
SOCIOECONOMICS APPENDIX

SOCIOECONOMICS APPENDIX

Attitudes, Beliefs, Lifestyles, and Values

Population Groups

General information about population groups was developed from a number of sources, including the documents cited in the text. While the generalized characterizations are not likely to apply to all individuals, the intention is to provide an idea of the range of the attitudes and lifestyles of the population subgroups present in the study area.

The study area population is largely rural, with strong ties to the land and to the many small towns. Ranch and farm families are one of the major groups of people living in the study area. They tend to favor traditional land uses and the preservation of intergenerational family operations. They may feel reluctance toward short-term developments that will alter their lifestyle. The study area population also includes long-time small town residents. While these people generally wish to maintain their way of life, at the same time, some may seek to find a compromise between their current situation and gradual development.

Another portion of the population in the study area is Native Americans, many of whom are residents of the three Indian reservations within the study area. These groups generally desire to preserve many elements of their heritage and do not wish to become homogenized into and by the non-Indian culture. At the same time, some tribal members or subgroups are pursuing the development of energy resources for the long-term social and economic betterment of tribal members.

A small but growing population is made up of professionals, craftspeople, retirees, and others who have moved to small towns to enjoy the slower pace of life and various amenities. While the forested areas of western Montana tend to attract more of this group than eastern Montana, these people are present in the study area as well. They may participate in opposition to development proposals that appear to jeopardize the quality of their new lifestyles.

Areas where energy resources are developed often see the influx of people from other areas. Many of these people regard their employment as temporary, expect to move on to other areas, and do not play an integral part in community affairs. Long-term local residents

often resent these “outsiders” while at the same time realizing some economic benefits from the business and service demands of these newcomers.

In summary, residents generally value the rural character of their lifestyle. Specific aspects of this lifestyle might include appreciation of wide-open spaces, natural landscape, fresh air and solitude. The lifestyle of rural communities often offers the desirable qualities of neighbors knowing each other, lack of urban problems, relaxed pace, personal freedom, and being a good place to raise children. Longtime residents often want to see continued control of the land at the local level without interference from outside agencies or groups.

Public Comments from EIS Scoping Process (2001)

The public comments received during the Statewide Document scoping process convey important information about general attitudes toward coal bed natural gas (CBNG) and other energy or mineral development. The vast majority of public comments received during scoping relayed concerns about potential impacts on water quality and quantity. Specifically, commentators were concerned with the discharge of water of poor quality (e.g., saline) and the drawdown of groundwater aquifers.

Public comments are often shaped by an individual’s lifestyle and livelihood. For example, ranching and irrigated agriculture are both dependent on the supply of water. Of the comments received by individuals engaged in farming and ranching, a great many related to concerns about potential degradation of water quality and quantity, in addition to general environmental impacts. The comments reflect a tension between the desire for new development to support the often stagnant rural economies and the concern that such development could harm the environment and the lifestyle qualities for which Montana is known, including natural beauty, wide-open spaces, and solitude.

In general the comments reflect a difference in attitudes toward CBNG development among those individuals and organizations that might profit directly from CBNG and those that would not. Those who own land or mineral rights where CBNG could be developed tend to favor cautious and prudent development for the economic benefits it could bring to them and the local economies. Some who do not stand

to benefit directly also favor responsible CBNG development as soon as possible, believing the economic benefits are needed urgently to bolster stagnant or failing local economies and in turn help maintain existing rural lifestyles. Particularly in the less affluent portions of the study area, CBNG and other resource development may be seen as one of the few means to meet urgent human needs in the form of employment and income.

Other individuals, including those who do not stand to benefit directly from CBNG, are concerned that the quality of their life and the environment will be adversely affected; that local benefits will be minor; and that most of the benefits will accrue to outsiders. There is a perception that such outside developers, or “wildcatters,” will move into a community, extract the profits, and leave a despoiled environment behind. Rural residents, including those in small developments or neighborhoods, are generally concerned about the potential for CBNG development in adjacent areas to disturb the peaceful and pristine setting, to contribute unsightly development, to disturb wildlife, and to threaten the provision of adequate public services.

There is also a perception from some comments that CBNG will adversely affect the lifestyles of the Native Americans living in and around the 13-county Planning Area—particularly those on the reservations. Concerns reflect the traditional high value placed on natural resources by these groups, the importance of existing water and other natural resources in tribal economies and cultures, and the opinion that tribal members will be unduly burdened with the costs of development while not receiving many or any benefits.

Public Comments from SEIS Scoping Process (2005)

Scoping comments received in the summer of 2005 reflect similar concerns about and support for CBNG development as those expressed during scoping for the Statewide Document. In addition, there was a concern that delayed or phased development would create economic impacts. Specifically, lessees and lessors would lose revenue due to leasing and permitting delays and the state would have a net present value loss in income and payroll taxes, as well as production taxes and royalties. There were also concerns about the displacement of wildlife to livestock grazing tracts, the subsequent interference with livestock grazing, and the potential effect on sub-irrigated tracts.

Newspaper Reports

One of the largest newspapers in the Planning Area, the *Billings Gazette*, was reviewed for information about local attitudes and concerns related to the socioeconomics of CBNG. During the week of February 19, 2001, the *Billings Gazette* presented an in-depth report on CBNG development in Wyoming and Montana. While the series was running, readers were invited to register their opinions about the positive and negative aspects of CBNG in the Powder River Basin. Because this was not a scientific or statistical survey, the responses are likely to be biased toward those who had a concern or issue to communicate.

Of the 154 responses received, 94 agreed with the statement, “Coal bed methane development will be detrimental to Montana’s environment and shouldn’t be developed here.” Thirty-seven respondents agreed with the statement, “Coal bed methane should be developed in Montana with regulation to reduce negative affects on water and other land uses,” and 23 selected the statement, “Coal bed methane will bring jobs and money to Montana and should be developed as soon as possible.” (*Billings Gazette* 2001.) Thus, roughly one-third of the respondents supported CBNG development and two-thirds did not. A number of other written comments were published, which generally reflect the diversity of opinions described previously in the public comments section.

The results of a poll conducted by Montana State University at Billings were reported in the *Billings Gazette* on November 14, 2001. Of the respondents to this poll, 63 percent indicated support for CBNG in Montana if reasonable precautions were taken to protect the environment. Of the remainder of those polled, 11 percent indicated that CBNG should not be developed, 11 percent indicated it should be developed as quickly as possible, and 15 percent were undecided.

The Coalbed Natural Gas Alliance conducted a poll in the fall of 2004, and the results were reported in an article published by the *Billings Gazette* on January 19, 2005. The survey involved 450 landowners from a mailing list generated by six of the area’s largest CBNG producers (Marathon, Devon, Huber, Fidelity, Yates Petroleum, and Nance). Of those responding to the survey, 36 percent said that the overall impact of CBNG development on their community has been “very positive,” while 77 percent responded between “very positive” and “neutral.” For a similar question regarding effects of CBNG development on the environment, 47 percent responded either “positive” or “neutral” and 32 percent responded “somewhat

negative.” The article also presented comments on the survey from the director of the Powder River Basin Resource Council and a ranch owner. Their comments indicated that the survey results contradicted what they have experienced with ranchers and landowners.

Attitudes Toward Public Lands

Attitudes about general social conditions and about U.S. Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM’s) management of public lands in eastern Montana were gathered by Trent (1991) in interviews with about 100 residents. The results are summarized here from the discussion in the *Big Dry RMP/EIS* (BLM 1995). The residents indicated the most important aspects of their area and community were the outdoors and wide open spaces, good people, a small town atmosphere, keeping the community alive, the ability to earn a living, enjoying outdoor recreation, and, finally, that the area is a good place to raise children.

In relation to use and management of public lands, many of the respondents stated the importance of multiple uses and support for resource protection while allowing a variety of activities on public lands. Vegetation and soils were identified as the resources most important to protect, with livestock grazing and hunting the most favored activities. Recreation was slightly less favored and oil/gas, coal, and other mineral development were less favored than recreation. Concern about local economic conditions was predominant among the respondents. Respondents were concerned about the livestock industry, citing it as the most threatened activity on public lands. The respondents also were concerned with resource protection and preserving special resource values such as wildlife habitat, riparian areas, and wetlands.

Another summary of attitudes toward public lands and resource management is provided in the *Off-Highway Vehicle Final EIS* (U.S. Department of the Interior [USDI] 2001). The document states that social values for lands and natural resources take many forms, such as commodity, amenity, environmental quality, ecology, public use, spiritual, health, and security. In the past, natural resource management tended to emphasize commodity values. An emerging emphasis is a shift from commodities and services to environments and habitats. At the same time, in places where land use has been unrestricted, there is increasing concern by some that new regulations and uses are driving out traditional uses such as livestock grazing and off-highway vehicle use.

Oil and Gas Development

Other past data on attitudes toward oil and gas development is contained in the report “Natural Resource Development in Montana” (Wallwork and Johnson 1986). The discussion here is summarized from the *Final Oil and Gas RMP/EIS Amendment for Billings, Powder River and South Dakota* (1992). The original study consisted of interviews with 624 Montana adults. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents indicated natural resource development, in general, to be essential to the State’s future economic health. The primary benefits were construed to be jobs and income, help the state and local economy, tax revenues, and the provision of needed products. Respondents indicated the primary costs or disadvantages associated with natural resource development would be environmental impacts, pollution, poor reclamation, population growth, and boom-and-bust economic cycles. About three-fifths of the respondents saw little or no conflict between natural resource development and outdoor recreation, while one-fourth felt that the two activities did conflict.

Most respondents in the 1986 interviews felt the following activities should be allowed on government lands: timber cutting (85 percent approval); oil and gas extraction (83 percent); coal mining (78 percent); and hardrock mining (79 percent). Some respondents felt the following activities should be prohibited on government lands: timber cutting (11 percent disapproval); oil and gas extraction (12 percent); coal mining (17 percent); and hard rock mining (15 percent). In response to specific questions about oil and gas leasing and development, about half the respondents felt oil and gas development to be essential to Montana’s future economic health, with a higher percentage of respondents in eastern Montana feeling this way. Another third of the respondents indicated oil and gas development to be fairly essential. Responses to the pace of development were evenly split, with nearly 40 percent responding that it was just right and 40 percent feeling it was too slow. Nearly 75 percent of the respondents said they had a favorable impression of the industry. About two-fifths of the eastern Montana respondents rated the industry excellent or pretty good in its behavior as a responsible citizen of the state. Another two-fifths of these respondents rated the industry as only fair or poor in its behavior as a responsible state citizen.

Northern Cheyenne and Crow Tribes

Attitudes toward coal development among the members of the Northern Cheyenne and Crow tribes are described in the Economic, Social and Cultural Supplement to the *Powder River I Regional Draft EIS* (BLM 1989). While there may be differences in attitudes between coal development and natural gas (CBNG), there are also likely to be similarities.

Northern Cheyenne attitudes toward coal development are complex. In general, tribal members have shown a determination to maximize the potential benefits of coal development (such as training and employment opportunities and possible revenue sources) and to minimize the potential adverse effects (such as air quality degradation and increased demand on tribal facilities and services). In spite of the conflict it causes with traditional values and attitudes toward land and resources, many tribal members felt that if mining is going to occur in the area anyway, then the tribe and its members should try to reap some of its benefits as well as bear some of its costs. However, other Northern Cheyenne, particularly some of the more traditional elders, were firmly against energy development because of its disruption to the land and environment. They recognized that there is a need for jobs on the reservation but felt that other jobs that were less disruptive to the land and traditional values must be found.

The attitudes of individual Northern Cheyenne members toward coal development off the reservation reflected their perceptions about whether, and to what extent, they or their friends and family were benefiting from it. Those who were benefiting from coal-related employment or who aspired to do so seemed to be in favor of this development. Those who had been refused

coal-related jobs or were not interested in them felt less positive about regional coal development. Many cited both positive effects (mostly jobs) and negative effects (environmental pollution, increased traffic, and drug and alcohol problems) that they believed were associated with the coal mines and power plants that had been constructed since 1970.

For residents of the Crow Reservation, a high level of concern was found regarding the impact that off-reservation coal development could have on the reservation. Three major concerns emerged regarding off-reservation coal development: 1) that it would compete with the marketing and development of on-reservation coal; 2) that reservation services and infrastructure would be affected and experience fiscal shortfalls; and 3) that regional coal development could have an impact on Crow culture and individual behavior such as alcohol and drug abuse. Specific cultural concerns included potential loss or dilution of culture values such as sharing and the importance of family as a result of the exposure to non-Native American values.

Many people on the Crow Reservation, including tribal officials, expressed the concern that federal coal would compete directly with tribal-owned coal. If federal coal is leased, then tribal-owned coal is less likely to be leased. Tribal coal leasing was seen by some members as a way for the tribe to raise money to save its land base and to enhance the tribe's ability to govern itself. If the tribe can generate its own revenues, it can determine how that money is spent and will no longer have to depend on the federal government to address problems.

See the section **Public Comments from SEIS Scoping Process (2005)** for a discussion regarding tribal concerns related to socioeconomic impacts from CBNG development.

Government Revenue Sources

Total county revenues for fiscal years 1999 and 2004 are presented in Table SEA-1. The table shows that the total revenues collected in the 13 Planning Area counties accounted for 21.0 percent of the revenues collected by all of the counties in the State in 1999 and 16.3 percent in 2004. By comparison, the Planning Area population was 21.8 percent of the state total in 2000.

Taxes

Total taxes collected by counties are shown in Table SEA-1. With some exceptions, taxes account for a large share—often about one half—of total county revenue. Counties that are less reliant on tax revenues have other miscellaneous income or intergovernmental income, generally related to natural resources rents or royalties.

Property Taxes and Assessed Value

Property taxes are levied by counties on real property and on any specified facilities and/or improvements to that real property.

The assessed value, taxable value, and total property taxes collected for the state and each study area county in 2000 are presented in Table SEA-2. The average mill levy rate for each county is also shown. Property taxes collected in the 13 study-area counties totaled more than \$182 million, which is 23.0 percent of the state total. The percentage of property taxes collected in the study area is consistent with the study area population, which was similarly 21.8 percent of the state total in 2000. The taxes collected in the counties vary widely in accordance with the assessed values, taxable values, and tax rates and mill levies in each county.

Table SEA-4 shows the assessed value, taxable value, and total property taxes and fees collected in 2004 for

each of the 13 counties in the study area. Total property taxes collected increased over 30 percent from 2000; however, the total of \$239 million constituted 23.6 percent of the state total, which is similar to the proportion observed in 2000. Much of increase in property taxes came from Big Horn and Yellowstone counties, while smaller increases occurred for Carbon, Custer, Rosebud, Stillwater, and Sweet Grass counties. Total property taxes collected for the other counties in the study area were relatively unchanged between 2000 and 2004.

Natural Resource Taxes

Natural resource taxes were a relatively small component of total tax revenues, at \$100 million or 6.5 percent. Natural resource taxes include taxes on coal, oil, natural gas, and metals mining. Table SEA-4 shows the State oil and natural gas tax revenues for 1999 and 2000. Total natural gas revenues were \$11,205,901 in 2000—an increase of 8.1 percent from the previous year—while total oil revenues were \$32,564,421—an increase of 59.1 percent from 1999. For both oil and natural gas, revenues in 2000 were 42.0 percent higher than 1999.

As shown in Table SEA-1, county revenues from oil and natural gas production taxes and the percent of these revenues compared to total county revenues varied greatly among the 13 study-area counties. For a number of the counties, the income was minimal or zero. The exceptions include Blaine County (\$626,111 or 15.7 percent of county revenue), Carbon County (\$178,443 or 4.1 percent) and Musselshell County (\$256,627 or 7.1 percent). (Note: The Oil and Gas Production Tax [LGST] was eliminated after 1999.)

Oil and natural gas production tax revenues collected by the state of Montana from 1999 through 2004 are shown in Table SEA-5. While oil and natural gas revenues increased substantially in 2000 and 2001, 2002 revenues were markedly lower. In 2003 and 2004, the state share of these revenues has surpassed the 2002 total, while the local share remains below the 2002 high.

TABLE SEA-1
TOTAL COUNTY REVENUES BY SOURCE, FISCAL YEARS 1999¹ AND 2004

	Revenue Source	Amount (1999)	% of County Total (1999)	Amount (2004)	% of County Total (2004)
Big Horn County	Taxes	\$4,481,631	44.6%	\$4,098,456	38.9%
	Licenses and Permits	\$114,511	1.1%	\$5,020	0.0%
	Intergovernmental	\$1,235,480	12.3%	\$3,226,513	30.7%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$5,280	0.1%		
	Charges for Services	\$1,364,573	13.6%	\$2,224,803	21.1%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$115,996	1.2%	\$104,961	1.0%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$2,090,577	20.8%	\$779,100	7.4%
	Investment Earnings	\$643,663	6.4%	\$84,096	0.8%
	Total:	\$10,046,431	100.0%	\$10,522,949	100.0%
Carbon County	Taxes	\$2,243,839	51.8%	\$2,832,181	53.0%
	Licenses and Permits	\$158,176	3.7%	\$23,010	0.4%
	Intergovernmental	\$1,441,197	33.3%	\$2,020,479	37.8%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$178,443	4.1%		
	Charges for Services	\$196,394	4.5%	\$264,928	5.0%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$62,692	1.4%	\$71,730	1.3%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$62,203	1.4%	\$68,384	1.3%
	Investment Earnings	\$164,215	3.8%	\$64,181	1.2%
	Total:	\$4,328,716	100.0%	\$5,344,893	100.0%
Carter County	Taxes	\$1,026,167	53.9%	\$1,503,686	61.9%
	Licenses and Permits	\$20,765	1.1%	\$80	0.0%
	Intergovernmental	\$267,473	14.1%	\$614,190	25.3%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)				
	Charges for Services	\$100,220	5.3%	\$191,450	7.9%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$6,569	0.3%	\$6,238	0.3%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$399,562	21.0%	\$85,202	3.5%
	Investment Earnings	\$82,130	4.3%	\$29,395	1.2%
	Total:	\$1,902,886	100.0%	\$2,430,241	100.0%

SOCIOECONOMICS APPENDIX
Government Revenue Sources

TABLE SEA-1
TOTAL COUNTY REVENUES BY SOURCE, FISCAL YEARS 1999¹ AND 2004

Revenue Source		Amount (1999)	% of County Total (1999)	Amount (2004)	% of County Total (2004)
Custer County	Taxes	\$2,327,867	49.8%	\$2,865,221	52.7%
	Licenses and Permits	\$110,737	2.4%	\$1,930	0.0%
	Intergovernmental	\$1,042,529	22.3%	\$1,519,309	28.0%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$41,434	0.9%		
	Charges for Services	\$484,733	10.4%	\$634,756	11.7%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$68,931	1.5%	\$71,477	1.3%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$471,159	10.1%	\$257,342	4.7%
	Investment Earnings	\$163,813	3.5%	\$84,131	1.5%
	Total:	\$4,669,769	100.0%	\$5,434,166	100.0%
Golden Valley County	Taxes	\$387,137	57.0%	\$426,703	52.0%
	Licenses and Permits	\$13,242	1.9%	\$480	0.1%
	Intergovernmental	\$174,519	25.7%	\$286,189	34.9%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$6,415	0.9%		
	Charges for Services	\$22,560	3.3%	\$29,886	3.6%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$13,219	1.9%	\$10,484	1.3%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$4,967	0.7%	\$3,903	0.5%
	Investment Earnings	\$63,575	9.4%	\$62,381	7.6%
	Total:	\$679,219	100.0%	\$820,026	100.0%
Musselshell County	Taxes	\$1,084,288	30.1%	\$1,305,277	37.0%
	Licenses and Permits	\$73,915	2.0%	\$1,835	0.1%
	Intergovernmental	\$739,530	20.5%	\$1,616,815	45.9%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$256,627	7.1%		
	Charges for Services	\$256,627	7.1%	\$354,328	10.1%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$35,272	1.0%	\$77,828	2.2%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$1,287,222	35.7%	\$89,835	2.5%
	Investment Earnings	\$130,944	3.6%	\$79,074	2.2%
	Total:	\$3,607,798	100.0%	\$3,524,992	100.0%

TABLE SEA-1
TOTAL COUNTY REVENUES BY SOURCE, FISCAL YEARS 1999¹ AND 2004

Revenue Source		Amount (1999)	% of County Total (1999)	Amount (2004)	% of County Total (2004)
Powder River County	Taxes	\$1,193,285	37.7%	\$1,732,413	37.8%
	Licenses and Permits	\$44,235	1.4%	\$905	0.0%
	Intergovernmental	\$586,548	18.5%	\$1,174,272	25.6%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$89,261	2.8%		
	Charges for Services	\$1,177,971	37.2%	\$1,555,757	33.9%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$29,218	0.9%	\$42,180	0.9%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$50,028	1.6%	\$52,971	1.2%
	Investment Earnings	\$86,243	2.7%	\$29,086	0.6%
Total:	\$3,167,528	100.0%	\$4,587,584	100.0%	
Rosebud County	Taxes	\$3,736,882	50.7%	\$2,417,614	32.2%
	Licenses and Permits	\$96,804	1.3%	\$1,450	0.0%
	Intergovernmental	\$1,627,917	22.1%	\$3,574,494	47.6%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$14,024	0.2%		
	Charges for Services	\$642,491	8.7%	\$1,132,386	15.1%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$86,111	1.2%	\$61,590	0.8%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$824,751	11.2%	\$80,518	1.1%
	Investment Earnings	\$349,646	4.7%	\$249,154	3.3%
Total:	\$7,364,602	100.0%	\$7,517,206	100.0%	
Stillwater County	Taxes	\$2,302,415	8.3%	\$2,365,085	51.5%
	Licenses and Permits	\$338,758	1.2%	\$17,420	0.4%
	Intergovernmental	\$24,113,855	86.8%	\$1,177,398	25.7%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$11,326	0.0%		
	Charges for Services	\$256,559	0.9%	\$717,346	15.6%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$101,596	0.4%	\$115,777	2.5%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$445,202	1.6%	\$163,371	3.6%
	Investment Earnings	\$215,360	0.8%	\$33,644	0.7%
Total:	\$27,773,745	100.0%	\$4,590,041	100.0%	

TABLE SEA-1
TOTAL COUNTY REVENUES BY SOURCE, FISCAL YEARS 1999¹ AND 2004

Revenue Source		Amount (1999)	% of County Total (1999)	Amount (2004)	% of County Total (2004)
Sweet Grass County	Taxes	No Report Received		\$2,082,286	22.1%
	Licenses and Permits			\$345	0.0%
	Intergovernmental			\$2,366,927	25.1%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)				
	Charges for Services			\$4,247,320	45.0%
	Fines and Forfeitures			\$56,549	0.6%
	Miscellaneous Revenue			\$640,310	6.8%
	Investment Earnings			\$41,322	0.4%
	Total:			\$9,435,059	100.0%
Treasure County	Taxes	\$422,269	60.4%	\$474,025	52.8%
	Licenses and Permits	\$16,076	2.3%		
	Intergovernmental	\$124,734	17.8%	\$259,193	28.9%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)				
	Charges for Services	\$46,933	6.7%	\$87,309	9.7%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$47,409	6.8%	\$19,906	2.2%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$16,561	2.4%	\$48,112	5.4%
	Investment Earnings	\$25,710	3.7%	\$8,568	1.0%
	Total:	\$699,692	100.0%	\$897,113	100.0%
Wheatland County	Taxes	\$20,477	0.84%	\$1,141,255	59.7%
	Licenses and Permits	\$240,304	9.9%		
	Intergovernmental	\$132,438	5.4%	\$520,918	27.2%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)				
	Charges for Services	\$25,717	1.06%	\$182,543	9.5%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$416,588	17.2%	\$18,068	0.9%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$22,246	0.92%	\$10,066	0.5%
	Investment Earnings	\$1,557,462	64.5%	\$38,797	2.0%
	Total:	\$2,415,232	100.0%	\$1,911,647	100.0%

TABLE SEA-1
TOTAL COUNTY REVENUES BY SOURCE, FISCAL YEARS 1999¹ AND 2004

Revenue Source		Amount (1999)	% of County Total (1999)	Amount (2004)	% of County Total (2004)
Yellowstone County	Taxes	\$16,996,908	44.1%	\$20,549,931	49.2%
	Licenses and Permits	\$2,732,460	7.1%	\$3,482,605	8.3%
	Intergovernmental	\$7,946,773	20.6%	\$6,345,544	15.2%
	Oil and Gas Production Tax (LGST) (Included in Intergovernmental above)	\$5,155	0.0%		
	Charges for Services	\$8,757,415	22.7%	\$10,103,632	24.2%
	Fines and Forfeitures	\$676,103	1.8%	\$737,145	1.8%
	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$240,406	0.6%	\$251,641	0.6%
	Investment Earnings	\$1,232,920	3.2%	\$260,324	0.6%
Total:		\$38,582,985	100.0%	\$41,730,822	100.0%
Study Area Total²		119,820,279		\$98,746,739	
% of State Total		21.0%		16.3%	
Montana State Total		569,806,112		604,483,926	

Source: Montana Department of Commerce, Billings (2000, 2006).

¹Based on unaudited data reported by Counties.

²1999 total does not include Sweet Grass County (no data available).

TABLE SEA-2

ASSESSED VALUES AND PROPERTY TAX COLLECTIONS BY COUNTY (2000)

	2000 Assessed Value	2000 Taxable Value	Total Property Taxes and fees Collected	Average Mill Levy
Big Horn County	\$565,023,700	\$21,354,436	\$6,952,144	293.77
Carbon County	\$521,678,159	\$23,754,742	\$9,288,300	349.51
Carter County	\$120,132,817	\$6,808,649	\$2,382,143	329.01
Custer County	\$371,459,345	\$14,389,152	\$8,806,856	460.53
Golden Valley County	\$98,470,244	\$5,687,402	\$1,784,283	305.79
Musselshell County	\$179,355,501	\$6,881,914	\$3,173,428	393.23
Powder River County	\$125,672,599	\$4,415,991	\$2,227,445	463.94
Rosebud County	\$1,957,565,773	\$100,635,100	\$20,804,541	173.34
Stillwater County	\$697,014,674	\$28,705,444	\$10,708,053	319.89
Sweet Grass County	\$247,083,525	\$9,532,599	\$3,677,085	354.74
Treasure County	\$86,217,475	\$4,306,117	\$1,646,795	329.73
Wheatland County	\$162,260,802	\$10,468,500	\$3,263,418	297.22
Yellowstone County	\$5,245,460,701	\$204,127,734	\$107,952,414	378.48
Study Area Total	\$10,377,395,315	\$441,067,780	\$182,666,905	--
% of State Total	no data	26.3%	23.0%	--
Montana	no data	\$1,679,739,857	\$794,598,177	--

Source: Montana Department of Revenue (2000).

SOCIOECONOMICS APPENDIX
 Government Revenue Sources

TABLE SEA-3

ASSESSED VALUES AND PROPERTY TAX COLLECTIONS BY COUNTY (2004)

	2004 Assessed Value	2004 Taxable Value	Total Property Taxes and fees Collected
Big Horn County	\$509,234,496	\$19,071,825	\$13,500,559
Carbon County	\$604,545,613	\$24,558,032	\$12,059,295
Carter County	\$128,295,092	\$10,269,939	\$3,692,825
Custer County	\$395,219,177	\$14,165,809	\$11,267,038
Golden Valley County	\$94,613,026	\$4,919,186	\$1,905,042
Musselshell County	\$200,581,108	\$6,560,315	\$3,949,930
Powder River County	\$119,338,454	\$4,005,441	\$2,554,997
Rosebud County	\$1,676,984,323	\$84,867,600	\$22,071,869
Stillwater County	\$767,840,416	\$28,823,824	\$12,852,966
Sweet Grass County	\$447,045,426	\$14,688,014	\$6,087,181
Treasure County	\$82,736,041	\$3,932,398	\$1,780,852
Wheatland County	\$152,027,561	\$9,001,462	\$3,497,120
Yellowstone County	\$6,077,895,654	\$215,714,493	\$143,708,149
Study Area Total	\$11,256,356,387	\$440,578,338	\$238,927,823
% of State Total	22.8%	24.8%	23.6%
Montana	\$49,450,862,550	\$1,779,929,986	\$1,014,487,652

Source: Montana Department of Revenue (2004).

TABLE SEA-4

MONTANA OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION TAX REVENUES (1999 AND 2000)

	1999	2000	% Change 1999-2000
Natural Gas Tax Revenues	\$10,367,718	\$11,205,901	8.1%
% of Total	33.6%	25.6%	
Oil Tax Revenues	\$20,461,684	\$32,564,421	59.1%
% of Total	66.4%	74.4%	
Total	\$30,829,402	\$43,770,322	42.0%

Source: Montana Department of Revenue (2000).

TABLE SEA-5

MONTANA OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION TAX REVENUES (1999 THROUGH 2004)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total State Share	\$9,221,612	\$13,817,290	\$31,392,351	\$15,837,967	\$30,894,533	\$47,712,085
% Change from Previous Year		49.8%	127.2%	-49.5%	95.1%	54.4%
Total Local Share	\$21,607,789	\$29,953,032	\$61,425,763	\$34,465,644	\$42,494,843	\$44,963,964
% Change from Previous Year		38.6%	105.1%	-43.9%	23.3%	5.8%
Total	\$30,829,401	\$43,770,322	\$92,818,114	\$50,303,611	\$73,389,376	\$92,676,049
% Increase from Previous Year		42.0%	112.1%	-45.8%	45.9%	26.3%

Source: Montana Department of Revenue (2004).