themselves are not determinant: "From this point of view, integrative structures can be seen as intervening variables between the more fundamental community factors and the type of power structure."61

5. The economic variable:

The more diverse the economic structures within the community the more pluralistic the power structure.

---

60 Gilbert, p. 16.

61 Clark, p. 307.
The assumption behind this proposition is that diverse economic structures allow competing cliques (most likely to be businessmen) to develop.

Ascertaining community leaders

Inasmuch as there has been accusations and counter-accusations over the supposed relation between method and findings, a discussion of the methodological approaches to ascertaining community leaders is apropos in a Review of the Literature section as well as being briefly discussed in the Methodology section of this study.

With respect to Bierstedt's second source of power—that of social organization—power is generally recognized as being manifested through the leadership of formal and informal leaders. Leadership has been defined as: "... a complex number of individuals in a collectivity behave in such a way that they affect (or effectively prevent) a change in the lives of a relatively large number."

To locate community leaders, studies of community leadership patterns have relied generally on three distinct methods; the reputational, the positional, and the action measure (decision-making). Writers using each approach and the basic assumption behind each of the three techniques are:

a. Reputational measure of leadership. (Hunter,63


Miller,64 Andrews,65 Bonjean,66 Miller and Dirkson,67 Gamson,68 Sollie,69 and Dant70). Basically, this approach of measuring leadership consists, "... of eliciting responses from a 'panel of informants' assumed to be knowledgeable about community affairs."71 Here the assumption is that the leadership process is so complex that it cannot be indexed directly. "Instead of examining leadership as such, proponents of this approach assesses reputation for leadership."72


69 Carlton R. Sollie, "Reputational Techniques for Identifying Community Leaders," Rural Sociology, 31 (September, 1966), 301-309.


72 Freeman, p. 7.
b. Positional measure of leadership. (Herson, Stouffer, Schulz and Blumberg, Clelland and Form, Dahl, and Smith). With this approach leaders, "... are taken to be those persons occupying important positions in formal and/or informal organizations." The assumption here is that formal authority is leadership. "Here the occupants of the top positions in the authority structures of the community's major economic, religious, educational, political, and voluntary system are taken to be the community leaders."

c. Action measure of leadership. (Bonjean and Olson, Clark,)

---


80 Freeman, p. 6.


82 Clark, p. 10.
Dahl, Polsby, Preston, Martin, et. al., McClain and Highsaw, and Wildawsky. Basically this approach consists of making a historical reconstruction of the major action programs in a community over the past five or so years and noting the individuals involved in these action programs. This approach assumes that active participation in decision making is leadership.

In an attempt to discover whether there is a significant relation between the method used and the power structure described in a community Walton examined thirty-three studies of community power. He noted that the reputational method had revealed 13 monistic structures and 14 pluralistic structures while the decision-making-combined methods revealed two monistic and 12 pluralistic structures. In summarizing, Walton noted that: "The type of power structure identified by studies that rely on a single method may well be an artifact of

83 Dahl, op. cit.
85 Preston, op. cit.
89 Preston, op. cit.
90 Freeman, op. cit.
that method."91

The dangers of using just one approach for most community studies is apparent. The reputational approach as used by Hunter92 has been criticized by Dahl,93 Polsby,94 Wolfinger,95 and Rossi.96 These authors indicated that Hunter's methodological techniques necessarily leads to the conclusion that a monolithic leadership structure exists. When a reputational approach is used (such as that used by Hunter), the question "Who are the leaders?" forces the respondents to respond as if there were only one elite.97

However, it would appear that in most small, homogeneous communities that using multiple indicies of power would not be needed as it would likely result in the identification of essentially the same group of individuals as leaders. A comparative analysis was made by Preston of the three major approaches for the identification of community leaders--reputational, positional and participation in action programs. From his results, he concluded that:

The three approaches converged on identifying essentially the same group of leaders in each community. The

91 Walton, p. 438.
92 Hunter, op. cit.
95 Wolfinger, op. cit.
96 Rossi, op. cit.
97 Freeman, p. 9.
substantial overlap suggests that, in smaller and middle size cities, the results of the three approaches will be the same, particularly with regard to identifying the top grouping of leaders.98 Yoo99 has also compared the degree of overlap existing among these three approaches in the identification of community leaders. His study was done on a small, primarily Mormon community (9,000 residents) in central Utah. He hypothesized that:

There is a strong positive statistical association between the reputational, positional and action analysis approach in the identifying of community leaders; that is, the leadership structure identified through the use of one technique will be identically the same in the leadership structure identified through the use of other techniques.100

The results of his study supported his hypothesis and he concluded that the findings of his study, "... offer cumulative support for the hypotheses that there will be a strong positive statistical association between various approaches to the identification of community leaders."101

**Summary of the Literature Review**

With respect to changing uses of land and water resources as a source for conflict, past research has noted differences between farmers and non-farmers as to their recreational attitudes (orientation) and behavior. Differences have also been noted between urban and rural residents as to their environmental orientations, in particular, the utilitarian attitude toward nature held in general by rural residents. It has also been noted

---

98Preston, p. 204.


100Ibid., p. 12.

101Ibid.
that new arrivals to a rural area are likely to be accustomed to more public services and have higher expectations for the public services they want in their new community than do the local, old-time residents. Higher taxes for local permanent residents result from the increased demand for public services. These differences in incompatible values as well as others could result in conflict over priorities for land and water uses as well as opposition to higher taxation rates and the additional services required for a recreational community as compared to the public services required for an agricultural oriented community.

Also, a main theme of this study is that the culture or subculture under study is integrated to some degree and that intervention into that culture by some outside force in a planned change program will be disruptive to that culture. The extent of the disruption cannot be determined fully until intervention has actually taken place and a re-study can be made. However, on the other hand, potential disruptive effects of planned change programs can be, as will be developed in this study, brought to the surface.

With respect to changing water and land use and community power structures, this review of literature can be summarized by noting that social power is manifest in all social systems including communities, and appears to stem from three sources; (1) numbers of people, (2) social organization, and (3) resources. By viewing leadership as a continuum, most community power structures fall somewhere between a monolithic and pluralistic extreme although there are still communities where single industries, political parties, religious institutions,
etc. prevail. To ascertain where a community's power structure would fall on a monistic-pluralistic continuum, a model developed by Clark was focused on. This model using secondary data, attempts to explain the form of a community's power structure—either monistic or pluralistic—as a dependent variable of demographic, economic, legal and political, organizational, and cultural variables.

To locate community leaders, studies of community leadership patterns have relied generally on three distinct methods; the reputational, the positional, and the action measure (decision making), with many studies using only one of these methods. Inasmuch as the Bear Lake area under study is socially still relatively homogeneous and rural, only one approach (the positional) to ascertaining community leaders is used. Comparative studies such as the present study which looks at two neighboring areas (the Idaho side of Bear Lake with the Utah side of the lake) that are undergoing different rates of social change have been almost nonexistent.
CHAPTER IV
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In light of the research presented in the review of literature which focused on; (1) how changing uses of land and water resources can serve as a source of conflict, and (2) some of the affects of rapid social change on leadership structure, two theoretical orientations that focus on change will be discussed, i.e., the conflict and the ecological theoretical viewpoints.

Conflict Model

Although change is an inherent part of a living organism, society may be viewed as an organism characterized by a fair degree of stability. With this perspective, change is seldom conceived of as altering the fundamental structure of society. However, some theorists such as Marx (1959 in Feuer2), Dahrendorf,3,4 Coser5 and


others who might be considered as conflict theorists, have focused on change itself, regarding change as inherent in all social organisms. Dahrendorf identifies the underlying assumptions of what he terms structural-functional theory and contrasts this with the conflict model, which takes the opposite position on each of these assumptions:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural-Functional Model</th>
<th>Conflict Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Every society is a relatively persisting configuration of elements.</td>
<td>1) Every society is subjected at moment to change; social change is ubiquitous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Every society is a well integrated configuration of elements.</td>
<td>2) Every society experiences at every moment social conflict; social conflict is ubiquitous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Every element in a society contributes to its functioning.</td>
<td>3) Every element in a society contributes to its change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Every society rests on the consensus of its members.</td>
<td>4) Every society rests on constraints of some of its members by others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sociologist William G. Sumner, the starting point of the analysis of social life is the necessity for man to adapt to his environment. The resulting struggle for existence involves competition with other people for the resources which sustain life. In attempting to adapt to his environment, man develops customary ways of doing things which Sumner labeled "folkways." "The folkways are the 'right' ways to satisfy all interests, because they are traditional, and exist in fact. ... In the folkways, whatever is, is right." With the development of a set of folkways the group becomes ethnocentric about them, distinguishing between the "in-group" and the "out-group".

6Dahrendorf (1964), p. 103.

Since the "in-group" is thought of as superior, there is a natural opportunity for conflict with the "out-group" and their folkways.

Marx and Engels are generally considered to have provided a foundation upon which later conflict theories have been built. Marx emphasized the exploitative and competitive nature of social relations and sought to develop a theory of social structure and history upon conflict. For Marx, the production of economic goods was the central feature of social life, upon which other aspects of social life were dependent. The economy was therefore the substructure upon which the rest of society is built. Marx applied a dialectic approach in studying the forces of economic production and the social classes which compete with each other for a share of available resources. The interests of each social class were seen as opposed to those of other classes thus, history becomes the history of class struggles. The dialectical forces of history are seen as determining the ascendency and decline in the wealth and power of social classes in their struggle for ascendency.

Criticism of Marx's work have been noted by Duke:

Critics have argued that Hegelian dialectics as practiced and developed by Marx is not a valid interpretation of history. Some argue for a progressive, straight-line evolutionary model of social change, while others stress cyclical or developmental models. ... Sociologists favoring a functionalist or integrationist orientation criticize Marxism as placing too much emphasis on conflict and economically based power and rank. They argue instead that conflict is often integrative, and that consensus, integration and cooperation are much more frequently in evidence than conflict. ... Critics argue that Marx misjudged the depth of the alienation tendency among workers to identify with national, community, religious, racial, sexual, and occupational
groups than Marx foresaw. Further, the class system is much more complex than anticipated, with status consistency across the many dimensions of status relatively rare.  

Of course, not all of Marx's social ideas have been disputed, Ralf Dahrendorf, a contemporary Marxist sociologist, while rejecting several of Marx's notions listed earlier, does accept Marx's central structural position. Dahrendorf argues that social change must be explained by continual reference to the social structure and that conflict is the direct cause of social change.

The general theoretical perspective that conflict theorists share of focusing on social change and social structure as they relate to conflict is of practical value for better understanding the social affects of changing water and land uses to a community. However, while conflict theorists have generally looked at conflict as a cause of social change, the relationship can be looked at with the causal focus going in the opposite direction. That is, what affect might social change have on conflict? In particular, might not changing uses of a natural resource such as water result in conflicts? Change in man's uses of natural resources such as water and land results in a disruption of the existing status quo of presently functioning social systems. Institutions and customary patterns of behavior that have developed around specific usage of a natural resource can become outdated, ineffective and inappropriate for particular groups. Vested interests of individuals and institutions surface as they have

---


9 Dahrendorf (1959), op. cit.
an "interest" in the benefits provided by the existing status quo. "The whole life-process, so far as we know it, whether viewed in its social phase, is at last the process of developing, adjusting, and satisfying interests."\(^{10}\) The importance of vested interests is further noted by sociologist George C. Homans:

\[\ldots\] it may be that all motives are motives of self-interest in the sense that, given the situation in which he is placed, a man always tries to do as well as he can for himself. What he does may look to outsiders as if it were hurting rather than helping him; it may look impossibly altruistic rather than selfish, and yet modern psychology teaches us that, if we knew the full situation, both the social relationships and the psychological dynamics of the person concerned, we should find all his actions to be self-enhancing.\(^{11}\)

Bylund has noted some of the forms that vested interests may take:

\[\ldots\] with time, certain behavior patterns may be institutionalized. The expectation for conformity becomes stronger and deviation becomes more difficult. As vested interests become intertwined with these patterns, the institutionalization becomes more rigid. \ldots\] Much of the resistance to change is based on a very rational evaluation of the situation in terms of the vested interest of the individual or group which is threatened by the proposed change. The fear of losing or the vision of acquiring positions of leadership, either formal or informal, can represent a powerful vested interest.\(^{12}\)

It would appear then, that as individuals or groups holding opposing vested interests come together as a result of change, conflict or


dissatisfaction with the existing power structure may occur.

Ecological Model

The ecological viewpoint offers a framework for answering the question, "Would structural elaboration of the existing power structure be expected as a result of changing uses of the land and water resources of an area?" "... the ecologist takes the aggregate as his frame of reference and deliberately sets out to account for the forms that social organization assumes in response to varying demographic, technological, and environmental pressures." In general terms, the framework of human ecology can be seen as embracing four main referential concepts: population, organization, environment, and technology (P.O.E.T.) which define what has been called the "ecological complex". Organization as used here is assumed to be a property of the population that has evolved and is sustained in the process of adaptation of the population to its environment.

A model was suggested by Buckley noting the possible effects of an increase in population growth and development on an area and the effects on social/structural elaborations:

Population growth and territorial expansion, presumably aided by improved technology, create unspecified social-psychological pressures on the minds and decision-processes of group members; the result is the differentiation and specialization of functions previously embraced in a more homogeneous sociocultural web of interrelationships; this,

in turn, exacerbates the pressures and tensions due to increasing complexity, resulting—again presumably by way of unspecified social-psychological processes—in decisions giving rise to further cultural and structural differentiation. 15

This model can be related to the present situation in the Lake Tahoe Basin on the California-Nevada border. The rapid growth and territorial expansion of recreational land developments (due in part to technological advancements of building techniques for swampy and mountainous terrains) in the area has resulted in tension for power realignment as the previous balance of power has been upset. The leadership patterns that existed in the Lake Tahoe Basin while the population was relatively stable were probably adequate to handle problems as they arose. However, as the Basin has become more developed there was an increasing need for specialization of services and an elaboration of the power structure:

Most States have delegated regulatory powers over land use to local governments. In the case of the Lake Tahoe Basin, however, Nevada and California have rescinded a degree of local governmental control so that a uniform basinwide approach to land use regulation can be achieved through the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). 16

As decisions are made to meet the needs of the different interest groups in a bi-state water basin there appears to be an increased cultural and structural differentiation resulting in an elaboration of the existing power structure.

If social organization is a response to varying demographic,


technological and environmental pressures then structural elaboration of an existing power structure due to changing water and land uses would be expected where: (1) There were accompanying demographic changes inasmuch as the existing power structure while seen as functional for the original more homogeneous group could be considered as disfunctional to new comers who have new and different vested interests; (2) technological changes result in new, feasible alternative uses of the resources of the area; and (3) where alternative uses of environmental resources are not compatible for multiple uses such as using the same field for both farming and camping.

Inasmuch as the ecological model is an open systems model, further argument favoring a structural elaboration of an existing power structure in an area that is undergoing rapid social change can be made. Buckley\textsuperscript{17,18} has criticized the mechanical equilibrium and the organismic homeostasis models of society on the basis that equilibrium systems are relatively closed having no feedback or other systematic self-regulating or adaptive capabilities and the homeostatic system while having feedback loops with its environment, is primarily functioning to maintain the given structure of the system within pre-established limits. Buckley prefers instead to view society of the sociocultural system as what he terms a "complex adaptive system" that is: 

\textit{...open 'internally' as well as externally in that the inter-}

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.

changes among their components may result in significant changes in
the nature of the components themselves as a whole. ... True feedback
control loops make possible not only self-regulation, but self-
direction or at least adaptation to a changing environment, such that
the system may change or elaborate its structure as a condition of
survival or viability."19

As indicated above, the notion of feedback is the basic principle
underlying the complex adaptive system. The transition of a relatively
closed system to an open or complex adaptive system requires inter-
changes with the environment, "... this interchange is an essential
factor underlying the system's viability, its reproductive ability or
continuity and its ability to change."20 To the extent that a system
is not receiving feedback or having interchange with its environment,
it is a relatively closed system. A large number of absentee owners
in an area would generally have little interchange or feedback with
existing community leaders. This is due in part to the short periods
of time these people are in the area and the general uniqueness of
their problems and concerns as compared to those of the permanent
residents.

Buckley has further noted that, "The typical response of
natural, closed systems to an intrusion of environmental events is
loss of organization, or a change in the direction of dissolution of
the system (although, depending on the nature and strength of the

Although a rural community should not be considered as a completely closed system, the intrusion of environmental events such as the changing uses of water and land and the accompanying arrival of a large number of new residents would be expected to result in some loss of organization with respect to the leadership structure of the area as well as a possible dissolution of existing leadership patterns. This loss of leadership structure would likely lead to the development of a new leadership pattern that would include the newer residents and reflect some of their interests. This change in organization and leadership was found in a study by Andrews and Bauder:

There was a definite increase in the number of different organizations taking a lead in community action and definite evidence of shifts in leadership which would support the benchmark hypothesis that 'more power groups will evolve and leadership functions will shift to new groups.' This expectation was further confirmed by the larger number of organizations that evolved as leading groups and by the shift in relative importance from the traditional organization, church, school, and local government to the newer action groups, such as civic and service groups and community and development groups.22

This study was done in Monroe County, Ohio—a sparsely populated county in which a large industrial plant was built.

21 Ibid.

Summary of the Theoretical Orientation

As noted in the writings of "conflict theorists", change can be considered as inherent in all social organisms. While conflict theorists have generally looked at conflict as a cause of social change, the relationship can be looked at with the causal focus going in the opposite direction. That is, might not changing uses of natural resources result in a disruption (conflict) of the existing status quo of presently functioning social systems? Institutions and customary patterns of behavior that have developed around specific usage of a natural resource can become outdated, ineffective and inappropriate for particular groups who then seek change of these systems more in line with their interests.

The ecological model which takes the aggregate as its frame of reference and sets out to account for the forms that social organization assumes in response to varying demographic, technological, and environmental pressures is also helpful in attempting to answer the question, "Would structural elaboration of the existing power structure be expected as a result of changing uses of the land and water resources of an area?"

If social organization is a response to varying demographic, technological and environmental pressures then structural elaboration of an existing power structure due to changing water and land uses would be expected where; (1) there were accompanying demographic changes inasmuch as the existing power structure, while seen as functional for the original more homogeneous group could be considered as dis-
functional to new arrivals who have new and different vested interests, (2) technological changes results in new, feasible alternative uses of the resources of the area, and (3) where values for alternative uses of environmental resources are not compatible for multiple uses such as using the same field for both farming and camping. This is summarized schematically below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in uses of natural resources (Using land/water for recreation instead of agriculture.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results in: Social change (Increasing recreation populations, influx of absentee property owners.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in: 1. Opposition (Between new and older special interest groups.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Changes in the power structure (From monistic to pluralistic.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretical conclusions

Conclusions from the discussion of conflict theory in relation to changing uses of natural resources (i.e., land and water resources) noted the following points:

1. Feelings of ethnocentrism develop with respect to traditional and customary uses of land and water resources.
2. Vested interest groups develop around specific uses of land and water resources.
3. Changes in uses of land and water resources disrupts the status quo of presently functioning social systems and serves as a potential source of conflict.
Conclusions from the analysis of ecology and conflict theory in relation to community power structure revealed the following points:

1. Forms of social organization develop in response to demographic, technological, and environmental pressures.

2. Shifts in demographic, technological, and environmental pressures will result in changes in the structure of social organizations.

3. Population and territorial expansion aided by improved technology create pressures for differentiation and specialization of functions previously dealt with in a more homogeneous socio-cultural web of interrelationships.

4. Changes in demographic, technological and environmental conditions will be followed by changes in the power structure.

5. The degree to which community power structures become more elaborated would be related to changing uses of land and water resources and changing and increasing population patterns.

In brief summary then, the conceptual framework of this study suggests that changing land and water uses can serve as a source of conflict between incompatible values held by new and older vested interest groups and, that the community power structure in an area undergoing rapid social change due to changing uses of land and water resources will become more elaborate (pluralistic).

Hypotheses

As mentioned in the objectives of the present study (Chapter I),
there were three basic questions to be answered. Each of these questions will now be discussed as well as the hypothesis that have been developed to test the conceptual framework derived from the review of literature and theoretical orientation:

Question #1:

What are the areas of conflict associated with changing uses of Bear Lake area natural resources (i.e., land and water resources)?

The first question is concerned with how changing land/water uses (which result in an area that was primarily agriculture oriented becoming a recreation center) can serve as a source of conflict between vested interest groups that have incompatible values over land and water use priorities.

Two problem areas have been identified, the first is concerned with property owner's perceptions as to whether their interests are being represented by local town and county governments. This problem is especially apropos for the absentee property owners in an area as they are not able to vote in local elections yet are still required to pay local taxes. The following two hypotheses were developed which focus on this problem.

Hypothesis #1:

Absentee property owners will express more dissatisfaction with the local power structure (i.e., local county and town governments) than will local property owners.

Hypothesis #2:

Property owners in an area undergoing rapid social change will
be more apt to feel their interests are not being represented by the local power structure (i.e., local county and town governments) than will property owners in an area that is socially relatively stable.

The second problem area of incompatible values between vested interest groups which could serve as a source of conflict and that are focused on in the present study, are concerned with the priorities of water and land uses in the Bear Lake area as noted by three different vested interest groups. Do local agriculturalists in the Bear Lake area note different priorities for land/water use than do the local non-agriculturalists and the absentee property owners? The following hypotheses were developed which focus on this problem area.

Hypothesis #3:
Individuals in special interest groups will view problems and priorities of the different uses associated with the use of a natural resource according to the special interest group they belong to.
Sub-Hypothesis #3.1:
Opposition to further private recreational development of a lake area will differ between special interest groups.
Sub-Hypothesis #3.2:
The perceived importance of different uses of a lake will differ between special interest groups.
Sub-Hypothesis #3.3:
Opposition to man controlled fluctuations in the level of a lake will differ between special interest groups.
The second key question that the present study attempts to answer is concerned with possible changes in the local power structure, this question is stated again below:

Question #2:
Do changing uses of the natural resources of land and water in an area tend to be accompanied by changes in the form of the power and decision making structures? That is, is there an increasing proliferation of the power structure?

As discussed in the review of literature (Chapter II), there is evidence that rapid change results in a change in the power structure— that a monistic power structure becomes more pluralistic. It is assumed that until recently (approximately the last decade) that the power structure in the Bear Lake area was monistic, centered principally around the Mormon Church. Would changing land and water uses in an area (i.e., from primarily agriculture use to a recreational center) be expected to result in an area that has undergone these changes to a greater degree (the Utah side of Bear Lake) to have a more pluralistic power structure than would a neighboring area that has yet to undergo such change (the Idaho side of the lake)? In order to answer this question the following hypothesis has been developed that distinguished pluralistic vs. monistic power structures in two neighboring areas that have undergone differing degrees of social change resulting from changing land and water uses around the Bear Lake.

Hypothesis #4:
As noted by permanent local property owners, the comparative leadership structure will be more diverse in an area undergoing more rapid social change than in an area undergoing a lesser degree of change.

The third key question of the present study that was listed in Chapter I is concerned with possible changes in the style of leadership:

Question #3:
To what extent does change if any in the power structure tend to modify the focus of leadership? That is, do leaders tend to become less parochial in their style (focus) of leadership; do they receive more assistance from resources outside their communities?

This question probes at possible changes in the leadership style of local positional leaders with respect to the help they might be receiving from organizations outside their own community. Would positional leaders in the area around Bear Lake undergoing a more rapid degree of change (Utah) due to changing land and water resources have more contact with organizations outside their community than would positional leaders in neighboring Bear Lake communities (in Idaho) that have not undergone such a degree of change? In answering this question the following hypothesis was developed which notes positional leader's contact with organizations outside their communities for the two sides of the lake undergoing differing degrees of social change.

Hypothesis #5:
The greater the amount of change in an area, the more likely
are the positional leaders in that area to seek advice from non-local sources in trying to resolve local problems.

A related question is, do positional leaders in an area undergoing rapid changes in natural resources uses, tend to be more diverse in their opinions over priorities of water resource uses than do those leaders in a neighboring area that is not undergoing rapid change? To answer this question the following hypothesis was developed:

Hypothesis #6:

The greater the amount of change in an area, the more likely are the positional leaders in that area to reflect a diversity in the priority of the uses of water held in a reservoir lake.
CHAPTER V
RESEARCH METHODS

Methodology

This study is part of a larger project\(^1\) conducted by the Institute for Social Science Research on Natural Resources at Utah State University. The analytical approach of this study includes several elements. Included in this chapter are; field methods, sampling method for the questionnaire, operational measures of variables, and the statistics to be used.

Field methods

In this study direct interviews with positional leaders, secondary data, and a mailed questionnaire were used to collect data. Personal interviews using an interview schedule were made with all the elected/appointed county and town leaders that lived within six miles of Bear Lake. Ten positional leaders in Idaho and 18 leaders in Utah that lived within six miles of Bear Lake were interviewed. The secondary data sources that were used included; minutes of town council meetings, public hearings, commission meetings, as well as government reports related to the present study, area newspapers, and academic studies (theses, dissertations, etc.) concerned with the Bear Lake area. The mailed questionnaire was the third data collection technique used in the present study. A questionnaire consisting of 38

\(^1\)Wade H. Andrews and William C. Dunaway, the project is titled The Effects of Shifting and Conflicting Multiple Water Uses on an Interstate Lake Development Decision, and was funded by the Office of Water Resources Research, United States Department of the Interior, 1975.
(closed) and unstructured (open ended) questions that required approximately 15 to 25 minutes to complete (see Appendix) was mailed to a sample of Bear Lake property owners, this sample is described in detail below.

**Sampling method for the questionnaire**

Respondents to be interviewed by the mailed questionnaire were stratified and then randomly drawn from lists of property owners on file in the Rich County and Bear Lake County court houses. Property owners were stratified as to whether or not they lived within six miles of Bear Lake year round or not. Inasmuch as this study is interested in the attitudes and knowledge of property owners living within six miles of the shore of Bear Lake and also of individuals who own property within six miles of the lake but do not reside there (absentee property owners), a random sample of 120 respondents were to be chosen from each of these two categories in both counties, i.e., there were four sample groups.

Property owners for taxing purposes were listed in both county court houses by sections, lists were made of all property owners in those sections that extended approximately six miles from the shore of Bear Lake. In Idaho this area included the villages of Fish Haven, St. Charles, and Dingle. Property owners of Paris, Idaho were not included as this town was almost exactly six miles from the lake and has a considerable number of renters. Nine questionnaires were sent to residents of Pegram, Idaho but were subsequently eliminated. Although Pegram is approximately six miles north-east of the lake the
author found out after the questionnaires had been mailed that the winding road to this village is more than 23 miles from the lake. Therefore, these people should not really be considered as being lake side residents. In total, 120 respondents (52 percent) were randomly drawn from the total 232 property owners living within six miles of the lake, however, by eliminating the nine Pegram area property owners (there were an additional five Pegram property owners not drawn) only 111 questionnaires out of the original 120 which were sent out are considered as forming the proper sample. One hundred and twenty respondents (23 percent) were randomly drawn from 530 absentee property owners within 6 miles of the lake in Idaho and sent questionnaires (see Tables 4 and 5 for residence of property owners).

In Utah, towns within the 6 mile radius of the lake were Garden City, Pickleville, and Laketown. Although the court house records indicated over 175 property owners residing in this area, upon checking these names with the local post office clerks there were only 111 appropriate respondents. The original list obtained from the court house included over a dozen people who were deceased, over a dozen town and county officials that had been previously interviewed by the author, and the remaining individuals had listed Bear Lake area addresses as permanent mailing addresses when in fact they did not reside in the area year round. Therefore, all 111 property owners residing year round in the area as noted in the court house records were mailed questionnaires in Utah. Questionnaires were sent also to the 120 respondents (16 percent) who were randomly drawn from the 726 total absentee property owners in the Utah area under study.
Table 4. Property ownership within six miles of Bear Lake in Bear Lake County, Idaho.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence of Property Owners</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property owners (absentee) who own property within six miles of Bear Lake but reside outside Bear Lake County, Idaho.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County residents who own property within six miles of Bear Lake but reside outside this six mile limit.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owners who reside year round within a six mile radius of Bear Lake.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Bear Lake Co., Id. property owners July, 1974 approximately 3,100.

*Data source: Bear Lake County, Id., Court House (Tax Assessor's Office).
Table 5. Property ownership within six miles of Bear Lake in Rich County, Utah.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence of Property Owners</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property owners (absentee) who own property within six miles of Bear Lake but reside outside Rich County, Utah.</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County residents who own property within six miles of Bear Lake but reside outside this six mile limit.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owners who reside year round within a six mile radius of Bear Lake.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Rich County, Utah property owners July, 1974 approximately 1,100.

*Data source: Rich County, Utah, Court House (Tax Assessor's Office).
It should be noted that in both counties, owners of property within 6 miles of the lake who resided in that county but not within 6 miles of the lake were not included in the study nor were the approximately 12 renters in both counties living within the 6 mile limit under study (the number of renters was ascertained by questioning local postal clerks).

Inasmuch as the renting population fluctuates seasonally and because no records are available for these people they are not included in this study. It is also assumed that property owners would have more of a vested interest in community affairs and would be more greatly affected by changes occurring in the community than would those individuals who are renting homes; therefore, the attitudes of property owners are more important for the purposes of this study.

In all cases possible the respondents receiving the mailed questionnaire were contacted by telephone previous to receiving the mailed questionnaire. The value of "personalization" techniques in increasing mail questionnaire response has been noted by Dillman\(^2\) and in particular, the value of telephoning respondents has been noted by Dillman and Frey.\(^3\) The following telephone procedure used by

\(^2\)Don A. Dillman, "Increasing Mail Questionnaire Response in Large Samples of the General Public," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36 (Summer, 1972), 254-257.

Dillman and Frey was also used in the present study:

Telephone contact was designed to encourage mail response. The procedure followed in each contact was to (a) explain the nature of the study; (b) create interest by asking a few questions on the topic, selected because of their presumed interest to the respondent; (c) explain that we wanted to send them a mailed questionnaire; (d) emphasize that they, individually, were of great importance to the study; and (e) answer their questions. Clearly a telephone conversation can convey the fact of individual attention to the respondent.4

The step by step procedures noted by Christenson for obtaining a high response rate from the general public through the use of a mail survey was essentially used for the present study: "Through the use of this technique, researchers can expect to consistently obtain response rates near or above 70 percent from the general public and higher rates of response from select groups."5

Respondents who had not returned the original questionnaire (approximately 50 percent) after four weeks were contacted again by telephone and reminded to return the questionnaire or if not contacted by phone they were mailed a duplicate questionnaire accompanied with a hand written note (see Appendix). After waiting an additional four weeks, 322 usable questionnaires—70 percent of the original 462 questionnaires mailed out had been returned. By adding the respondents who returned the questionnaire after the cut-off date (four respondents), and those who received the questionnaire but shouldn't have because they were deceased (eight respondents), already interviewed (two

4Ibid., p. 298.

respondents), or lived out of the appropriate area (five respondents), or could not be reached because of an inappropriate address (six respondents), 347 (75 percent) of the original 462 questionnaires mailed out can be accounted for. The total usable questionnaires returned for each of the four property ownership categories under study are noted in Table 6.

As noted in Table 6, higher return rates were received from Utah property owners (74 percent) than from Idaho property owners (66 percent). Also, the return rate of absentee property owners was slightly larger (71 percent) than the return rate for the permanent property owners around the lake (68 percent).

As is noted in Tables 7 and 8, over 65 percent of the absentee property owners in the area under study in both Idaho and Utah are from Utah towns and over 55 percent are from towns represented in the Salt Lake City and Ogden, Utah SMSA's. Complaints of local Idaho residents that the Bear Lake area in Idaho is being sold out to Utah appears to be well rounded.

**Analysis of data**

Data collected from the mailed questionnaire was precoded and punched on standard IBM cards. The statistical analysis of the data received from the mailed questionnaire was made using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences\(^6\) (SPSS), an integrated system of

---

Table 6. Usable questionnaire return rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No. of Questionnaires Mailed</th>
<th>Usable Questionnaires Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Co., Idaho</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owners Within 6 Miles of Bear Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Co., Idaho</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Property Owners Within 6 Miles of Bear Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Co., Utah Property Owners Within 6 Miles of Bear Lake</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Co., Utah Absentee Property Owners Within 6 Miles of Bear Lake</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Place of residence of Idaho absentee property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden, Utah</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Utah</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other States</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Place of residence of Utah absentee property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah SMSA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden, Utah SMSA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Utah Cities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Utah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
computer programs for the analysis of social science data.

In reducing the raw data, several types of statistical methods were used. The most basic method used was the simple computation of percentages which served in the interpretation and description of the various responses.

To establish statistical significance the chi-square test was used. When the number of cases in a cell is five or less then correction for continuity as noted by Downie and Heath\(^7\) will be used. However, as pointed out by Blalock, "If the number of cells is relatively large and if only one or two cells have expected frequencies of five or less, then it is generally advisable to go ahead with chi-square tests without worrying about such corrections."\(^8\) The .05 level of significance was generally accepted as the point of acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses of the present study.

---


CHAPTER VI
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION STUDIED

Demographic information on the respondents returning the mailed questionnaire are noted on Tables 9 - 12. Differences in the characteristics of the absentee respondents in both states and the local respondents in both states are noted below with respect to occupations, education, age and sex.

OCCUPATION: As noted in Table 9, 63 percent of the absentee property owners held professional type jobs,\(^1\) as compared to 10 percent for the permanent local property owners. With respect to the highest professional category i.e., that of "higher executive of large concerns, proprietors and major professionals", 37.3 percent of the absentee property owners held this type of occupation whereas only 2.9 percent of the local permanent property owners noted having this type of occupation. The greatest single occupation of the local respondents was that of "farmer" with 29.3 percent indicating this occupation. The local respondents were also more likely to be retired as nearly a fourth (22.1 percent) of the local respondents indicated they were retired, this is in comparison to only 10.1 percent of the absentee respondents who were retired.

---
\(^1\)The occupational categories discussed here and as noted in the first seven occupational categories presented in Table 9 were developed by August Hollingshead as part of his Two Factor Index of Social Position. This scale is given in Charles M. Bonjean, Richard Hill, and S. Dale McLemore, Sociological Measurement (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1967), p. 442-448.
Table 9. Head of household's major occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Categories</th>
<th>Permanent Residents</th>
<th>Absentee Land Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah No.</td>
<td>Utah No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher executives of large concerns, proprieters and major professionals</td>
<td>3 4%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business managers, proprieters of medium sized business and lesser professionals</td>
<td>3 4%</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses and minor professionals</td>
<td>3 4%</td>
<td>5 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales workers, technicians and owners of little businesses</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual employees</td>
<td>13 16%</td>
<td>7 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine operators and semiskilled employees</td>
<td>9 11%</td>
<td>6 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled employees</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>28 35%</td>
<td>13 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>17 21%</td>
<td>14 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/disabled</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>3 4%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81 100%</td>
<td>58 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION: Absentee property owners on the whole noted having more formal education than did the local permanent property owners. As indicated in Table 10, only one percent of the local respondents held a graduate degree (MD, Ph.D., LLD, etc.) whereas 20 percent of the absentee respondents held a graduate degree. Also, 69.9 percent of the absentee respondents had at least some college education as compared to 23.9 percent of the local respondents.

AGE: Local respondents on the whole were older than the absentee respondents. As noted in Table 11, 43.9 percent of the local respondents were 60 years old or older, this in comparison to 15.2 percent of the absentee respondents who were 60 years or older.

SEX: The high percent of all the respondents who were males (87.3 percent) is to be expected as the male head of household was asked to complete the questionnaire. However, eight percent more of the local respondents were female head of households (16.8 percent) than were noted by absentee respondents as nine percent of them were female head of households.

Summary of the Characteristics of the Population Studied

In comparing the sample of property owners having permanent residence within 6 miles of Bear Lake with the sample of absentee property owners, a permanent resident is more likely to be older, a woman, less educated, and employed in a lower status occupation than his seasonal neighbor—the absentee property owner. With respect to education, only eight percent of the permanent local residents had received a bachelor's degree or higher, whereas
Table 10. Education of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Year of School</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ut</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Id</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years of college</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or trade school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 years of school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years of school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 7 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing observations = 21
Table 11. Age of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>39 and Below</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60 Plus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah permanent residents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho permanent residents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah absentee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho absentee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing observations = 10
Table 12. Sex of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah permanent residents</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho permanent residents</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah absentee residents</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho absentee residents</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing observations = 6
46 percent of the absentee property owners had received a bachelor's degree or higher. There was a similar large discrepancy in occupations, 10 percent of the permanent local property owners held professional status occupations as compared to 63 percent for the absentee property owners. Also, nearly a fourth (22.1 percent) of the local permanent property owners indicated they were retired as compared to 10.1 percent of the absentee property owners.

The high education and occupation levels of the absentee property owners would be expected of individuals able to afford the expensive recreational properties in the Bear Lake area. Also, the lower income and high percent of retired residents as well as a high percent of heads of households that are female (presumably widows) would likely indicate difficulty on the part of local permanent property owners in meeting higher tax and cost of living demands that are rapidly rising in the Bear Lake area.
CHAPTER VII
CHANGING USES OF NATURAL RESOURCES AS A SOURCE FOR CONFLICT

The first three hypotheses and the accompanying sub-hypotheses of this study are concerned with some of the implications of opposition to changing land and water uses in the Bear Lake area of Utah and Idaho. Inasmuch as changing uses of natural resources such as water/land resources are likely to result in a disruption of the existing status quo of presently functioning social systems, opposition as well as support of those changes are likely to differ between different special interest groups who might benefit or lose by such changes.

The first hypothesis of this study notes that absentee property owners will be more likely to express dissatisfaction with local county and town governments than will permanent local property owners:

Hypothesis #1:
Absentee property owners will express more dissatisfaction with the local power structure (i.e., local county and town governments) than will local property owners.

Dissatisfaction with local county and town governments was ascertained by asking respondents receiving the mailed questionnaire if they felt that on the whole, the county and town governments in which their Bear Lake property lies represents their interests or not. Respondents were considered to be dissatisfied with the local governments if they indicated their interests were not being represented.

As indicated in Table 13, only 40 percent of the absentee property
Table 13. Perception as to whether or not the local town government represents their interests as noted by local and absentee Bear Lake property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local town government represents your interests?</th>
<th>Residence of Property Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60  40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89  59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>149  100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected chi square=8.05  df=1  P<.05

No answer = 40
owners sampled in both counties indicated that they felt that the local
town government represented their interests whereas 60 percent of the
local permanent property owners considered the town government to
represent their interests. The chi square test showed this difference to be significant at the .05 level.

With respect to the local county government (Table 14), the
difference was in the same direction with a lower percentage of absen­
tee property owners (42 percent) reporting that the local county
government represented their interests than did the local permanent
property owners (51 percent) but this difference was not statistically
significant. The first hypothesis then, was only partially supported.

The second hypothesis is also concerned with the property
owner's satisfaction with local governments and notes that property
owners (both local and absentee) in an area undergoing rapid social
change due to changing land and water uses will be more apt to feel
their interests are not being represented by the local town and county
governments than will property owners in a neighboring area that is
socially relatively stable, this hypothesis is noted below:

Hypothesis #2:

Property owners in an area undergoing rapid social change
will be more apt to feel their interests are not being re­
presented by the local power structure (i.e., local county and
town governments) than will property owners in an area that is
relatively stable socially.

As previously indicated, the Utah area around Bear Lake is con­sidered to be undergoing more change than the Idaho side of the lake.
Table 14. Perception as to whether or not the local county government represents their interests as noted by local and absentee Bear Lake property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local county government represents your interests?</th>
<th>Residence of Property Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected chi square = 2.20  df = 1  P = .14

No answer = 30
Therefore, Utah property owners--both absentee and local--were hypothesized to be more dissatisfied with the local town and county governments (i.e., feel that their local town and county governments do not represent their interests) than are the Idaho property owners.

As noted in Table 15, with respect to the local town government, the percent of Utah property owners (49 percent) who felt they weren't being represented by their local town government is only slightly greater than the Idaho property owners (48 percent) who felt their interests weren't being represented. This was not a statistically significant difference.

However, a statistically significant difference is found between the Utah property owners and the Idaho property owners with respect to their views of their respective county governments (Table 16). Only 39 percent of all Utah property owners around Bear Lake felt that the Rich County government represented their interests whereas 54 percent of the Idaho sample of property owners felt that their interests were represented by the Bear Lake County, Idaho government.

The second hypothesis is supported then, only with respect to the local county governments. In discussing this subject with locally elected officials in Utah living near Bear Lake, the general consensus was that the three man Rich County, Utah Commission which has two of its three members from "over the hill" in Randolph and Woodruff, represent the interests of agriculturalists in the county and not the recreationists or other property owners living near Bear Lake. This division in the county government did not appear to exist in Bear Lake County, Idaho.
Table 15. Perception as to whether or not the local town government represents their interests as noted by Bear Lake area property owners in Utah and Idaho.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Property</th>
<th>Local town government represents your interests?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Row Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>77 49.4</td>
<td>79  50.6</td>
<td>156 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>60  47.6</td>
<td>66  52.4</td>
<td>126 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected chi square = .03  df=1  P = .86

No answer = 40
Table 16. Perception as to whether or not the local county government represents their interests as noted by Bear Lake area property owners in Utah and Idaho.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence of Property Owners</th>
<th>Local county government represents your interests?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected chi square=6.32 df=1 P<.05

No answer = 30
The third hypothesis of this study notes that property owners in the Bear Lake area representing three special interest groups—identified as full and part-time agriculturalists (farmers) living in the Bear Lake area full time, non-agriculturalists (non-farmers) living in the area full time, and all absentee property owners owning property within 6 miles of Bear Lake—will view problems and priorities of the different uses associated with the lake according to the special interest group they belong to:

Hypothesis #3:

Individuals in special interest groups will view problems and priorities of the different uses associated with the use of a natural resource according to the special interest group they belong to.

To ascertain possible incompatible values in the Bear Lake area, local property owners as well as absentee property owners were asked what they considered to be the greatest problem property owners in the Bear Lake area face. This was an open ended question and produced a list of nine items summarized in Table 17. For statistical purposes, these nine items were collapsed into five categories as noted on Table 18.

As previously mentioned, property owners were subdivided into three groups—those respondents that indicated they were either full or part-time farmers, local non-farmers, and absentee property owners. In comparing these three special interest groups in Table 18, farmers were mainly concerned with a group of items involving increased costs, including taxes, sewage, land prices and inflation as well as social
Table 17. Greatest problem of property owners as noted by absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems Mentioned</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Local Non-farmer</th>
<th>Local Farmer</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enough irrigation water</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution of Bear Lake</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many recreationists</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Taxes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage disposal costs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much zoning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough zoning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Land prices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No answer = 73
Table 18. Collapsed responses as to the greatest problem of property owners as noted by absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems Mentioned</th>
<th>Residence of Property Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution of Bear Lake</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Costs (taxes, land, sewage disposal, inflation)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Institutional Changes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(too many recreationists, zoning)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                    | 142  | 100.0 | 58   | 100.0 | 49   | 100.0 |

Chi square=33.26   df=6   P < .05

No answer = 73
change from having increasing numbers of recreationists in the area. This was also true for the local non-farmers but in addition there was somewhat more concern for pollution of the lake. The absentee property owners are most concerned with pollution of Bear Lake followed by concern for high taxes. The concerns can be seen as logical reflections of the special interest of these three groups. The local residents are worried about high taxes which could force them out of the area and their secondary concern— that of the increasing number of tourists in the area— contributes directly to the higher taxes. Absentee property owners are concerned with increasing pollution of the lake as the quality of the water is directly related to their enjoyment of the Bear Lake area. There was not a statistically significant differences among the special interest groups thereby not supporting the hypothesis on this item.

Respondents were also asked to note what they would like least to see changed in the Bear Lake area. As noted in Table 19, there was a significant difference between special interest groups as follows: Farmers indicated greatest concern with seeing a loss of the area's rural atmosphere whereas non-farmers were most concerned with seeing the lake contaminated but were almost equally concerned with the loss of the area's rural atmosphere. The absentee property owners again indicated their concern over the lake becoming more polluted.

Respondents were then asked to note what they would like most to see changed in the Bear Lake area. These results are indicated in Table 20, again farmers are most concerned with protecting their
Table 19. What respondents would like least to see changed in the Bear Lake area as noted by the sample of property owners that are absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Checked</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Local Non-farmer</th>
<th>Local Farmer</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See the lake lowered</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See the lake contaminated</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of the area's rural atmosphere</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square=14.10  df=f  P < .05

No answer = 37
Table 20. What respondents would like most to see changed in the Bear Lake area as noted by the sample of property owners that are absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Checked</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Local Non-farmer</th>
<th>Local Farmer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more businesses come in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop pollution of the lake</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have fewer recreationists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop more public facilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more zoning in the area</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square=42.72 df=8 P < .05

No answer = 60
interests and would like to have fewer recreationists in the area. The local non-farmers living year round in the area indicated they would like most to see the pollution of the lake stopped, this was also the principal wish of the absentee property owners. The second choice of the non-farmers was to see more business come into the area, this was the same as the second choice of the farmers in the area and probably represents their desire to have employment in the area that would keep their children in the community. Statistically significant differences were found between the special interest groups thus supporting the hypothesis that individuals in special interest groups will view problems and priorities of the different uses associated with the use of a natural resource according to the special interest group they belong to. It appears then, that the greatest differences are found between farmers and the absentee property owners with the non-farmers living in the Bear Lake area having certain interests and values similar to both of these other two groups.

The first sub-hypothesis of the third hypothesis notes that values for further private recreational development of the Bear Lake area would differ between special interest groups:

Sub-Hypothesis #3.1:

Opposition to further private recreational development of a lake area will differ between special interest groups.

To ascertain attitudes toward further private recreational development in the Bear Lake area, respondents receiving the mailed questionnaire
were asked, "Do you prefer to see more or less or the same amount of private recreation development in the Bear Lake area?"

Absentee property owners could be expected to prefer more private recreational development inasmuch as many of them (45 percent) own vacant property near the lake (as compared to nine percent for the local permanent resident property owners) and could likely be desirous of building a cabin or home there in the future. Inasmuch as the permanent local property owners (both farmers and non-farmers) are already settled in the area, they could be expected to prefer less private recreational development.

As noted in Table 21, only about 22 percent of the absentee property owners preferred more private recreational development as compared to 14 percent for the permanent non-farmers and 19 percent for the permanent farmers. The relatively high percentage of farmers preferring more private development in the area is somewhat surprising unless they are hoping the commercial value of their land would increase. However, 56 percent of the permanent farmers as well as 57 percent of the permanent non-farmers preferred less private recreational development, this in comparison to 38 percent of the absentee property owners. Inasmuch as there were statistically significant differences, the hypothesis is supported that opposition to further private recreational development of the Bear Lake will differ between the three special interest groups identified in the area.

The second sub-hypothesis is concerned with the perceived importance of different uses of Bear Lake held water as noted by the
Table 21. Preference for more, same or less private land development around Bear Lake as noted by absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Development Preference</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Local Non-farmer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Local Farmer</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square=11.26 df=4  P< .05

No answer = 9
three special interest groups:

Sub-Hypothesis #3.2:

The perceived importance of different uses of a lake will differ between special interest groups.

Inasmuch as there are three basic uses of water held in the Bear Lake (i.e., electrical power production, recreation, and irrigation) respondents were asked, "At the present time what do you think are the most important uses of Bear Lake water between; (1) power production, (2) recreation, and (3) irrigation?" Of all the respondents answering this question, 41.3 percent indicated that irrigation was the most important use, 29.5 percent felt that recreation was the most important use. When looking at the perceived importance of the uses of the lake by the three special interest groups of absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners, and local farm property owners, it was expected that the local full and part-time farmers while not using Bear Lake water directly for their own irrigation purposes would still be oriented toward seeing irrigation as the most important use of the water. Similarly, absentee property owners were expected to see recreation as the most important use of the lake. Inasmuch as local non-farmers are seen as a hybrid group (as noted by the fact that 74 percent of them identified their interests as being most similar to those interests held in general by agriculturalists in the Bear Lake area, while 26 percent identified their interests as being most similar to those interests held in general by recreationists in the Bear Lake area) made up of both farm and recreation oriented people, their responses were expected to be
nearly equally divided between irrigation, power production, and recreation.

As noted in Table 22, 39 percent of the absentee property owners considered recreation to be the most important use of the lake, however, nearly an equal number (38 percent) felt that irrigation was the most important use. For the agriculturalists, over half (55 percent) felt that irrigation was the most important use of the lake and only 10 percent felt recreation was the most important use. Electrical power production was considered by the local non-farmers to be the most important use of the lake (40 percent) and irrigation (36 percent) was the second choice of the local non-farmers. This distribution was significant and supported this hypothesis.

Opposition to the use of Bear Lake water for downstream irrigation during a drought is possible inasmuch as the level of the lake is lowered as the water is drawn from the lake resulting in a decrease of the aesthetic and recreational value of the lake. This source of opposition is more real than hypothetical inasmuch as there were threats to blow up the Lyfton Power Plant during the drought of the 1930's if more water wasn't released to downstream irrigators. To attempt to ascertain what might happen were the lake to be lowered to provide irrigation water to downstream agriculturalists during a drought, respondents were asked, "What do you think would be the most important use of Bear Lake water during a drought between: (1) power production, (2) recreation, and (3) irrigation?" These results are shown in Table 23, and as can be noted there was a high degree of agreement between all three special interest groups over the impor-
Table 22. Most important uses of Bear Lake water as noted by absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners, and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Water</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th></th>
<th>Local Non-farmer</th>
<th></th>
<th>Local Farmer</th>
<th></th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 25.34  df = 4  P < .05

No answer = 9
Table 23. Most important uses of Bear Lake water during a drought as noted by absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners, and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Uses</th>
<th>Absentee No.</th>
<th>Absentee %</th>
<th>Local Non-farmer No.</th>
<th>Local Non-farmer %</th>
<th>Local Farmer No.</th>
<th>Local Farmer %</th>
<th>Row Total No.</th>
<th>Row Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Production</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square-5.98 df=4 P=.20
No answer = 11
tance of using Bear Lake held water for irrigation purposes during a
drought. These differences were also not statistically significant.

Over 70 percent of the respondents answering the question for
each of the three special interest groups noted irrigation as being
the most important use of Bear Lake water during a drought. It is
interesting to note that the special interest group having the
highest percent of respondents indicating irrigation as the most
important use of Bear Lake water was found to be the absentee property
owners (78 percent).

The third sub-hypothesis notes that opposition to man controlled
fluctuations in the level of a lake will differ between special in-
terest groups:

Sub-Hypothesis #3.3:

Opposition to man controlled fluctuations in the level of a
lake will differ between special interest groups.

With respect to changing uses of water held in Bear Lake, a
principal source of opposition is over the fluctuations in the level
of the lake. This affects recreationists owning property on the shore
of the lake as they can receive property damage when the lake is too
high and can be inconvenienced if the water is too far out from the high
water level. Also the recreationists using the North Beach Park in
Idaho can find themselves nearly two miles from the water if the lake
were to be drawn down the full 21 vertical feet. The shallow portions
of Bear Lake that are most affected by major fluctuations in the level
of the lake were shown earlier in Figures 2 and 3. Agriculturalists
in the area are generally not as affected by fluctuations in the level
of the lake, although when the lake is drawn down those ranchers having property along the northwestern shore can increase their farming acreage and vice versa, they can lose farm acreage when the water is too high.

Because recreationists are considered to be more affected by fluctuations of the level of the lake and as previously noted they are more concerned with the lake's pollution, recreationists (absentee property owners) are considered to have greater vested interests in seeing the lake level held stationary during the summer months. Therefore, it is expected that recreationists (absentee property owners) are more in favor of seeing the level of the lake held stationary during the summer months than would the agriculturalists in the area.

To ascertain attitudes toward controlling the fluctuations in the level of the lake, respondents were asked, "Should the level of the lake by law be maintained at a stationary level during the summer months?" The responses of the three special interest groups (i.e., absentee property owners, permanent non-farmer property owners, and permanent farmer property owners) to this question are noted in Table 24.

Inasmuch as a greater percent (63 percent) of the absentee property owners had noted earlier on the questionnaire that they were affected by fluctuations in the level of the lake, they would be expected to be more desirous to see the level of the lake maintained at a stationary level than would the permanent non-farmers and permanent farmers who indicated they were less likely to be influenced by
Table 24. Attitude as to whether the level of Bear Lake should be controlled by law as noted by absentee property owners, local non-farm property owners and local farm property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Lake Level</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Local Non-farmer</th>
<th>Local Farmer</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square=9.20 df=2 P<.05

No answer = 14
fluctuations in the level of the lake (38 percent and 49 percent respectively). Although a greater percent of the permanent farmers were affected by fluctuations in the level of the lake than were the permanent non-farmers, the farmers would not necessarily be more in favor of maintaining the lake at a stationary level during the summer months as they are aware this water is being used out of necessity by other farmers for irrigation purposes down stream and could be expected to identify with these other farmer's needs.

As noted in Table 24, statistically significant differences were noted between the three special interest group's answers. The absentee property owners as would be expected, were the most in favor (66 percent) of maintaining the lake at a stationary level by law during the summer months. The permanent non-farmers had a nearly equal (65 percent) percent of respondents in favor of maintaining the level of the lake by law, while the permanent farmers were the lowest at 46 percent. It would appear that although the farmers are in many cases affected (loss of low lying croplands) by fluctuations in the level of the lake, they are less likely to desire seeing the level of the lake maintained at a specific height by law during the summer months.
CHAPTER VIII

IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGING NATURAL RESOURCE USES ON THE LOCAL POWER STRUCTURE

Introduction

The organizational format of the existing political power structures of the area in both counties under study is very similar. There are four identifiable communities in Idaho within the six mile area under study (Fish Haven, Bloomington, St. Charles, and Dingle). Only Bloomington and St. Charles have town governments, both have a mayor and four town councilmen. The Rich County, Utah area under study has three identifiable communities (Garden City, Pickleville, and Laketown) and all three have town governments consisting of a mayor and either three or four town councilmen. Rich County and Bear Lake County both are administered by a three man County Commission. All of these positional leaders living within six miles of Bear Lake were individually interviewed using a structured open ended interview schedule which among others, contained many of the questions that were included in the mailed questionnaire that was sent to the random sample of property owners (see Appendix).

As previously discussed, in comparing the Idaho side of Bear Lake with the Utah side of the lake, the greatest change is considered to be occurring on the Utah side inasmuch as this area has received the greatest influx of recreational development in recent years. As was noted, approximately 40 percent of the shoreline in Utah has been
developed into recreational sites whereas only about 14 percent of the Idaho shoreline has been so developed. Sweetwater Park, the largest single recreational development complex with about 7,000 acres on and near the lake, is located on the Utah side of Bear Lake.

The number of business enterprises in the two counties within six miles of Bear Lake is another indicator of the greater change (i.e., recreational development) on the Utah side of the lake. The number of businesses that are locally and absentee owned in the Utah and Idaho areas under study are shown in Figure 7 and Figure 8. As indicated in these figures, Utah not only has a greater number of business enterprises than does the Idaho side of the lake but also has a greater number and a higher percent of these enterprises that are absentee owned. Also, the number of absentee property owners (which are assumed to be almost entirely recreational type investments) is greater in Utah than in Idaho. As was discussed previously in the description of the study's sample design, well over 50 percent of the property owners in both counties within six miles of the lake are absentee property owners. However, 86 percent of the property owners in Rich County and 63 percent in Bear Lake County were absentee property owners, a difference of 23 percent.

Resource Use Change and Local Power Structures

The fourth hypothesis of this study attempts to identify some of the implications of social change (due to changing uses of the land and water resources) as it relates to the local power structure of two
Construction:
1. Johnson Ready Mix*
2. Bear River Lumber*
3. Malcolm Plumbing & Heating
4. Bear Lake Electric

Resorts/Motels:
1. Bear Lake Motor Lodge
2. Blue Water Beach*
3. Holiday Marina*
4. Lakeshore Lodge
5. Lakeview Cafe & Motel
6. Sweetwater*
7. Bear Lake KOA*
8. Bridgerland Village*

Service Stations/Markets:
1. Floyd's Service
2. Johnson's Super Service
3. Mack's Service
4. Ralph's V-1 Service
5. Sterling Service

Drive Inns:
1. Western Drive Inn*
2. Taco Drive Inn*
3. Magie's Kitchen

General Merchandise/Groceries:
1. Selle's Trading Post
2. Kearl's Market

Trailer Courts:
1. Bear Lake Trailer Court
2. Four Seasons Trailer Court*
3. Garden City Trailer Court

Miscellaneous:
1. A-A-A Reality*
2. Beauty Shop
3. Parnell's Meat Packing
4. Applied Eco-Systems

Governmental:
1. Utah State University Wildlife Dept. Experimental Station
2. Utah State Park and Marina
3. Utah State Highway Equipment Shed

Total establishments, N=32
Total businesses, N=29
*Absentee owned businesses, N=11

Figure 7. Governmental and business establishments located within six miles of Bear Lake in Utah.
Resorts/Motels:
1. Fish Haven Resort
2. Bear Lake Hot Springs
3. Bear Lake West Inc.*

Drive Inns:
1. Bundy's Drive Inn

Service Stations/Markets:
1. A & J Market
2. Mecham's General Merchandise
3. St. Charles Maverick Service
4. Villager
5. Izatt's Service

Governmental:
1. Idaho State Park and Beach
2. Bear Lake Regional Commission Office

Utilities:
1. Utah Power and Light Company

Total establishments, N=12
Total businesses, N=9
*Absentee owned businesses, N=1

Figure 8. Governmental and business establishments located within six miles of Bear Lake in Idaho.
areas undergoing differing degrees of social change. The fourth hypothesis of this study is stated again below.

**Hypothesis #4:**

As noted by permanent local property owners, the comparative leadership structure will be more diverse in an area undergoing more rapid social change than in an area undergoing a lesser degree of change.

As noted earlier, the perceived leadership structure is to be measured using the reputational approach for ascertaining leaders. The greater the number of individuals mentioned as leaders three or more times by permanent local property owners in a county the more that county is considered to have a diverse leadership structure. If the fourth hypothesis is supported then, the Utah area around the lake will be considered to have the more pluralistic power structure as it is undergoing the greatest amount of recreational development (change) of the two sides of the lake.

Data related to the fourth hypothesis are presented in Table 25. This table notes the rather low response rate to this question as only 40 percent of the respondents returning the mailed questionnaire answered the question identifying influential leaders by indicating one or more local residents as being influential in the area. It can also be noted in Table 25 that the greatest number of different individuals mentioned as being influential was made by the Utah local property owners (N=41) and the lowest number was noted by the Idaho local property owners (N=29). Also, the findings in Table 25 would indicate
Table 25. Number of Bear Lake area residents that were mentioned by Utah and Idaho local property owners as being community influentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence of Local Property Owners</th>
<th>Number of Different Local Residents Mentioned One or More Times</th>
<th>Number of Different Residents Mentioned One or More Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}39 of the 85 local Utah respondents returning the mailed questionnaire answered this question (46 percent).

\textsuperscript{b}21 of the 66 local Idaho respondents returning the mailed questionnaire answered this question (32 percent).
that the Utah area around the lake has a more pluralistic power structure as was hypothesized inasmuch as twice as many local residents were mentioned three or more times as being influentials by the sample of property owners returning the mailed questionnaire. Although this difference is probably influenced by the greater number and percent of Utah local property owners answering the question, the lower response rate of the Idaho local property owners could indicate that these respondents as well as those Utah respondents not responding, actually consider the area of their county under study to be without influentials.

Receiving Assistance from Sources Outside the Local Community

The fifth hypothesis is concerned with the amount of outside assistance received by communities in Utah as compared to the assistance received by the Idaho communities near Bear Lake.

Hypothesis #5:

The greater the amount of change in an area, the more likely are the positional leaders in that area to seek advice from non-local sources in trying to resolve local problems.

This hypothesis states that the positional leaders in an area that has a pluralistic power structure would be more likely to seek advice from non-local sources in trying to resolve local problems than would positional leaders of an area having a more monistic power structure. Warren has described the seeking of outside help as a vertical pattern in community relations, "A community's vertical pattern was defined as the structural and functional relation
of its various social units and subsystems to extra-community systems."¹

Data relating to this hypothesis are presented in Tables 26 - 32. These tables indicate the number of personal contacts² with outside organizations for the five town governments in the area under study. As can be noted in Tables 26 - 32, the two Utah towns of Pickleville and Garden City which are adjacent to the lake proper, had a much greater number of contacts with outside organizations than did Lake-town, Utah and St. Charles and Bloomington, Idaho—communities which lie approximately 6 miles from the lake.

In Table 32, the total contacts with outside organizations as noted from memory and from town council minutes of the two Utah towns adjacent to Bear Lake (Garden City and Pickleville) are compared with the total outside contacts of the two Idaho towns (St. Charles and Bloomington) lying approximately 6 miles from the shore of the lake. As noted in this table, the two Utah towns on Bear Lake were in contact (as noted both by memory and as indicated in the town board minutes) with outside organizations 300 percent more times (249 to 71) than were the two Idaho towns 6 miles from the lake. Inasmuch as the Utah side of the lake was shown earlier to have undergone more recreation development, this data would support the hypothesis that the more change in an area, the more likely are the positional leaders in the area to receive assistance from non-local


²Personal contacts are defined as any mail correspondence, telephone conversations, attendance at meetings, or personal contacts with organizations outside their respective towns, irregardless of whether the contact was initiated by them or by the outside organization.

Contracts with organizations outside of Pickleville as noted by the Mayor of Pickleville.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Engineering</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.H.A.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Commission</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.&amp;D.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.U.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Board of Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Land Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Planning Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contracts with organizations outside of Pickleville as noted in the minutes of the 1974 Pickleville Town Council Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Highway Department</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.H.A.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Building Inspector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.U.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah League of Cities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.&amp;D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Tax Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Engineer's Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Six town council meetings were held in 1974.
Table 27. Garden City, Ut. contacts with organizations (1974).

Contracts with organizations outside of Garden City as noted by the Mayor of Garden City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid (Attorney from Logan)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Attorney</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Civil Defense</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Commission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah League of Cities and Towns</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Community Action Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Sanitary Department</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contracts with organizations outside of Garden City as noted in the minutes of the 1974 Garden City Town Council Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid (Attorney from Logan)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Commission</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Attorney</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Civil Defense</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Road Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Tax Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Division of Community Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah League of Cities and Towns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Road Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Tourist Counsel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear River Sanitary District</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Environmental Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogdeh Defense Depot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverstment Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thirteen town council meetings were held in 1974.
Table 28. Laketown, Ut. contacts with organizations (1974).

### Contracts with organizations outside of Laketown as noted by the Mayor of Laketown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.U.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Commission</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Highway Department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Health Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contracts with organizations outside of Laketown as noted in the minutes of the 1974 Laketown Town Council Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.H.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich County Road Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Selle (Mayor of Garden City)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Five town council meetings were held in 1974.
Table 29. St. Charles, Id. contacts with organizations (1974).

Contracts with organizations outside of St. Charles as noted by the Mayor of St. Charles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County Commission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State Health Department</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County Attorney</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Department</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County Sheriff Department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State Highway Department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton and Voeller Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contracts with organizations outside of St. Charles as noted in the minutes of the 1974 St. Charles Town Council Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State Auditor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Governor's Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Manpower Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Idaho Area Long-Range Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County Attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton and Voeller Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Haven Volunteer Fire Dept.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ten town council meetings were held in 1974.
Table 30. Bloomington, Id. contacts with organizations (1974).

Contracts with organizations outside of Bloomington as noted by the Mayor of Bloomington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County Commission</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake County Attorney</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewell Engineering Company</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contracts with organizations outside of Bloomington as noted in the minutes of the 1974 Bloomington Town Council Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake Regional Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twelve town council meetings were held in 1974.
NOTE: The town clerk was unwilling to let the author look personally at the minutes but went through them herself.
Table 31. Utah combined contacts with organizations outside the communities of Garden City, Pickleville, and Laketown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Number of Contacts</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleville</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laketown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Idaho combined contacts with organizations outside the communities of St. Charles and Bloomington.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Number of Contacts</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sources in trying to solve local problems.

Mention should be made at this time about the limitations of the town board meeting minutes discussed above and presented in Tables 26 - 30. As can be noted in these tables, the mayors from memory indicated having had over twice as many contacts with outside organizations as were found in the minutes of their respective town council meetings' minutes. In most cases (except for Garden City, Utah) town board meetings as well as the minutes of these meetings are very informal, the minutes were often hand written and only a few sentences long. Garden City, under the present administration of Mayor Fred Selle (a retired Army colonel) had the only detailed minutes and although the contacts with outside organizations as indicated in the town board minutes were in several cases with different organizations than those noted by the mayor's memory, the actual number of contacts as remembered by the mayor and as noted in the minutes was the same (Table 27). It would appear that much of the outside assistance is sought (and received) on an informal basis in these small communities.

Perception of the Most Important Use of Bear Lake Water by Positional Leaders

While the fifth hypothesis has noted possible differences in the amount of outside assistance the positional leaders in Utah are receiving as compared to the assistance received by leaders on the Idaho side of Bear Lake, the sixth hypothesis is concerned with possible differences between the priorities that leaders have over the different uses of water held in Bear Lake.
Hypothesis #6:
The greater the amount of change in an area, the more likely are the positional leaders in that area to reflect a diversity in the priority of the uses of water held in a reservoir lake.

To ascertain possible differences in the priorities over different uses of the water held in Bear Lake the positional leaders were asked, "At the present time what do you consider to be the most important uses of Bear Lake water between recreation, irrigation and power production?" Inasmuch as the Utah side of Bear Lake was shown to have undergone a greater amount of changing land and water uses, if this hypothesis is supported then, the positional leaders from the Utah side of Bear Lake would be expected to be more diverse (i.e., have opinions that are less homogeneous) as to the most important uses of Bear Lake water than would the leaders from the Idaho side of the lake.

As noted in Table 33, there was a statistically significant difference between the most important uses of Bear Lake water as perceived by Utah and Idaho positional leaders. As was hypothesized, the Utah positional leaders were more diverse in their opinions as to the most important uses of Bear Lake water. In particular, only 56 percent of the Utah leaders noted irrigation as the most important use of Bear Lake water whereas the Idaho leaders were almost unanimous (90 percent) in noting irrigation as the most important use of water held in Bear Lake.
Table 33. The most important uses of Bear Lake water between recreation, irrigation, and power production, as noted by Utah and Idaho positional leaders living within six miles of Bear Lake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Uses</th>
<th>Positional Leaders</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VIII
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Summary of Procedures

The present study was undertaken to develop further information as to the implications of changing uses of water and land resources as a source for conflict and as it related to community power structure.

The position taken in this study was that change in uses of natural resources (in this case using land/water for recreation instead of for agriculture purposes) results in social change which in turn results in changes in the social power structure and serves as a source of potential conflict between new and older vested interest groups using the Bear Lake area of Utah and Idaho.

Theory and research on power structure indicated that the form a social organization assumes is in response to varying demographic, technological, and environmental pressures. As was noted by Buckley,\(^1\) population growth and territorial expansion (presumably aided by improved technology) are likely to result in pressures that bring about the differentiation and specialization of functions thereby resulting in an elaboration of the existing power structure. As a result it was hypothesized that the leadership structure as noted by local permanent property owners will be more pluralistic in an area undergoing more rapid social change, and the more pluralistic the

power structure the more likely are the positional leaders in the area to seek advice from non-local sources in trying to resolve local problems.

With respect to changing uses of land and water as a source for conflict, the general theoretical perspective that conflict theorists share of focusing on conflict as a cause of social change was reversed with the causal focus going in the opposite direction. That is, might not changing uses of land and water resources result in conflicts inasmuch as change in man's uses of natural resources results in a disruption of the existing status quo of the presently functioning social system. In general then, it was hypothesized that property owners in special interest groups will view problems and priorities of the different uses associated with a natural resource according to the special interest group to which they belong and the dissatisfaction with local town and county governments will vary according to special interest groups.

Data to empirically test the above hypotheses were obtained from structured interviews with positional (elected) leaders living within six miles of Bear Lake and by a mailed questionnaire sent to a random sample of 462 individuals owning property within approximately six miles of Bear Lake. Usable questionnaires were received from 321 (70 percent) of the respondents.

Summary of the Findings

To test the assumptions and theoretical framework of this study,
five hypotheses and three sub-hypotheses were formulated. Basically, these hypotheses stated that changing land and water uses; (1) disrupt the status quo of existing social systems and that incompatible values held by different vested interest groups associated with these resources will serve as a potential source of conflict, and (2) will result in a change in the community power structure, i.e., the local community power structure will change from a monistic to a pluralistic power structure.

Changing resource uses as a source of conflict

The first three hypotheses and the accompanying sub-hypotheses of this study are concerned with some of the implications of opposition to changing land and water uses in the Bear Lake area of Utah and Idaho.

Dissatisfaction with local county and town governments in the Bear Lake area was ascertained by asking respondents receiving the mailed questionnaire if they felt that on the whole, the county and town governments in which their Bear Lake property lies represents their interests or not. Only 40 percent of the absentee property owners sampled in both counties indicated that they felt that the local town government represented their interests whereas 60 percent of the local permanent property owners considered the town government to represent their interests. With respect to the local county government, again a lower percent of absentee property owners felt that the county government represented their interests than did the local permanent property owners. This hypothesis was supported by the data collected from the samples.
The second hypothesis was also concerned with property owner's satisfaction with local governments and noted that property owners in an area undergoing rapid social change (Utah side of Bear Lake) due to changing land and water uses will be more apt to feel their interests are not being represented by the local town and county governments than will property owners in a neighboring area that is relatively stable (Idaho side of Bear Lake). A greater percent of Utah property owners felt they weren't being represented by their local governments in which their Bear Lake property lies but statistically significant differences were found only with respect to attitudes toward the local county government.

The third hypothesis noted that property owners representing three special interest groups (identified as full and part-time agriculturalists living in the Bear Lake area full time, non-agriculturalists living in the area full time, and all absentee property owners owning property within six miles of Bear Lake) will view problems and priorities of the different uses associated with Bear Lake according to the special interest group they belong to. In comparing the three special interest groups, farmers were most concerned with high property taxes and having too many recreationists, this was also true of the local non-farmers. The absentee property owners were most concerned with pollution of Bear Lake and high taxes. These concerns can be seen as logical reflections of the special interests of these three groups.

Respondents were also asked what they would like least to see changed in the Bear Lake area. Farmers indicated greatest concern with seeing a loss of the area's rural atmosphere. Non-farmers were
most concerned with seeing the lake contaminated but were almost equally concerned with the loss of the area's rural atmosphere. The absentee property owners again indicated their concern about the lake becoming more polluted.

Respondents were also asked what they would like most to see changed in the Bear Lake area. Again, the agriculturalists are most concerned with protecting their interests and would like to have fewer recreationists in the area. The local non-farmers living year round in the area indicated they would like most to see pollution of the lake stopped, this was also the principal wish of the absentee property owners.

The first sub-hypothesis (#3.1) noted that values for further private recreational development of the Bear Lake area would differ between the three special interest groups. Absentee property owners who are almost entirely recreationists, were expected to prefer more private recreational development inasmuch as many of them (45 percent) owned vacant property near the lake while the permanent local property owners (both farmers and non-farmers) who are already settled in the area, were expected to prefer less private recreational development. Statistically significant differences were found, as 56 percent of the permanent farmers as well as 57 percent of the permanent non-farmers preferred less private recreational development, this in comparison to 38 percent of the absentee property owners who preferred to see less private recreational development.

The second sub-hypothesis was concerned with the perceived importance of different uses of Bear Lake water as noted by the three
special interest groups. When looking at the perceived importance of the three principal uses of the lake's water by the three special interest groups, it was expected that the farmers while not using Bear Lake water directly for their own irrigation purposes would still be oriented toward seeing irrigation as the most important use of the water. Absentee property owners were expected to see recreation as the most important use of the lake. Inasmuch as local non-farmers were seen as a hybrid group made up of both farm and recreation oriented people, their responses were expected to be nearly equally divided between irrigation, power production, and recreation. By only a slight margin, absentee property owners considered recreation to be the most important use of the lake. For the farmers, over half felt that irrigation was the most important use of the lake and only 10 percent felt recreation was the most important use. Electrical power production was considered by the local non-farmers to be the most important use of the lake. When asked what they would consider to be the most important use of Bear Lake water during a drought all three special interest groups were unanimous in naming irrigation as the most important use--over 70 percent of the respondents answering the question for each of the three special interest groups noted irrigation as being the most important use of Bear Lake water during a period of drought. The hypothesis then, was not supported in case of a hypothetical drought situation.

With respect to changing uses of water held in Bear Lake, a principal source of conflict is over fluctuations in the level of the lake and it was hypothesized that opposition to man controlled fluctuations
As hypothesized, Utah local property owners identified a greater number of different individuals as being influentials than did the Idaho local property owners, thereby indicating that the Utah area around the lake has a more pluralistic power structure than does the Idaho side of the lake.

The fifth hypothesis was concerned with the amount of outside assistance received by communities in Utah as compared to the assistance received by the Idaho communities. The two Utah towns lying on the immediate shore of Bear Lake were in contact (as noted both by memory and as indicated in the town board minutes) with outside organizations for assistance 300 percent more times than were the two Idaho towns lying within 6 miles of the lake. Inasmuch as the Utah side of the lake was shown earlier to have undergone a greater amount of recreation development, this data would support the hypothesis that the more change in an area the more likely are the positional leaders in the area to receive assistance from non-local sources in trying to resolve local problems.

The last hypothesis was concerned with possible differences between the priorities that leaders have as to their perception of the most important use of water held in Bear Lake. Again, inasmuch as the Utah side of Bear Lake was shown to have undergone a greater amount of changing land and water uses, positional leaders from the Utah side of the lake were expected to have more diverse opinions (i.e., opinions that were less homogeneous) over their perceived importance of the three different uses of Bear Lake water discussed above. Statistically significant differences were found between the
most important uses of Bear Lake water as perceived by Utah and Idaho positional leaders, and the Utah positional leaders were found to be more diverse in their opinions as to the most important uses of water held in the Bear Lake.

Discussion and Implications

Bear Lake in recent years has become an increasingly popular recreation area. Residents and non-residents alike enjoy numerous activities such as boating, water skiing, fishing, and sailing on the lake's 100 square miles of clean, azure blue water. The location of Bear Lake between Yellowstone National Park and the urban populations of Utah's Wasatch Front, brings many additional visitors to the area during the summer months.

Rapid growth of an area such as Bear Lake can bring with it both advantages and disadvantages. Some of the advantages to growth in the Bear Lake area include; a source of economic growth to a declining community, jobs and business opportunities open up which could help in keeping the youth in the area. Also, tax revenues are increased as the land values and property sales both increase. Sewer and culinary systems that could possibly not be afforded by a small community could become economically possible. More and better recreational facilities would likely be provided by government as well as private recreational enterprises. These advantages could likely enhance the life style of Bear Lake area residents.

Though not inevitable, disadvantages may also accompany growth in the Bear Lake area. Numerous threats to the environment are possible
as development increases. These threats include, loss of fish and wildlife as well as their habitat, loss of aesthetic quality of the area, degradation of air and water quality. Threats to safety can develop if lands are developed within hazardous areas such as flood plains, earth quake prone areas, and earth slide areas. Economic threats are also possible through the destruction of the agriculture industry and replacing it with an economic base that is nearly entirely seasonal and highly dependent upon the economic state of the country as a whole.

This study however, has focused on social problems associated with different interest groups in the Bear Lake area and in particular those values which may be incompatible and thereby serve as a source of conflict as shifting uses of the land and water occurs, this study has also focused on some of the implications of changing resource uses on the local social power structure.

The principle incompatible value between the two major uses of the land, i.e., between agriculture and recreation, is that of the agriculturalists in the area who want to see the area remain relatively open and primarily used for agriculture, and the recreationists and the absentee property owners on the other hand, who prefer seeing the land developed further for recreational purposes. The wishes of the agriculturalists are steadily succumbing to the wishes and needs of the recreationists as many of the agriculturalists in the area are indirectly forced to sell their property to developers due to increasing taxes on their property.
As land surrounding the lake is developed recreationally the value per acre of the land increases causing a corresponding increase in taxes. In many cases the land around Bear Lake which is being developed is still bordered by agricultural land which the same family has been farming for decades. The high taxes that these farmers have to pay on their already slim profit margins as was mentioned, has forced many farmers into selling their property.

If no alternatives to the present situation are developed, agriculturalists in the Bear Lake area that are no longer able to economically run their farms will probably be faced with one of the following five alternatives:

1. Begin to develop specialized skills such as welding, mechanics, carpentry, etc., skills that can be used in the area.
2. Apply for jobs within the resort areas, such as cooks, custodians, maintenance, etc.
3. Get a job out of the immediate area and commute to work.
4. Begin a new business within the valley.
5. Move from the area or retire.

While these alternatives may be used by some of the agriculturalists, the question remains, is there not an alternative to some of the basic changes that are going on that would allow for those individuals in the area that are agriculturalists and wish to use their land for farming, to do so? A principal problem which exists in the Bear Lake area then, is to see that the recreational growth which in all likelihood will continue to increase, is done in a
manner which does not ignore the values and life patterns of earlier residents in the area as well as disrupt the unique physical ecology of the area.

Local town and county governments concerned with management at the local level in the Bear Lake area are often unprepared and untrained to handle the multiple problems and questions that have rapidly arisen as the area has become increasingly developed. This study found that the power structure of the Utah side of the lake is more pluralistic and receives more assistance from organizations outside the area than was found on the Idaho side of Bear Lake. In the past it is assumed that the social power structure in the communities surrounding the lake were quite monistic that is, were homogeneous and centered around the dominant religious institution and were able to resolve local problems themselves. As social change rapidly occurs in the area it is expected that communities near Bear Lake would turn increasingly to outsiders for help for assistance in solving local problems.

The establishment of the Bear Lake Regional Commission in 1973 is an alternative organizational arrangement which is capable of seeing that the goals of the different special interest groups in the Bear Lake area are met in such a way as to avoid severe problems with other special interest groups. In particular, it appears appropriate that the Bear Lake Regional Commission should emphasize; (1) an increase in the public participation of the Commission's decision making processes, (2) aiding local community governments, and (3)
encourage zoning changes that would ensure planned development of the area rather than the relatively unplanned development that has gone on in the Bear Lake area in recent years.

Limitations

The present study does have some important limitations which should be taken into account. To begin with, the unique homogeneity of the Bear Lake area residents suggest some caution in generalizing the findings of this study to other areas. Although the findings of this study give some indication of the problems of changing land and water uses in general, there is a need for replication of other geographical areas undergoing similar types of social change.

Second, this study has not examined the larger problem of actual conflict over changing land and water uses rather, it has looked at these changes as sources of conflict. The present study suggests a need for additional research on those areas that have actually had conflict.

Finally, additional research in the Bear Lake area is appropriate inasmuch as a main theme of the present study was that the culture or subculture under study is integrated to some degree and that intervention into that culture by some outside force in a planned change program will be disruptive to that culture, and the extent of the disruption cannot be determined fully until intervention has actually taken place and a re-study can be made.
COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP AND WATER RESOURCE USES

IN THE BEAR LAKE AREA

The Institute for Social Science Research on Natural Resources at Utah State University is conducting a study on water use and related developments in the Bear Lake area. This study deals with the effects of changing uses of a natural resource and the ways in which decisions are made about it. This information will be useful in gaining a better understanding of the effects of change in communities such as those in the area of the lake.

In order to get a fair representation of people who own property around the lake, we have drawn a scientific random sample from all of the property owners in this area. You are one of those who were chosen in this sample. This is a scientific study; therefore, your help is necessary in order to provide accurate information. All the information received from you is strictly confidential and individuals will not be identified in the results.

The answers to this questionnaire should be made only by the male head of household without consulting with others, such as members of the family, for help in answering the questions. If there is no male head of household, then the female head of household should answer the questions. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible.

Your cooperation with this study is very greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

William C. Dunaway
Research Assistant
Utah State University
752-4100 Ex. 7198
March 3, 1975

In case you never received the annual questionnaire mailed to you a few weeks ago, I am sending you a duplicate. We would appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire and return it as soon as possible.

Thank you.
BEAR LAKE QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE CHECK OR WRITE IN ONLY ONE ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

1 In your opinion, what do you feel is the greatest problem property owners in the Bear Lake area face?

   1. Lack of enough irrigation water
   2. Pollution of Bear Lake
   3. Too many recreationists
   4. High taxes
   5. Sewage disposal costs
   6. Too much zoning
   7. Not enough zoning
   8. Rising land prices
   9. Inflation
   10. Other (specify)

2 At the present time what would you like least to see changed in the Bear Lake area?

   1. See the lake lowered
   2. See the lake contaminated
   3. Loss of area's rural atmosphere
   4. Other (specify)

3 At the present time what would you like most to see changed in the Bear Lake area?

   1. Have more businesses come in
   2. Stop pollution of the lake
   3. Have fewer recreationists
   4. Develop more public facilities around the lake
   5. Have more zoning in the area
   6. Other (specify)

4 What group in the Bear Lake area do you feel is the most influential in handling problems that might exist with respect to different uses of Bear Lake water?

   1. Army Corps of Engineers
   2. Bear Lake Home Owners Assoc.
   3. Utah Power & Light Co.
   4. Town Commissions in the area
   5. Bear Lake Regional Commission
   7. County Commission
   8. County Planning Commission
   9. Bureau of Reclamation
   10. Other (specify)

5 Should the level of the lake by law be maintained at a stationary level during the summer months?

   1. Yes
   2. No

6 Who has the mechanism for controlling the water level of Bear Lake?
7 In what ways, if any, are you affected by fluctuations in the level of the lake?

8 There has been talk of developing a sewer system along the west side of Bear Lake; are you in favor or against such a development?

   1. Strongly favor
   2. Favor
   3. Don't care
   4. Oppose
   5. Strongly oppose

9 There has also been talk of developing a sewer system on the south end of the lake; are you in favor or against such a development?

   1. Strongly favor
   2. Favor
   3. Don't care
   4. Oppose
   5. Strongly oppose

10 What has been your principal source of information if any about the development of a sewer system near the lake?

   1. Have received no information
   2. Radio
   3. Newspaper
   4. Friends
   5. County Commission
   6. Town Commission
   7. Bear Lake Regional Commission
   8. Other

11 What do you think is the maximum cost the "typical" property owner should have to pay monthly for a hook-up to a new sewer system? $ __________

12 Do you own property that touches on the shore of Bear Lake?

   1. Yes
   2. No

13 Approximately how many days in 1974 did you spend at your Bear Lake area property? __________ days

14 How long have you lived in Bear Lake and/or Rich County? __________

15 On your Bear Lake property, do you have a house (year-round occupancy) or a recreational cabin, or is the land vacant?

   1. House
   2. Cabin
   3. Vacant

16 IF LAND IS VACANT, in the next five years do you plan to build a house or a recreational cabin or leave the property vacant?

   1. Build house
   2. Build cabin
   3. Leave vacant

17 Have you heard of the Bear Lake Regional Commission?

   1. Yes
   2. No
18 IF YES, have you ever had any personal contact with the Bear Lake Regional Commission?

_1. Yes _2. No

19 With respect to the Bear Lake Regional Commission's ability to effect change in the Bear Lake area, would you say that the commission has:

_1. Too much power _2. About the right amount of power _3. Too little power _4. Don't know

20 At the present time what do you think are the most important uses of Bear Lake water between (1) power production, (2) recreation, and (3) irrigation? (Please rank these 3 uses.)

1. Most important use
2. Second most important use
3. Third most important use

21 What do you think would be the most important uses of Bear Lake water during a drought between (1) power production, (2) recreation, and (3) irrigation?

1. Most important use
2. Second most important use
3. Third most important use

22 Please list below what groups, clubs, or organizations you belong to, if any. (Note: We are thinking of organizations such as civic, educational, religious, professional, and neighborhood groups.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES OF COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR OFFICES HELD IN PAST 5 YEARS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civic:

Educational:

Religious:

Professional:

Neighborhood Groups:

23 Do you prefer to see more or less or the same amount of private recreation development in the Bear Lake area?

_1. More _2. Same _3. Less
24 Do you feel that recreation interests should have a greater role or a lesser role in the lake management or should the management continue as it is?
   ___ 1. Greater role       ___ 2. Continue as is       ___ 3. Lesser role

25 On the whole, do you feel that the county government in which your Bear Lake property lies represents your interests?
   ___ 1. Yes                   ___ 2. No

26 On the whole, do you feel that the town government in which your Bear Lake property lies or is closest to represents your interests?
   ___ 1. Yes                   ___ 2. No

27 On the whole, do you identify your interests as being most similar to:
   ___ 1. Those interests held in general by agriculturalists in the Bear Lake area
   ___ 2. Those interests held in general by recreationists in the Bear Lake area

28 When it comes to making important decisions in the county in which your Bear Lake property lies, please list individuals who you consider to be influential leaders:

29 Are there any individuals in the county in which your Bear Lake property lies who you would consider to be influential in any of the following areas of life? (NOTE: The same person can be mentioned in more than one category.)
A. Business and Trade  D. Religion
B. Agriculture          E. Recreation
C. Politics              F. Water Management

30 What in your opinion has been the most significant program in the county in which your lake property lies during the past 5 years?_________________________
31 Who were the individuals most actively involved in this program? 

32 What is your age? ___ years

33 Sex: ___ 1. Male ___ 2. Female

34 What was the last grade of school you completed?

35 What is the head of household's major occupation? (Work that brings in more than \( \frac{1}{2} \) of income)
   a. Job title

36 Do you expect to be working at this occupation for the next 5 years?
   ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No

37 Does the head of household have a part-time occupation?
   ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No

38 If Yes, what is the job title?

Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed envelope.
BEAR LAKE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What is your organization's interest to water held in Bear Lake?

2. With respect to water uses of Bear Lake, what is the most pressing problem your organization faces (IF ANY)?
   
   A. Why is this a problem?
   
   B. How long has this problem existed?
   
   C. How do you expect to resolve this problem?

3. What other groups do you work with on water problems? (PLEASE RANK THESE GROUPS IN ORDER OF THE AMOUNT OF WORK YOU DO WITH THEM ON BEAR LAKE WATER MATTERS.)

   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

   Who are the directors of these agencies?

   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

   How often have you met with these agencies in the past year?

   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5.
4. What is the supervisory agency or group for your organization, that is, to whom do you report?

5. Briefly, what are the major purposes of your organization?

6. What groups if any, report to you on water problems?

7. What groups in the Bear Lake area do you feel are the most influential in handling problems that might exist with respect to different uses of Bear Lake water? (LIST IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE.)

8. At the present time what do you think are the most important uses of Bear Lake water? (LIST IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE.)

   1. Most important use
   2. Second most important use
   3. Third most important use

9. In terms of importance, how would you rank the uses of Bear Lake water during a drought? (LIST IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE.)

   1. Most important use
   2. Second most important use
   3. Third most important use

10. Have you heard of the Bear Lake Regional Commission?  ___Yes  ___No

11. Have you ever had any personal contact with the BLRC?  
    ___Yes
    ___No

12. If YES to #10: With respect to the Commission's ability to affect change in the Bear Lake area, would you say that the BLRC has:
    ___1. Too much power  ___2. About the right amount of power
    ___3. Too little power   ___4. Don't know
13. If YES to #10: How effective do you feel the Commission has been in the following areas: (Note: These are the 8 purposes of the Commission as stated in their Articles of Association.)

A. Serve as a common forum to identify, discuss, study and bring to resolution, regional problems and opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Serve as a vehicle for the collection and exchange of information and data of a regional interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Provide a continuing organizational means to insure maximum communication and coordination among governments and agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Coordinate the planning efforts of the several members and various levels of government to the end that an overall comprehensive plan for the region shall be developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Study regional and governmental problems of mutual interest and concern, and facilitate agreements and cooperative action proposals among member governments for specific projects or other interrelated developmental services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Maintain liaison with members, other governmental units, and groups or organizations, and serve as regional spokesman for member local governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Furnish general and technical aid to member local governments, as they direct, promote, and accomplish Commission approved agreements, policies, and plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Serve as a reviewing and policy-making body with respect to projects and proposals, of both public agencies and private organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Although recreation has been a part of the Lake use for many years, recently it has grown greatly in proportion: Do you feel that recreation interests should have a greater role or a lesser role in the Lake management or should the management continue as it is?

___1. Greater role
___2. Continue as is
___3. Lesser role
___4. Don't know

15. With respect to different uses of Bear Lake water such as irrigation, power production, recreation, etc. what do you see as the most pressing problems, if any, that the Bear Lake area residents face? (LIST IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE.)

1.
2.
3.

A. Do you think this problem can be resolved?

1. Problem one listed above ___a. Yes ___b. No
2. Problem two listed above ___a. Yes ___b. No
3. Problem three listed above ___a. Yes ___b. No

B. How do you think this problem will be resolved?

Problem one
Problem two
Problem three

16. At the present time what would you like most to see changed in the Bear Lake area?

17. At the present time what would you like least to see changed in the Bear Lake area?

18. What in your opinion have been the most significant programs in the county during the past five years?

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

A. Who were the individuals most actively involved in each of these?

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
WE ARE INTERESTED IN ANY CONFLICTS, THAT IS, DIFFERENCE OF OPINIONS OR PROBLEMS THAT MAY HAVE RESULTED FROM CHANGING USES OF BEAR LAKE WATER AND THE LAND AROUND THE LAKE.

19. In the past five years, what do you see as the most important change occurring with respect to land use around Bear Lake?

A. Has this change resulted in any conflicts, that is, problems or differences of opinion of any groups or individuals?

B. In what ways, if any, have the conflict(s) affected the development of the Bear Lake area?

C. Has the change mentioned in question #19 resulted in any conflicts (problems or differences of opinion) between your organization and any other organizations or individuals?

   1. Yes
   2. No

   a. If YES, what was the conflict?

   b. If the conflict has been resolved, how was it resolved?

   c. If the conflict still exists, what keeps it from being resolved?

   d. If the conflict still exists, how do you expect to resolve it?

20. In trying to solve problems in general in the Bear Lake area, what would you say constrains your organization (if anything) from being able to work more effectively toward solving these problems?

   1.

   2.

   3.

21. In trying to solve water-related problems in the Bear Lake area, what would you say constrains your organization (if anything) from being able to work more effectively toward solving water-related problems?
22. When it comes to making important decisions in Bear Lake and Rich Counties, who would you consider to be the influential leaders? (PLEASE LIST INDIVIDUALS IN ORDER OF THEIR IMPORTANCE.)

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  
6.  
7.  
8.  
9.  
10.  
11.  
12.  
13.  
14.  
15.  
16.  
17.  
18.  
19.  
20.  
23. Are there any individuals in Bear Lake and Rich Counties who you would consider to be influential in any of the following areas of life? (NOTE: AGAIN, PLEASE LIST INDIVIDUALS IN ORDER OF THEIR IMPORTANCE.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Business and Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Water Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Please list individuals in order of their importance.)
24. There has been talk of developing a sewer system along the west side of Bear Lake, are you in favor or against such a development?
  ___1. Strongly favor
  ___2. Favor
  ___3. Don't care  Why?
  ___4. Strongly oppose
  ___5. Don't know

25. Do you have any recommendations for any alternative policies for resolving any conflict of use problems with the uses of Bear Lake water? (WRITE DOWN WHAT EACH CONFLICT THEY SEE AS EXISTING IS.)

26. Do you have any recommendations for any alternative organizational arrangements for resolving any conflict of use problems with the uses of Bear Lake water? (WRITE DOWN WHAT EACH CONFLICT THEY SEE AS EXISTING IS.)

27. In what ways if any, are you affected by jurisdictional boundaries?

28. What is your age?  ____years

29. How long have you lived in Bear Lake or Rich Counties?  ____years

30. What is your main occupation (work that brings in more than half of your income)?
   a. Job Title_____________________
   b. Brief Description_________________
   Part time occupation?
   a. Job Title_____________________
   b. Brief Description_________________

31. Who owns the property rights to Bear Lake water?
SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

32. It is important to us to know something about the kinds of contacts people have and what they do in the community. What groups, clubs, or organizations do you belong to? (We are thinking of organizations such as: Lodges, Civic, Educational, Religious, Professional, and neighborhood groups.)

Name of Organization

What committees or offices have you held in the past five years?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

33. What do you feel is the greatest problem property owners in the Bear Lake area face.
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