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Introduction

This report summarizes the results of a needs assessment conducted from October 2022 to March 2023. A primary objective of the assessment is to support University of Idaho (UI) Extension’s planning process. The needs assessment is based on county- and state-level secondary data and primary data collected through client listening sessions as well as surveys of county commissioners and clientele throughout the state.

The following report begins with an Executive Summary of primary findings by UI Extension district and program area. It then provides the assessment results in detail organized by data type.

Data for this report are presented by UI Extension district, where possible. Table 1 and Figure 1 show the geographic boundaries and counties in the four UI Extension districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>UI Extension districts and the counties they serve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District</td>
<td>Southern District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td>Ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Boise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Elmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>Gem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Owyhee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>Payette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1 | University of Idaho Extension districts and offices
Idaho State

Idaho is home to over 1,800,000 residents.

From 2016 to 2021, the population increased 11%.

TOTAL POPULATION BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>114,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>123,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>129,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>124,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>117,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>117,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>117,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>116,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>105,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>101,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>99,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>108,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>106,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>96,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>72,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>49,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>31,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>28,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHANGE IN POPULATION BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4% of the population lives below poverty

27 / 44 counties are considered “rural”

31 / 44 counties have unemployment rates below 5%

99.2% of businesses in Idaho have < 20 employees

Median income $64,377

12.8% of the population is Hispanic or Latino
Northern Extension District

In 2021, 359,507 Idaho residents lived in the Northern Extension District.

- 20% of the state’s population
- 2021 unemployment rates in the district ranged from 3.3% in Nez Perce County to 6.3% in Shoshone County
- From 2016 to 2021, the population of the district increased 8% (+20,601)
- Kootenai County had the third highest population increase in Idaho (+20,601)
- Lewis County had the largest decrease in the number of residents of any county in Idaho (-213)
- 7% of the population is Hispanic or Latino
- 31% of district residents live below 200% of poverty level

Southern Extension District

In 2021, 830,215 Idaho residents lived in the Southern Extension District.

- 46% of the state’s population
- 2021 unemployment rates in the district ranged from 0.7% in Valley County to 9.7% in Adams County
- From 2016 to 2021, the population of the district increased 11% (+24,585)
- Canyon County had the second highest population increase in Idaho (+24,585)
- Ada County had the highest population increase in Idaho (+59,448)
- 14% of the population is Hispanic or Latino
- 28% of district residents live below 200% of poverty level
- The number of jobs in 6/10 counties grew more between 2010 and 2020 than the population.
2021 unemployment rates in the district ranged from 0.3% in Oneida County to 6.7% in Lincoln County.

From 2016 to 2021, the population of the district increased by 7%. All counties in the district increased in population except for Lincoln County. Twin Falls County had the highest population increase.

25% of the population is Hispanic or Latino, and 36% of district residents live below 200% of poverty level.

The number of jobs in 8 out of 10 counties grew more between 2010 and 2020 than the total population.

In 2021, 216,957 Idaho residents lived in the Central Extension District, which is 12% of the state’s population. In 2021, the unemployment rates in the district ranged from 0.3% in Oneida County to 6.7% in Lincoln County.

In 2021, 404,938 Idaho residents lived in the Southern Extension District, which is 22% of the state’s population. From 2016 to 2021, the population of the district increased by 9%. Madison County had the highest population increase.

12% of the population is Hispanic or Latino, and 35% of district residents live below 200% of poverty level. From 2016 to 2021, the unemployment rates in the district ranged from 0.8% in Franklin County to 6.5% in Madison County.
General UI Extension Programming

LISTENING SESSION FEEDBACK

Staffing

- Hire more UI Extension staff where needed
- Make UI Extension staff compensation more competitive
- Address high turnover
- Do not rely on volunteers

Offer programs at a variety of times to meet different needs.

Barriers to participating

- Lack of awareness of opportunities
- Time constraints
- Distance to programs

Increase communications and advertising.

COUNTY COMMISSIONER SURVEY

County commissioner survey results revealed tension between the perspective that UI Extension offices and programs need to be better resourced on one hand and concern about impact of increasing such resources on taxpayers on the other.

CLIENT SURVEY

Percent of client survey respondents who said they are “very interested” in learning through select formats. While clients expressed the most interest in in-person formats, there is interest in many forms of delivery.

- In-person workshops / classes (n=808) 56%
- In-person field days (n=811) 51%
- In-person conferences (n=809) 42%
- Combination in-person and online (n=803) 40%
- Online courses (n=806) 39%
- Online videos (for example, YouTube) (n=803) 38%
- Online video conferences / meetings (n=805) 33%
- Online publications and reports (n=811) 32%
- Websites (n=807) 32%
- Webinars (n=796) 31%
- Podcasts / audio recordings (n=812) 27%
- Printed publications / reports (n=810) 26%
- Local newspapers / newsletters (n=809) 18%
- Social media (for example, Facebook) (n=801) 16%
- DVD / Blue-Ray videos (n=803) 10%
## CLIENT SURVEY (CONTINUED)

### Level of likelihood of participating in UI Extension programs, percent of client survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural programs (n=910)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth development programs (n=920)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticultural or small farms programs (n=879)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness programs (n=862)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water programs (n=841)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and natural resource programs (n=850)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development programs (n=836)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extent to which select factors challenge client survey respondents’ ability to participate in UI Extension programs, percent of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Significant challenge</th>
<th>Moderate challenge</th>
<th>Not a challenge at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timing of programs (n=821)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel distance to programs (n=819)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of programs (n=815)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of programs (n=823)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation to programs (n=823)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access (n=816)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (for example, not speaking English) (n=816)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of client survey respondents with children aged 12 or younger, needing child care is a significant challenge for 11% and a moderate challenge for another 28% (n=279).

### Percent of client survey respondents who said they are “very interested” in courses lasting select durations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4 hours (n=796)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day (n=798)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 days (n=798)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 weeks (n=799)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 16 weeks (n=795)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth Development

LISTENING SESSIONS

Youth development needs commonly identified in listening sessions:

- Life skills, soft skills, and character development
- Personal finance skills
- In-person opportunities to support social-emotional wellbeing
- STEM skills
- Vocational and technical training
- Small animal and non-animal 4-H options in addition to large-animal programs

CLIENT SURVEY

How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select youth development topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents:

- Developing youth leadership skills (n=534):
  - High priority: 75%
  - Medium priority: 21%
  - Low priority: 2%
  - Don't know: 2%

- Developing youth skills to thrive (e.g., resume building and managing finances) (n=529):
  - High priority: 67%
  - Medium priority: 26%
  - Low priority: 6%
  - Don't know: 2%

- Social-emotional learning and youth mental health (e.g., managing feelings, relationship skills) (n=527):
  - High priority: 56%
  - Medium priority: 26%
  - Low priority: 14%
  - Don't know: 4%

- Providing curricula and other educational resources (e.g., STEM, civic engagement, health) (n=530):
  - High priority: 54%
  - Medium priority: 34%
  - Low priority: 9%
  - Don't know: 4%

- Training for youth program volunteers (n=531):
  - High priority: 49%
  - Medium priority: 40%
  - Low priority: 8%
  - Don't know: 3%

- Access and equal opportunities for diverse and underserved youth (n=526):
  - High priority: 46%
  - Medium priority: 33%
  - Low priority: 16%
  - Don't know: 4%
In the 2021-2022 school year, 13,427 students were enrolled in 4-H in Idaho.

- 3,389 in the Northern Extension District
- 4,040 in the Eastern Extension District
- 3,026 in the Southern Extension District
- 2,969 in the Central Extension District

In 2021, 2,096 teens ages 16-19 were not enrolled in school or in the workforce.

- 800 in the Eastern Extension District
- 316 in the Northern Extension District
- 652 in the Southern Extension District
- 328 in the Central Extension District

---

**COUNTY COMMISSIONER SURVEY**

Workforce-related needs identified by county commissioners:

- Soft skills
- Affordable housing
- Vocational and technical training programs
- Self-sufficiency
- Child care
- Personal finance skills for youth and adults
CLIENT SURVEY

How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select community development topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Medium priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening food systems (n=459)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening communities (n=458)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship and business skills (n=459)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community infrastructure development (n=454)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote working and e-commerce (n=455)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topics respondents commonly listed:

- Fostering relationships
- Communication and business development
- Population growth

SECONDARY DATA

From 2019 to 2020, the State of Idaho had the largest percent growth in median housing prices in the entire nation.

- Housing prices rose 9.6% in the one year alone.

- 7% of Northern Extension District adults had not graduated from high school in 2021
- 8% of Eastern Extension District adults had not graduated from high school in 2021
- 8% of Southern Extension District adults had not graduated from high school in 2021
- 17% of Central Extension District adults had not graduated from high school in 2021

This is over double the percent of the other Extension districts.
LISTENING SESSIONS

Listening session participants saw a need to raise awareness of the importance of agriculture in Idaho, especially as more people move here from out of state.

COUNTY COMMISSIONER SURVEY

Needs identified by county commissioners:

- Farm succession planning support
- Outreach on emerging agricultural technologies
- Small-acreage farm programming

CLIENT SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select agricultural topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Medium priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land preservation (n=644)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and managing pests (e.g., insects, weeds, diseases) (n=647)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient animal production (n=649)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for new and underserved farmers and ranchers (n=646)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and agricultural business support (e.g., marketing, sales and tax management, succession planning) (n=644)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate-Smart and regenerative agriculture (n=644)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural producer and worker health and safety (n=648)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topics respondents commonly listed:

- Natural resource stewardship and conservation
- Raising livestock and animals
- Farm economic viability
- Home gardening and small-acreage food production
Food Production Systems

SECONDARY DATA

In 2017, Idaho had 24,996 farm operations with >11 million acres of land.

In 2017, the state’s agricultural sector employed about 50,000 workers.

Median farm size in Idaho: **34 acres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension District</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counties with median farm size at or less than 15 acres:

- **ADA COUNTY**
  - 1,304 farms with a median size of 9 acres.
- **CANYON COUNTY**
  - 2,289 farms with a median size of 10 acres.
- **BONNEVILLE COUNTY**
  - 1,109 farms with a median size of 13 acres.
- **BOISE COUNTY**
  - 90 farms with a median size of 15 acres.

Health & Wellness

LISTENING SESSIONS

The need to increase cooking, nutrition, and “healthy living” skills were common listening session themes.

CLIENT SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

Topics respondents commonly listed:

- Exercise classes
- Healthy eating
Health & Wellness

SECONDARY DATA

In 14 counties, each doctor is responsible for the care of over 3,000 residents.

In 6 counties, there is only ONE physician.

Clark and Camas counties have ZERO physicians.

In 2020, 1,818 babies were born pre-term.

1,481 babies born had low birth weight, and

817 babies were born to mothers who had not received prenatal care or had received it only in the 3rd trimester of pregnancy.

Health indicators include

Health outcomes
(length of life, overall health)

Health factors
(health behaviors, clinical care, social factors, economic factors, physical environmental factors)

The counties with the highest health outcomes are
1. Valley County
2. Ada County
3. Blaine County
4. Latah County
5. Teton County

The counties with the highest health factors are
1. Ada County
2. Latah County
3. Madison County
4. Jefferson County
5. Teton County

The counties with the lowest health outcomes are
1. Benewah County
2. Shoshone County
3. Lincoln County
4. Owyhee County
5. Lemhi County

The counties with the lowest health factors are
1. Shoshone County
2. Owyhee County
3. Lincoln County
4. Benewah County
5. Clearwater County

How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select health and wellness topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Medium priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to affordable, healthy food (n=538)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe food preparation and storage (n=535)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health and stress management (n=536)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and family financial planning (n=543)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy physical activity (n=539)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic disease prevention and management (e.g., cancer, heart disease, stroke, diabetes) (n=544)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Client Survey Highlights

How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select horticultural and small farms topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Medium priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-season gardening (n=645)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and managing pests (e.g., insects, weeds, diseases) (n=651)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permaculture (self-sustaining food production) practices (n=650)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food independence on a homestead (n=645)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating value-added products (n=649)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market gardening (n=646)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listening Sessions

Listening session themes included:

- Role of gardening to increase self-sufficiency
- Need for small-acreage farm production programming

### County Commissioner Survey

County commissioner survey participants saw the need for small-acreage and “hobby” farm programming.

### Topics respondents commonly listed:

- Water conservation
- Specialty crops
- Livestock and animals
- Soil management
LISTENING SESSION HIGHLIGHTS

Asking in the listening sessions “What matters in your life?” Participants frequently answered “nature,” “the environment,” and “the outdoors.”

CLIENT SURVEY

How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select forestry and natural resource topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents

- High priority
- Medium priority
- Low priority
- Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing wildfire risks (n=384)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing impacts of invasive species on forests and rangelands (n=385)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing forests and rangelands for improved health and growth (n=386)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting forest and range management to changing climate (n=386)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing and supporting the forest and range management workforce (n=383)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing carbon markets and managing forests and rangelands for optimum carbon sequestration (n=386)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECONDARY DATA

In 2021, forestry contributed $2 billion to the state’s gross product.

The forestry and natural resources industry employees:

- $2 billion to the state’s gross product.
- >31,000 people throughout.
- >200 businesses related to manufacturing and wholesaling.
How much of a priority client survey respondents believe select water topics should be for new UI Extension programs and resources, percent of respondents

- **Water use efficiency** (n=500)
  - High priority: 76%
  - Medium priority: 20%
  - Low priority: 3%
  - Don't know: 1%

- **Drinking water quality** (e.g., source water and wellhead protection) (n=505)
  - High priority: 66%
  - Medium priority: 28%
  - Low priority: 4%
  - Don't know: 1%

- **Water supply** (e.g., snowpack and aquifer storage maximization) (n=503)
  - High priority: 65%
  - Medium priority: 30%
  - Low priority: 4%
  - Don't know: 2%

- **Surface and groundwater quality** (n=506)
  - High priority: 60%
  - Medium priority: 34%
  - Low priority: 2%
  - Don't know: 10%

- **Developing probable water supply forecasts earlier in the season** (n=504)
  - High priority: 44%
  - Medium priority: 42%
  - Low priority: 5%
  - Don't know: 4%

- **Urban stormwater management** (n=505)
  - High priority: 33%
  - Medium priority: 35%
  - Low priority: 27%
  - Don't know: 5%

**SECONDARY DATA**

- **In 2015**, 15.3 billion gallons of water were used for irrigation in Idaho.
- **276 million gallons** of water were used for public supply per day.
- 744 million gallons used for irrigation in the Northern Extension District.
- 5.1 billion gallons in the Eastern Extension District.
- 6.1 billion gallons in the Central Extension District.

**Water**