ANALYSIS OF THE SECONDARY EFFECTS OF THE WESTSIDE AND MIDDLE FORK WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Edward B. Bradley Paul J. Farris James J. Jacobs

October 1985 WWRC-85-05

Department of Agricultural Economics College of Agriculture University of Wyoming

Research Project Technical Completion Report (USGS G-943, Project No. 04)

> Prepared for: U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey

The research on which this report is based was financed in part by the United States Department of the Interior as authorized by the Water Research and Development Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-467).

Contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the United States Department of the Interior, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute their endorsement by the U.S. Government.

> Wyoming Water Research Center University of Wyoming Laramie, Wyoming

Contents of this publication have been reviewed only for editorial and grammatical correctness, not for technical accuracy. The material presented herein resulted from objective research sponsored by the Wyoming Water Research Center, however views presented reflect neither a consensus of opinion nor the views and policies of the Water Research Center or the University of Wyoming. Explicit findings and implicit interpretations of this document are the sole responsibility of the author(s).

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I	
Introduction	1
General Problem	1
Practical and Theorectical Significance	1
Objectives	3
αυλοπές τι	
Droblom Sotting	4
Hestoide Trrigation Project	6
Cree Production	Ř
	10
Project Costs	11
Project Employment	12
Middle Fork Dam and Reservoir	15
Crop Production	15
Coal Gasification	15
Construction Costs	10
Employment	10
Conceptual Framework	18
Inter-industry Linkages and Secondary Effects	19
Demographic Effects	20
Fiscal Effects	20
Methodology of Impact Assessment	21
CHAPTER III	
Design of Research	22
CHAPTER IV	
Results of the Westside Analyses	24
Regional Economic Impact Projections	24
Public Sector Effects	35
CHAPTER V	48
Results of the Middle Fork Analyses	40
Regional Economic Impact Projections	40 61
Public Sector Ellects	01
CHAPTER VI	
Summary and Conclusions	79
·	

List of Tables

			Page
Table	1.	Projected Revenue from Project Lands - 9,026 Acres	11
Table	2.	Increase in Annual Gross Revenue per Acre from Supplying Supplemental Water	17
Table	3.	Counties in Regions 1-6 (Wyoming)	23
Table	4.	Westside 9,026 Acre Project: Economic Overview	25
Table	5.	Westside 20,718 Acre Project: Economic Overview	25
Tabl e	6.	Projected Business Activity for the Westside Scenarios and Projected Increase in Business Activity from Addition of the Westside Scenarios, Region 6	28
Table	7.	Projected Personal Income for the Westside Scenarios and Projected Personal Income from the Addition of the Westside Scenarios	29
Table	8.	Projected Baseline Employment by Sector, Region 6	30
Table	8.1	Projected Baseline Employment by Sector, Region 6	31
Table	9.	Change in Projected Employment by Sector from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6	32
Table	10.	Change in Projected Employment by Sector from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6	33
Table	11.	Projected Population for the Westside Scenarios, Region 6	34
Table	12.	Projected Baseline Number of Students by County, Region 6	37
Table	13.	Projected Increase in Students by County, Region 6, from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario	38
Table	14.	Projected Increase in Students by County, Region 6, from Addition of Westside 20,718 Scenario	39
Tabl e	15.	Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6	40
Table	16.	Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6	41
Table	17.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6	42

			Page
Table	18.	Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6	43
Table	19.	Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6	44
Table	20.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6	45
Table	21.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario	46
Table	22.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario	47
Table	23.	Middle Fork Dam and Reservoir Project	50
Table	24.	375 MMSCFD Coal Gasification Project	51
Table	25.	Projected Business Activity for the Middle Fork Scenarios, Region l	52
Table	26.	Projected Increase in Business Activity from Addition of the Middle Fork Scenario, Region l	53
Table	27.	Projected Personal Income for the Middle Fork Scenarios, Region 1	54
Table	28.	Projected Increase in Personal Income from Addition of the Middle Fork Scenarios	55
Table	29.	Projected Baseline Employment by Sector, Region 1	56
Table	30.	Projected Increase in Employment by Sector from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1	57
Table	31.	Projected Increase in Employment by Sector from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1	58
Table	32.	Projected Increase in Employment by Sector from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenarios, Region 1	59
Table	33.	Projected Population from Addition of Middle Fork Scenarios, Region l	60
Table	34.	Projected Baseline Number of Students by County, Region 1	63
Table	35.	Projected Increase in Number of Students by County from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir, Region 1	64

iii

Table	36.	Projected Increase in Number of Students by County from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1	65
Table	37.	Projected Increase in Number of Students by County from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenarios, Region 1	66
Table	38.	Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1	67
Table	39.	Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1	68
Table	40.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1	69
Table	41.	Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region l	70
Table	42.	Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region l	71
Table	43.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1	72
Table	44.	Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenarios, Region l	73
Table	45.	Projected Increase in State Expenditures from the Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and the Coal Gasification Plant Scenarios, Region 1	74
Table	46.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1	75
Table	47.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region l	76
Table	48.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region l	77
Table	49.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenario, Region l	78

Page

List of Figures

		1 460
Figure 1.	Westside Project Location Map	7
Figure 2.	Middle Fork Project Location Map	14

CHAPTER I

Introduction

General Problem

Although agricultural, industrial, municipal, and recreational demand for water has continued to grow in recent years, federal support for water development projects has dwindled. Several western states, especially Wyoming, have decided to expand their own programs to compensate for contractions in federal water development programs. The water planning and development agencies of these states have entered a field new to them. Previously the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have borne the principal responsibilities for planning and overseeing the construction of large-scale water development projects. State agencies have just begun to formulate policies and implement procedures for planning, evaluating, selecting, financing, constructing and operating state water development projects. The shift of water development responsibilities to state government has many implications for the planning, evaluation and selection of water projects. Practical and Theoretical Significance

Benefit-cost analysis has been used in planning and evaluating federally supported water projects ever since passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936. This act declared that the benefits, to whomsoever they may accrue, of federal water projects should exceed costs. While federal agencies have relied heavily upon the criterion of economic efficiency to evaluate the expected performance of proposed water projects, in the past they have included secondary benefits arising from jobs created indirectly from projects. But since 1973, the principles and guidelines of the Water Resource Council have largely limited analyses of economic efficiency to only the primary (direct) benefits and costs of water projects. Given the shift in responsibilities for water resource development to the states, the federal accounting stance, for which the federal principles and guidelines were drafted, is no longer applicable.

States may want to institute their own policies and procedures for water resources planning, ones consistent with their own goals and oriented from their own accounting stance. If a state primarily wants to increase its economic production, then economic efficiency should be the principal criterion used to evaluate proposed water projects. With this goal a state would concern itself only with those benefits and costs which accrue to or are borne by its residents. A benefit-cost analysis from the state point of view can not evaluate the total (i.e., primary and secondary) effects of a project as easily as a benefit-cost analysis from the federal point of view. From the federal viewpoint, secondary benefits and costs can be presumed to cancel each other out; thus, they can be ignored. But from the state viewpoint, secondary benefits may be significantly less than or greater than secondary costs; thus, they need to be identified, measured and included within analyses of state water projects.

A state could choose to use its water development program not only to increase economic activity, but also to redistribute income and economic growth to depressed areas. If this is the case, state officials will want to know how benefits from any prospective project will be distributed. Such information would also help in determining whether project beneficiaries could afford to support a project through users fees or other special assessments.

While the rationale behind including indirect effects and distributional effects within the framework for evaluating state water projects is clear, the practicalness of attempting to do so is not. Can information on these effects be obtained in a readily useable and interpretable form? In recent years,

economists and other social scientists have developed a new field of study called socioeconomic impact assessment. This field of study has developed specific methods and knowledge for identifying, analyzing, and evaluating the socioeconomic impacts resulting from a particular action. Researchers in this field have developed a number of techniques and models that assess the expected impact of developing large-scale energy projects in rural areas, but nobody has attempted to determine whether such models could be readily adapted and used to assess the distributional consequences and indirect benefits and costs of proposed water projects. If it is practical to do so, then information from a socioeconomic impact assessment could be used to expand the effects included within the benefit-cost framework for planning and evaluating a proposed project and to help evaluate the distributive effects of the project.

Objectives

The objective of this study is to demonstrate that a state-of-the-art impact assessment model can be used to identify and quantify the expected indirect effects and distributional effects of state water development projects. Embodied in this overall objective are the following specific objectives.

- To identify and quantify the expected indirect effects and distributional effects of developing the proposed Westside Irrigation project in Wyoming.
- To identify and quantify the expected effects for the proposed Middle Fork project in Wyoming.
- 3. To discuss how inclusion of the expected indirect benefits and costs, and the expected distributional effects contributes to the economic analysis of both the Westside and Middle Fork projects.

Presently the Wyoming Water Development Commission is planning and evaluating approximately 30 potential state projects. The techniques used in

this study to identify indirect effects and distributional effects of projects are readily available for further use in project planning and evaluation.

CHAPTER II

Problem Setting

Throughout this century the construction of federal water development projects (i.e., water reservoirs and irrigation systems) has been seen as a boon for economic growth in the West. From the viewpoint of host communities and states, federal water projects provide substantial benefits and impose only minor costs. Construction of reservoirs and irrigation systems, for example, creates additional business activity and employment in the local construction and agriculture sectors. As business activity and employment in these sectors increases, local construction workers, farm workers, construction companies and farm operators gain direct benefits from a project through additions to their incomes. Another important category of project impacts is its secondary effects. The increases in business activity and employment in the local construction and agricultural sectors typically increases business activity and employment in other local business and service sectors that are either forwardly linked or backwardly linked to the sectors directly effected by a water project. The income gains resulting from these indirect increases in business activity and employment are secondary benefits captured by the host community and state. Other secondary benefits from water project that typically are captured by host communities and states include state and local tax base expansion and population growth or stabilization.

Federal water projects, when costs are examined, also appear desirable from the viewpoint of host communities and states because most of their direct

and indirect costs are borne by individuals and businesses located elsewhere. The main cost imposed on host communities and states are for any additional public services and infrastructure needed to support the population growth induced by a project. Given that the benefits of water projects are received mainly by those in the immediate vicinity, while the costs of projects can be shifted elsewhere certainly explains why people in the western states ardently support federal water development programs. From a local perspective, it is perfectly rational to support the building of water projects in one's region, especially if most costs can be shifted elsewhere.

From a national efficiency viewpoint, society can be assured that projects where total benefits to society exceed total costs are good for society. This test, referred to as the Hicks-Kaldor criterion is generally regarded as the efficiency criterion to follow in the selection of federal water projects. Local arguments for federal funding for projects that fail this test are essentially arguments for a "beggar-thy-neighbor" approach for local economic development.

The recent shifting of responsibilities for water development programs to states from the federal level also shifts much of the total costs associated with water projects as well. With the change in responsibilities states can now use the Hicks-Kaldor criterion to test whether projects are efficient from their own perspective. Some projects that are not economically efficient from the national perspective may be efficient from a state perspective, but many projects will be found to be inefficient from either perspective.

The recent shift in water development responsibilities back to state governments has a number of implications. First, much of the total costs of constructing water projects has also shifted back to states. Second, many

proposed projects that would have been desirable for states had they been built with federal funds, will not be efficient for states to build. Third, states will need to carefully scrutinize their choice of projects for state funding (i.e., choose mainly those which will provide net economic benefits) or else water development will stymie rather than promote a state's economic development. Each of these implications suggest that the consequences of alternative state projects need to be thoroughly studied from the state perspective; and that the consequences may prove to be far less attractive to states, as they traditionally have been. The consequences for Wyoming of building water projects (i.e., the proposed Westside and Middle Fork projects) may not be well understood.

Westside Irrigation Project

The proposed Westside Irrigation Project is located in Washakie and Big Horn counties between the cities of Basin to the north and Worland to the south (Figure 1). The development would take place along the west side of the Big Horn Canal, a privately owned canal which is currently used for irrigation purposes. The additional water used by the project would irrigate land in addition to that already being irrigated by the Big Horn Canal. Project lands are upper benches which lie primarily above and to the west of existing irrigated acreage in the area. Presently, the project lands are used mostly for grazing of livestock. The project is motivated by the potential to increase the value of the public rangeland by converting its use to irrigated crop production. Without the project, the Westside area would continue to be used as rangeland.

Several studies of the Westside Irrigation Project have been done. In the early stages of analysis the proposed project assumed development of about 21,000 acres for irrigation purposes. More recent reports however, have



scaled down the amount of irrigable acres to be developed. A common project size in various studies is 9,026 acres. Both project sizes will be considered in this analysis.

The water for irrigation of the 9,026 acres would come from Boysen Reservoir which is located near Thermopolis. The water in Boysen Reservoir would flow into the Big Horn Canal. The total water requirement for irrigation of the 9,026 acres would be approximately 20,363 acre feet of water annually. If development of 20,718 acres took place it would require 63,000 acre feet of water annually. This water would be pumped from the river into the Big Horn Canal with high volume pumps. In turn, the water would be pumped under pressure to fields.¹

Much of the terrain in the project area is irrigable only by sprinkler systems. Because land that would be affected by the project are terraces, the project is assessed on the basis of side-roll or hand-move sprinkler system which would minimize the difficulties of irrigating slopes.²

In 1980 the population of Washakie and Big Horn Counties was 11,896 and 9,496 respectively. The population increased 20 percent in the last decade after two decades of decline.³ Most of the work force in the area is employed in manufacturing or minerals industries. Agriculture employs 7.5% of the work force in the area.

Crop Production

Currently, the main crops grown in the project area are sugar beets, malt

³ Ibid.

¹ In actuality parts of the 21,078 acres would be at different elevations. For more detail see <u>Feasibility Study of Big Horn Westside Irrigation</u> <u>District</u>, Clyde-Criddle-Woodward, Inc., June, 1975.

² Westside Irrigation Project - Special Report, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region, September, 1983.

or feed barley, corn for grain or silage, alfalfa, dry beans and oats. In 1980, 79 percent of irrigated land was devoted to sugar beets, barley and alfalfa, 10 percent was corn, and 11 percent dry beans and other minor crops.⁴ However, if more irrigation water becomes available other crops may be included in the farmers' cropping patterns. Big Horn and Washakie counties constitute one of the primary cash crop areas of Wyoming.

One factor determining the feasibility of the irrigation project is the expected monetary returns from the additional land brought into irrigated crop production. In estimating the productivity of the project lands it is assumed that only four crops would be grown; alfalfa, barley, corn grain and sugar beets. The yields per acre assumed for these crops are: alfalfa, 4.5 ton, barley, 90 bu., corn grain, 100 bu., and sugar beets, 22 tons.⁵ One-third of the project lands is assumed to be brought into production each year for the three years following construction (i.e., 3,009 or 6,906 acres per year depending on project size).⁶

In order to obtain and maintain good crop yields in subsequent years, it is necessary to rotate crops. In a study on the Westside Irrigation Project, Agee (1977) budgeted a crop plan for a 5-year development period.⁷ In the first year the land brought into production would be planted in barley. The second year the 3,009 (6,906) acres brought in would be in barley with alfalfa seeded into stubble after barley harvest. For the next three years alfalfa would be grown. A 7-year post development plan was also estimated. In this budget, sugar beets

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Obtained from personal communications with Drs. Douglas E. Agee and James J. Jacobs, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wyoming.

⁶ Ibid.

¹ <u>Report on the Westside Irrigation Project Water Payment Possibilities</u> <u>Worland-Manderson-Basin Area</u>, Agricultural Extension Service, University of Wyoming, Laramie, November, 1977.

(the main cash crop for the area) would not be planted until the eighth year following completion of the project. The optimal crop mix at the end of the development period is estimated to be 33 percent alfalfa, 20 percent barley, 25 percent corn grain, and 22 percent sugar beets.⁸

The prices assumed for the crops grown are, \$59.94/ton for alfalfa, \$2.69/bu for barley, \$2.74/lb for corn grain, and \$42.39/ton for sugar beets.⁹ Given the optimal crop mix stated above, projected annual revenue for the 9,026 acre project after full production of the land is underway is \$3,755,366 or \$416 per acre. A breakdown of the revenue is provided in Table 1. A similar projection could be made for the 20,718 acre project. Net revenues per acre, however, are far less. For a comparable cropping system, Jacobs estimated the annual net return to land and irrigation water for the Westside project to be \$29.95 per acre. At a four percent discount rate the 9,026 acre project was estimated to have a direct benefit-cost ratio of 0.22 to 1.00.¹⁰ Project Costs

The total construction cost of the proposed 9,026 acre irrigation project was estimated to be \$10,444,080 in 1980 dollars¹¹ The annual operation, maintenance and replacement cost was estimated to be \$374,246.¹² Construction of the irrigation system is estimated to take two years. The 20,718 acre

- Assumed prices are the 1979-81 average annual prices, calculated from the annual prices published in Wyoming Agricultural Statistics.
- ¹⁰ James J. Jacobs, "Development of Water Resources: An Evaluation of the Westside Irrigation Project." Unpublished Paper, February 1984.
- Westside Irrigation Project Special Report, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region, September, 1983.

¹² Ibid.

⁸ Obtained from personal communications with Drs. Douglas E. Agee and James J. Jacobs.

Crop	Percent of Total Land	Actual Acres	Yield/ Acre	Price	Revenue
Alfalfa	33	2,979	4.5 ton	\$59.94	\$ 803,412
Barley	20	1,805	90 bu.	2.69	437,039
Corn	25	2,257	110 bu.	2.74	680,109
Beets	22	1,986	22 ton	40.32	1,834,805
					\$3,755,366

Table 1. Projected Revenue from Project Lands - 9,026 Acres

project is estimated to have a total construction cost of \$14,691,217 in 1980 dollars and is estimated to take three years to construct.¹³ Project Employment

Presently, there are 211 farmers in the Westside area who irrigate a total of 23,500 acres.¹⁴ With the 9,026 acre alternative it is assumed that land brought into production through the project would be added on to existing farms. On average, this would be an additional 43 acres per farm, however, it is unlikely that the land would be distributed so uniformly. Regardless of how it is distributed it is assumed no new farms would be created from the additional acreage.

From an employment standpoint, it is estimated that the additional 9,026 acres would result in seventeen new jobs (i.e., full-time equivalent).¹⁵ Five

¹³ Feasibility Study of Big Horn Westside Irrigation District, Clyde-Criddle-Woodward, Inc., June, 1975.

Westside Irrigation Project - Special Report, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region, September, 1983.

¹⁵ Estimated based upon personal communications with Mr. Jack Kempler and Dr. James J. Jacobs, J. T. Banner & Associates and the University of Wyoming, respectively.

people would be employed to maintain the water delivery system and the other 12 would be employed in agriculture. Also, it is estimated that the construction of the project would involve short-term employment of 126 worker years during the peak year of construction which would be the second year.¹⁶

The 20,718 acre project would most likely involve the creation of new farms as well as add-on's to existing farms. It is estimated that additional acreage would result in 80 new farm units and therefore, 80 families.¹⁷ Total additional long-term employment stemming from the project is estimated to be 154 man-years (i.e., 7 maintenance worker man-years, 67 migrant farm worker man-years and 80 farm operator man-years) to maintain full irrigated production. The number of workers required to construct the water delivery system is estimated to be 79, 118, and 79 workers respectively, over a three year period.¹⁸

Middle Fork Dam and Reservoir

The Middle Fork Dam and Reservoir has been proposed for construction by the Power River Reservoir Corporation of Kaycee, Wyoming. The corporation was formed to facilitate the planning of the reservoir and consists of members (landholders) of the Middle Fork Irrigation District. Kaycee is located in Johnson County in northeastern Wyoming. The reservoir would be located about 12 miles west of Kaycee on the middle fork of the Powder River. A map of the project area is provided in Figure 2.

Two uses of the reservoir are being considered. One use of the reservoir

¹⁶ Westside Irrigation Project - Special Report, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region, September, 1983.

Personal communication with Dr. James J. Jacobs, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wyoming.

¹⁸ Personal communications with Mr. Jack Kempler, J.T. Banner & Associates.

would be to provide supplemental water on existing irrigation lands. Water from the reservoir would supplement water presently available from the Sahara Ditch, east of Kaycee. The additional supply of water would provide supplemental water for approximately 5,100 acres of presently irrigated lands. The water necessary to meet the supplemental irrigation is estimated to be about 6,000 acre feet per year which is well within the reservoir's capacity.

The second potential use of the reservoir would be to supply water for a coal gasification plant in addition to water supplied for irrigation purposes. Although no gasification plant currently exists in the vicinity of the project area, due to the slump in energy prices since 1980, it is not unreasonable to consider the existence of one in the future. Expanding the use of the reservoir for industrial purposes would increase the total value of water supplied by the reservoir. Discussions with the coal-energy companies indicated that while they may likely use the water resource in conjunction with development of their coal reserves, they have no firm plans regarding water use.²⁰ Thus, any consideration of using the Middle Fork Reservoir's supply of water for industrial purposes is purely conjecture. It is estimated that 27,000 acre feet per year, used at the rate of 2,250 acre feet per month, would be available for industrial use.²¹ The area of consideration for a coal gasification plant is approximately 20 miles south of Gillette, Wyoming, located in northeastern Wyoming.

The Middle Fork Irrigation District consists of a group of approximately 22 operators whose holdings are located primarily along the Powder River below Kaycee. The river flows due east for 18 to 20 miles below Kaycee and then turns sharply northward. The lands to be irrigated are located along this stretch of

²¹ Ibid.

Environmental Impact Statement, U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, January, 1976.



Figure

river between Kaycee and the bend.²²

Crop Production

The principal crops grown in the project area are alfalfa, alfalfa hay mixtures (improved hay), oats (cover crop), and irrigated pasture. The majority of these crops are fed locally to livestock. A typical agricultural operation consists of approximately 340 irrigated acres along with substantial summer range for pasturing livestock.²³ Current yields per acre for crops grown in the project area are assumed to be 3 tons for alfalfa, 2.2 tons for improved hay, 60 bushels for oat cover crop, and 3.5 AUM's for irrigated pasture.²⁴

A baseline estimate of gross returns per acre for the typical operator in the project area assuming the above yields is \$133.36 (Table 2). This is the gross return per acre prior to implementation of the irrigation project. In contrast, gross return per acre for existing irrigated lands, assuming a full water supply, is estimated to be \$193.75 (i.e., \$60.39 more per acre). The increased estimate is based on the assumption that yields would increase as a consequence of the supplemental irrigation from the Middle Fork Reservoir. Net revenue per acre is expected to increase by \$40.30 with supplemental irrigation.²⁵

Coal Gasification

In the coal gasification process there is a relationship between the amount of water used and the amount of synthetic natural gas produced. A plant of

25 Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ <u>Middle Fork Powder Dam and Reservoir Project, Level II, Agricultural Ability to Pay Analysis</u>, Preliminary Report, Western Research Corporation, 1984.

²⁴ Ibid.

typical size would be rated at a production of 250 million standard cubic feet per day (MMSCFD). This would require about 8,300 acre feet of water per year to operate.²⁶ Since it is assumed that the total water available for industrial purposes from the reservoir would be 27,000 acre feet, a 750 MMSCFD gasification plant could be supported or perhaps, two 375 MMSCFD size plants. In this study, the impacts of building and operating one 375 MMSCFD plant with water from the Middle Fork reservoir will be assessed. Approximately 12,500 acre feet of water would be necessary to operate the plant.

Synthetic pipeline gas is the principal product for which the plant is designed, however, there are a number of saleable by-products of the gasification process. These include sulfur, tar, tar oil, phenols and ammonia. The coal required to operate a 375 MMSCFD gasification plant is approximately 13,500,000 tons per year.²⁷ Coal reserves required for a 375 MMSCFD plant size, assuming a 30-year life for the plant, are estimated to be 405,000,000 tons.²⁸ Construction Costs

The total construction cost of the reservoir is estimated to be \$10,958,149 in 1980 dollars, with the annual operating and maintenance cost being \$159,478.²⁹ Construction time is estimated to be two years. Employment

It is estimated that if use of the reservoir is limited to agricultural

29

^{26 &}lt;u>Environmental Impact Statement</u>, U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, January, 1976.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Thid.

⁵ Engineering Feasibility Report on the Middle Fork Powder River Dam and <u>Reservoir</u>, J. F. Banner and Assoc., Laramie, WY, 1970. The 1970 costs were inflated to 1980 prices using cost indices from the <u>Engineering News</u> Reporter.

	Current Land Use			Expected Land Use			
Crop	Cropping Pattern	Yield/ Acre	Gross Return/ Acre	Cropping Pattern	Yield/ Acre	Gross Return/ Acre	
Alfalfa <u>a</u> /	.338	3.0 tons	\$62.30	.529	4.0 tons	\$129.21	
Improved <u>b</u> / Hay Oats <u>c</u> /	.368 .059	2.2 tons 70 bu.	50.18 8.19	.288 -	2.7 tons -	47.91	
Oat Cover Crop	.059	60 bu.	7.15	.094	75 bu.	13.86	
Irrigated <u>d</u> / Pasture	.176	3.5 AUM's	5.54	.088	3.5 AUM's	2.77	
D			\$133.36			\$193.75	
kevenue Increase					\$60	0.39/acre	

Table 2.	Increase in	Annual	Gross	Revenue	per	Acre	from	Supplying
	Supplemental	Water.						

Source: Middle Fork Powder Dam and Reservoir Project, Level II, Agricultural Ability to Pay Analysis, Western Research Corporation, 1984.

^a Based upon alfalfa at \$59.94/ton and aftermath grazing at \$4.50/acre.

b Based upon improved hay at \$59.94/ton and aftermath grazing at \$4.50/acre.

^c Based upon oats at \$1.75/bu. and 0.65 tons/acre of straw at \$25/ton.

d Based upon grazing valued at \$9 per AUM.

purposes five additional full-time, permanent jobs would be created as a consequence of construction of the dam.³⁰ Two of these jobs would be devoted to maintenance of the reservoir. The other three people would be employed to accommodate increased crop production. Also, it is estimated that construction of the dam would provide short-term, full-time employment for 115 workers during the first year of construction and 75 workers during the second year.³¹

Expanding the use of the reservoir for industrial purposes would result in a significant increase in employment estimates over those when use of the reservoir is limited to agricultural purposes. A 375 MMSCFD size gasification plant required approximately 1,000 people to operation.³² Construction of the gasification plant is estimated to take five years.³³ On average, 1,750 people would be employed for construction of the plant.³⁴ Because the size of the reservoir would be the same whether used for agricultural or industrial purposes (or both) the number of people to construct the reservoir and to maintain it would be the same as stated above.

Conceptual Framework

All impact assessments are implicitly of net impacts, that is, of impacts caused by a proposed action rather than of all change in a project area. To ascertain net impacts, the future with the proposed action must be compared to the future without the proposed action. Impact analysts, therefore initially construct baseline projections for a study area without a proposed project, and

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² <u>Environmental Impact Statement</u>, U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, January, 1976.

then changes in a wide range of socioeconomic dimensions from initial baseline projections are predicated on the expected expenditure and employment levels resulting from a proposed action. The analysis presented here examines the magnitude and distribution of the economic, demographic and public sector impacts associated with four specific water development projects.

Inter-industry Linkages and Secondary Effects

The evidence which has accumulated to date does suggest that water projects provide substantial benefits to local communities. They can be stimuli to the local economy, which contributes to the stabilization or enhancement of local population and public service bases, and enhancement of the local tax base. Construction of a large-scale water project will affect all aspects of an area's economy. In additional to the direct effects of the project on local employment, business activity and income, substantial secondary (indirect and induced) effects are expected to occur in the area. These secondary effects arise from the multiplier process, whereby an initial economic stimulus to the local economy leads to increased sales by local firms which in turn purchase additional inputs from other local firms and households. These secondary effects associated with consumer businesses and input-supply firms result in local economic activity exceeding the initial primary stimulus. Estimating the magnitude of secondary economic activity (i.e., induced employment, business volume and income) resulting from water development projects are central to the evaluation of the total (i.e., primary and secondary) changes in area employment, business volume and income resulting from water development. Secondary employment estimates are important inputs to making realistic projections of population growth and public service needs associated with water development. Estimates of secondary business activity and income assist in forecasting changes in local and state revenues resulting from

development.³⁵

A mechanism often utilized in estimating the secondary effects of an initial economic stimulus on an area's employment, business activity and income is the input-output model. The model, with quantitative estimates of the interdependencies of an area's economic sectors as suppliers of inputs and purchasers of products, provides the basis for tracing the multiplier effects of water development in the economy.

Demographic Effects

Large-scale water projects in rural areas impact the demographic structure of local communities. The employment opportunities resulting from a new project may lead to the retention of more young adults and to in-migration. The magnitude of population change, the age-sex composition of the new population and the location of population change within an impacted area have substantial implications for public service requirements and can be expected to be a major determinant of the social and public sector (service and fiscal) effects of a project. The composition of population growth can, for example, significantly affect the demand for public school services.

Fiscal Effects

The purpose of fiscal impact analysis is to project the changes in the costs and revenues of government units which are likely to occur in response to a proposed action. The governmental units of primary interest are the state, counties, cities and school districts which may experience significant changes in service demands or revenues as a result of a project. Important variables affecting fiscal impacts include the nature of the new project (especially the

³⁵ Larry F. Leistritz and Steven H. Murdock. <u>The Socioeconomic Impact of Resource Development: Methods of Assessment</u>. Boulder, Colorado. Westview Press, 1981.

capital-labor ratio), the number of additional dependents, residential patterns of the work force, incremental costs of the public services required, and tax and revenue transfer institutions.

Methodology of Impact Assessment

The preceding parts of this section are intended to provide a brief overview of the conceptual issues involved in the socioeconomic impact assessment of a water resource development project. Since none of the issues are mutually independent from each other most impact assessments are done with site-specific computerized models that embody inter-related input-output, demographic, residential allocation, service demand and fiscal impact sub-components.³⁶ Such models, such as the North Dakota Economic-Demographic Assessment Model (NEDAM) and the Texas Assessment Modeling System (TAMS) are expensive in terms of time and money to develop, but are capable of providing timely and readily usable projections of the effects of proposed natural resource developments for state and local decision makers.

All assessment models must be developed for or successfully modified for the unique characteristics (e.g., public revenue and expenditure patterns) of the particular study area in questions. Fortunately the existing computerized socioeconomic impact assessment model NEDAM was recently adapted and expanded for use in six multi-county regions in Wyoming.³⁷ This model for Wyoming projects business activity and personal income at the regional level and

³⁶ Larry F. Leistritz, et al. North Dakota Economic-Demographic Assessment Model (NEDAM: Technical Description. Agricultural Economics Report No. 158, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, September 1982.

³⁷ Randal C. Coon, et al. Expansion and Adaptation of the North Dakota Economic - Demographic Assessment Model (NEDAM) for Wyoming: Technical Description. Agricultural Economics Miscellaneous Report No. 63, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, May 1983.

estimates employment, population and public sector costs and revenues at the state, county and community levels. It is a model which embodies the best available methodology for assessing the secondary effects associated with alternative scenarios of water development.

Water development may have important implications for the public sectors of communities and counties within a project impacted region. Both directly and indirectly, and in the construction and operation phases, a water development project increases the demand for public services and increases municipal, county and state tax bases. If the capital to labor ratio associated with water development is high or if water is used for heavily taxed industrial purposes, then the net fiscal impacts on local and state government is likely to be positive. In fact, county and state government may find it advantageous to provide financial inducements for the construction of particular projects. Conversely, for projects were fiscal impacts are forecast to be negative, some tax rates may have to be raised at the local and/or state level to maintain previous levels of public services. In this latter case projects would act to drain governmental revenues from the juristictions in which they were located.

CHAPTER III

Design of Research

In this study two Westside irrigation projects scenarios and two Middle Fork reservoir project scenarios are examined to estimate the magnitude and distribution of economic, demographic and public sector impacts of these four possible project scenarios. The adapted version of NEDAM, which divides all 23 counties in Wyoming into six multi-county regions, is the impact assessment model used to examine of these scenarios. The counties within its six regions

are identified in Table 3.

Table 3. Counties in Regions 1-6 (Wyoming)

ion 6
, Horn
hakie
: Spring
:k

The Wyoming version of NEDAM (WEDAM) is a multiple-module interactive computer model with essentially the same structure and capabilities as NEDAM. The economic, demographic, residential allocation and fiscal impact modules each are adapted for the economic, demographic and fiscal conditions of Wyoming.⁴⁰ The WEDAM model first computes regional baseline economic activity without a proposed project and then regional economic activity with the development scenario specified for a particular project.

The economic module of WEDAM is driven by a project specific data file, which contains the following information:

- 1. Project starting date,
- 2. Location of Project,
- 3. Number of years after the start of construction that operation begins,
- 4. Tons of coal mined per year -- if it is a coal-energy project,
- 5. Cubic feet of synthetic gas sold per year -- if it is a coal-energy project,
- 6. Project final demand vectors for the following sectors:
 - a) Agriculture
 - b) Households,
 - c) Retail trade, and

⁴⁰ Randal C. Coon, et al. Expansion and Adaptation of the North Dakota Economic - Demographic Assessment Model (NEDAM) for Wyoming: Technical Description. Agricultural Economics Miscellaneous Report No. 63, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, May 1983.

- d) Construction.
- 7. Direct labor,
 - a) Construction (temporary workers), and
 - b) Operation or permanent workers.

Other modules of WEDAM require the following information for their use:

- 1. Birthrates,
- 2. Work force participation rates,
- 3. Family size,
- 4. Assumed inflation rate, and
- 5. Tax rates

CHAPTER IV

Results of the Westside Analyses

The magnitude and distribution of impacts due to a water development project principally are caused by the economic activity, income and employment it generates. The analyses presented in this chapter examine the expected economic, demographic and public sector impacts associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of two alternative Westside irrigation projects. Though several factors contribute to the economic impacts of water resource development, the principal determinants are the costs and revenues from project construction, operation and maintenance. An overview of these determinants of economic change are provided in Tables 4 and 5 for the Westside 9,026 acre and 20,718 acre scenarios, respectively.

Regional Economic Impact Projections

The WEDAM model utilizes regional input-output models to estimate the total effects (both primary and secondary) of developing proposed projects. Baseline estimates of business activity, income, employment and other variables for region 6 without either Westside project are presented in subsequent tables, along with regional estimates of project effects. These baseline estimates are based upon the assumption that final demand for the

	Construction Costs $\frac{a}{2}$ Operation and Maintenance Cos				:s		
	Contract	Payroll &	Material &	Payroll &	Agricultural		
Year	Construction	Salaries	Supplies	Salaries	Revenue		
		(1980	dollars)				
1986							
1987	\$1,779,100	\$1,702,260					
1988	3,558,200	3,404,520					
1989			\$239,146	\$135,100	\$728 , 399		
1990			239,146	135,100	1,456,798		
1991			**	11	2,268,326		
1992			11	**	2,874,846		
1993			**	**	3,315,106		
1994			**	**	3,755,366		
•			•	•	•		
•			•	•	•		
2005			239,146	135,100	3,755,366		

Table 4. Westside 9,026 Acre Project: Economic Overview

^a Construction costs exclude fees for engineering and legal services, interest during construction and allowance for contingencies.

	Construction				
Year	Contract Construction	Payroll & Salaries	Material & Supplies	Payroll & Salaries	Agricultural Revenue
		(1980	dollars)		
1986					
1987	\$2,062,911	\$2,134,580			
1988	3,107,876	3,188,360			
1989	2,062,911	2,134,580	\$379 , 395	\$189,140	\$1,671,943
1990	• •		379,395	189,140	3,343,885
1991			11	11	5,206,641
1992			11	11	6,598,827
1993			11	11	7,609,389
1994			**	**	8,619,950
•			•	•	•
•			•	•	•
2005			379,395	189,140	8,619,950

Table 5. Westside 20,718 Acre Project: Economic Overview

^a Construction costs exclude fees for engineering and legal services, interest during construction and allowances for contingencies.

production of each of the region's basic industrial sectors will grow from 1981-2005 at the same average rates as they did from 1960-80. Any assumption regarding expected growth in the demand for a region's basic output will not accurately depict the future, but historic trends do provide the most defensible bases for making baseline projections from which to assess project impacts.

Development of either Westside project would result in only moderate economic growth for the region (Tables 6-10). Even during the first year of construction when economic growth would be greatest; business activity, income and employment growth for the larger project is projected to be 2.2 percent, 3.3 percent and 2.2 percent, respectively. These growth rates would neither create significant in-migration into the region, nor overburden local governments' ability to provide additional services.

Tables 9 and 10 indicate that the economic stimulus provided by either Westside project would lead to substantial employment increases in trade and service sectors of region 6. For example in 1995, the 9,026 acre project would directly employ 12 agricultural workers and 5 project operation and maintenance workers; however, the project would create employment opportunities for an additional 125 people. This means that the employment multiplier for irrigation development is extremely high in this region.

Previous research has shown that annual population growth rates of 2.5 percent or more imposes stresses on a local government's ability to provide needed facilities and services.⁴¹ Residents often feel dissatisfied with

⁴¹ Kenneth L. Deaver and David L. Brown. <u>Social and Economic Trends in Rural</u> <u>Communities</u>. Economics, Statistics, and Cooperative Service, U.S. <u>Department of Agriculture</u>, The White House Rural Development Background Paper, Washington, D.C., 1979.

public services in communities with rapid growth.⁴² Population growth with the larger Westside project is never projected to be more than 1.8 percent (Table 11), a level that could be easily accommodated.

⁴² Steve Murdock and Eldon Schriner. "Community Service Satisfaction and Stages of Community Development: An examination of Evidence from Impacted Communities," <u>Journal of Community Development Society</u>. Vol. 10, Spring 1979.

			- <u> </u>	Projected Increase in Business Activity From	
		Westside	Westside	Addition of t	he Westside
Year	Westside	Irrig. 9026	Irrig. 20718	9026	20718
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	1,645,124	1,645,124	1,645,124	0	0
1982	1,649,241	1,649,241	1,649,241	0	0
1983	1,481,567	1,481,567	1,481,567	0	0
1984	1,514,158	1,514,158	1,514,158	0	0
1985	1,539,367	1,539,367	1,539,367	0	0
1986	1,562,485	1,562,485	1,562,485	0	0
1987	1,586,700	1,593,644	1,596,368	6,944	9,668
1988	1,610,200	1,623,546	1,625,511	13,346	15,311
1989	1,637,614	1,641,460	1,652,428	3,846	14,814
1990	1,664,320	1,668,286	1,673,007	3,966	8,687
1991	1,685,941	1,690,029	1,694,906	4,088	8,965
1992	1,702,675	1,707,403	1,713,111	4,728	10,436
1993	1,719,413	1,724,782	1,731,320	5,369	11,907
1994	1,736,146	1,742,157	1,749,525	6,011	13,379
1995	1,752,882	1,758,893	1,766,261	6,011	13,379
1996	1,769,620	1,775,631	1,782,999	6,011	13,379
1997	1,786,353	1,792,364	1,799,732	6,011	13,379
1998	1,803,092	1,809,103	1,816,471	6,011	13,379
1999	1,819,827	1,825,838	1,833,206	6,011	13,379
2000	1,836,560	1,842,571	1,849,939	6,011	13,379
2001	1,853,297	1,859,308	1,866,676	6,011	13,379
2002	1,870,033	1,876,044	1,883,412	6,011	13,379
2003	1,886,767	1,892,778	1,900,146	6,011	13,379
2004	1,903,505	1,909,516	1,916,884	6,011	13,379
2005	1,920,239	1,926,250	1,933,618	6,011	13,379

Table 6. Projected Business Activity for the Westside Scenarios and Projected Increase in Business Activitiy from Addition of the Westside Scenarios, Region 6.

In Personal IncolYearWestsideIrrig. 9026Irrig. 20718Addition of the Westside $(\$000)$ ($\$000$)($\000)($\$000$)($\000)($\$000$)($\000)1981 $619,517$ $619,517$ $619,517$ 0 1982 $621,489$ $621,489$ 0 1983 $582,169$ $582,169$ $582,169$ 0 1984 $601,803$ $601,803$ $601,803$ 0 1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 1999 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 82 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ 82 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ 82 1997 $753,057$ $756,985$ $761,816$ $3,928$ 82 1999 $70,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ 82 2000 $779,307$ $783,231$ $788,062$ $3,928$ 82 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$	Projected Increase in Personal Income From	
Year Westside Irrig. 9026 Irrig. 20718 9026 2 (\$000) </th		
1021westside1111g. 30201111g. 20710502024($\$000$)($\000)($\$000$)($\000)($\$000$)($\000)($\$000$)($\$$ 1981619,517619,517619,517001982621,489621,489621,48901983582,169582,169582,16901984601,803601,803601,80301985616,371616,371616,37101986629,502629,502629,50201987643,387648,122650,0174,7351988656,781665,945667,2969,1641989672,865675,359682,9032,4941990688,462691,036694,1142,5741991700,565703,219706,4012,6541992709,313712,391716,1233,0781993718,062721,565725,8473,50371994726,811730,739735,5703,92881995735,057756,985761,8163,92881996744,308748,236753,0673,92881999770,554774,482779,3133,92881999770,554791,980796,8113,92882001788,052791,980796,8113,92882002796,800800,728805,5593,92882003805,549809,477 </th <th>0718</th>	0718	
1981 $619,517$ $619,517$ $619,517$ 0 1982 $621,489$ $621,489$ 0 1983 $582,169$ $582,169$ $582,169$ 1984 $601,803$ $601,803$ $601,803$ 0 1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 86 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ 86 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ 86 1997 $753,057$ $756,985$ $761,816$ $3,928$ 86 1998 $761,806$ $765,734$ $770,565$ $3,928$ 86 1999 $770,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ 86 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ 86 2002 $796,800$ $800,728$ $805,559$ $3,928$ 86 2003 $805,549$ $809,477$ $814,308$ $3,928$ 86	\$000)	
1981 $619,517$ $619,517$ $619,517$ 0 1982 $621,489$ $621,489$ $621,489$ 0 1983 $582,169$ $582,169$ $582,169$ 0 1984 $601,803$ $601,803$ $601,803$ 0 1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 0 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 10 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 10 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 2 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 2 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 0 1993 $718,062$ $721,565$ $725,847$ $3,503$ 7 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 8 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ 8 1997 $753,057$ $756,985$ $761,816$ $3,928$ 8 1998 $761,806$ $765,734$ $770,565$ $3,928$ 8 1998 $761,806$ $765,734$ $770,565$ $3,928$ 8 2000 $779,307$ $783,231$ $786,662$ $3,928$ 8 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ 8 2002 $796,800$ $800,728$ <td><i>,000</i></td>	<i>,000</i>	
1982 $621,489$ $621,489$ $621,489$ 0 1983 $582,169$ $582,169$ $582,169$ 0 1984 $601,803$ $601,803$ $601,803$ 0 1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ $663,781$ 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 106 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 106 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 2565 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 26654 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 6662 1993 $718,062$ $721,565$ $725,847$ $3,503$ 71994 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 86767 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ $86767765,734$ 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ $86767,734$ 1999 $770,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ $8776,734,776,565$ $3,928$ $8776,734,776,565$ $3,928$ $8776,734,776,565$ $3,928,8576,559$ $892,928,8576,559$ $892,928,857,559$ $892,947,78,806,257,92,928,857892,928,957,792,928,928,928,928,928,928,928,928,928,9$	0	
1983 $582,169$ $582,169$ $582,169$ 0 1984 $601,803$ $601,803$ $601,803$ 0 1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 1993 $718,062$ $721,565$ $725,847$ $3,503$ 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 8 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ 8 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ 8 1997 $753,057$ $756,985$ $761,816$ $3,928$ 8 1998 $761,806$ $765,734$ $770,565$ $3,928$ 8 1999 $770,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ 8 2000 $779,307$ $783,231$ $788,062$ $3,928$ 8 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ 8 2002 $796,800$ $800,728$ $805,559$ $3,928$ 8 2003 $805,549$ $809,477$ $814,308$ $3,928$ 8 <	0	
1984 $601,803$ $601,803$ $601,803$ 0 1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 0 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 10 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 10 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 2 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 2 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 0 1993 $718,062$ $721,565$ $725,847$ $3,503$ 7 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 8 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ 8 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ 8 1997 $753,057$ $756,985$ $761,816$ $3,928$ 8 1998 $761,806$ $765,734$ $770,565$ $3,928$ 8 1999 $770,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ 8 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ 8 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ 8 2003 $805,549$ $809,477$ $814,308$ $3,928$ 8 2003 $805,549$ $809,477$ $814,308$ $3,928$ 8 <td>0</td>	0	
1985 $616,371$ $616,371$ 0 1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ 1993 $718,062$ $721,565$ $725,847$ $3,503$ 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ 1999 $770,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ 2000 $779,307$ $783,231$ $788,062$ $3,928$ 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ 2003 $805,549$ $809,477$ $814,308$ $3,928$	0	
1986 $629,502$ $629,502$ $629,502$ 0 1987 $643,387$ $648,122$ $650,017$ $4,735$ 0 1988 $656,781$ $665,945$ $667,296$ $9,164$ 10 1989 $672,865$ $675,359$ $682,903$ $2,494$ 10 1990 $688,462$ $691,036$ $694,114$ $2,574$ 565 1991 $700,565$ $703,219$ $706,401$ $2,654$ $56,733$ 1992 $709,313$ $712,391$ $716,123$ $3,078$ $667,928$ 1993 $718,062$ $721,565$ $725,847$ $3,503$ 570 1994 $726,811$ $730,739$ $735,570$ $3,928$ $867,928$ 1995 $735,559$ $739,487$ $744,318$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 1996 $744,308$ $748,236$ $753,067$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 1997 $753,057$ $756,985$ $761,816$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 1998 $761,806$ $765,734$ $770,565$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 1999 $770,554$ $774,482$ $779,313$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 2000 $779,307$ $783,231$ $788,062$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 2001 $788,052$ $791,980$ $796,811$ $3,928$ $87,928$ 2003 $805,549$ $809,477$ $814,308$ $3,928$ $87,928$	0	
1987 643,387 648,122 650,017 4,735 6 1988 656,781 665,945 667,296 9,164 10 1989 672,865 675,359 682,903 2,494 10 1990 688,462 691,036 694,114 2,574 2 1991 700,565 703,219 706,401 2,654 2 1992 709,313 712,391 716,123 3,078 6 1993 718,062 721,565 725,847 3,503 7 1994 726,811 730,739 735,570 3,928 8 1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 8 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 8 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 8 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 8 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 <td>0</td>	0	
1988 656,781 665,945 667,296 9,164 10 1989 672,865 675,359 682,903 2,494 10 1990 688,462 691,036 694,114 2,574 10 1991 700,565 703,219 706,401 2,654 10 1992 709,313 712,391 716,123 3,078 10 1993 718,062 721,565 725,847 3,503 10 1994 726,811 730,739 735,570 3,928 10 1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 10 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 10 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 10 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 10 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 10 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 10 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928	6,630	
1989672,865675,359682,9032,494101990688,462691,036694,1142,57411991700,565703,219706,4012,65411992709,313712,391716,1233,07861993718,062721,565725,8473,50311994726,811730,739735,5703,92881995735,559739,487744,3183,92881996744,308748,236753,0673,92881997753,057756,985761,8163,92881998761,806765,734770,5653,92881999770,554774,482779,3133,92882000779,307783,231788,0623,92882001788,052791,980796,8113,92882003805,549809,477814,3083,92882004916,208818,226802,0572,0002,028	0.515	
1990688,462691,036694,1142,57411991700,565703,219706,4012,65411992709,313712,391716,1233,07811993718,062721,565725,8473,50311994726,811730,739735,5703,92881995735,559739,487744,3183,92881996744,308748,236753,0673,92881997753,057756,985761,8163,92881998761,806765,734770,5653,92881999770,554774,482779,3133,92882000779,307783,231788,0623,92882001788,052791,980796,8113,92882003805,549809,477814,3083,92882004814,209814,206814,3083,9288	0.038	
1991 700,565 703,219 706,401 2,654 9 1992 709,313 712,391 716,123 3,078 0 1993 718,062 721,565 725,847 3,503 0 1994 726,811 730,739 735,570 3,928 0 1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 0 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 0 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 0 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 0 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 0 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 0 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 0 0 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 0 0 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 0 0	5,652	
1992 709,313 712,391 716,123 3,078 0 1993 718,062 721,565 725,847 3,503 0 1994 726,811 730,739 735,570 3,928 0 1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 0 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 0 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 0 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 0 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 0 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 0 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 0 0 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 0 0 0 0 0 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5,836	
1993 718,062 721,565 725,847 3,503 1994 726,811 730,739 735,570 3,928 8 1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 8 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 8 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 8 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 8 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	6,810	
1994 726,811 730,739 735,570 3,928 8 1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 8 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 8 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 8 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 8 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 8 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	7,785	
1995 735,559 739,487 744,318 3,928 8 1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 8 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 8 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 8 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	8,759	
1996 744,308 748,236 753,067 3,928 3 1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 3 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 3 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 3 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 3 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 3 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 3 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 3	8,759	
1997 753,057 756,985 761,816 3,928 8 1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 8 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	8,759	
1998 761,806 765,734 770,565 3,928 8 1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	8,759	
1999 770,554 774,482 779,313 3,928 8 2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	8,759	
2000 779,307 783,231 788,062 3,928 8 2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8	8,759	
2001 788,052 791,980 796,811 3,928 8 2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8 2004 814,208 818,226 823,057 2,028 8	8,759	
2002 796,800 800,728 805,559 3,928 8 2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8 2004 814,208 818,226 823,057 2,028 8	8,759	
2003 805,549 809,477 814,308 3,928 8 2004 814,208 812,226 823,057 3,028 8	8,759	
	8,759	
2004 014,270 010,220 023,03/ 3,928 8	8,759	
2005 823,047 826,975 831,806 3,928	8,759	

Table 7.	Projected	Personal 2	[ncome	for the	Westsid	e Scenarios	and Projected			
	Personal I	income from	n the .	Addition	of the	Westside Sc	enarios.			
• • • • •					Sec	tor		Whs1.		
-----------	---------	--------	--------	------	---------	-------	--------	-------	------	-------
				Pet.	<u></u>	Con-		Trade		
	Agri-	Metal	Coal	Exp.	0ther	tract	Lumber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal
Year	culture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	Const	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.
1981	1508	0	6	821	420	2286	395	4129	250	0
1982	1497	0	6	825	421	2331	396	4216	247	0
1983	1478	0	6	752	414	2225	397	4285	21	0
1984	1468	0	5	755	415	2268	398	4372	21	0
1985	1458	0	5	758	416	2312	399	4459	21	0
1986	1449	0	5	761	417	2357	400	4546	20	0
1987	1440	0	5	764	418	2402	401	4633	20	0
1988	1432	0	5	767	419	2449	402	4720	20	0
1989	1424	0	5	770	420	2497	403	4807	20	0
1990	1416	0	4	774	421	2546	404	4894	19	0
1991	1409	0	4	777	422	2595	405	4981	19	0
1992	1401	0	4	780	422	2646	406	5069	19	Õ
1993	1395	Õ	4	783	423	2699	406	5156	19	Õ
1994	1388	Õ	4	786	424	2752	407	5243	19	Õ
1995	1382	0	4	789	425	2806	408	5330	19	Ő
1006	1376	0	4	702	426	2862	408	5/17	18	0
1990	1370	0	4	792	420	2002	400	5504	18	0
1000	1364	0	4	795	420	2919	409	5501	18	0
1000	1350	0	4	801	427	2970	409	5678	18	0
2000	1353	0	4	804	420	3100	410	5765	18	0
2000	1000	U	5	004	420	5100	410	5705	10	Ū
2001	1348	0	3	807	429	3163	411	5852	18	0
2002	1343	0	3	810	429	3227	411	5939	17	0
2003	1339	0	3	813	430	3294	412	6026	17	0
2004	1334	0	3	816	430	3362	412	6114	17	0
2005	1329	0	3	819	431	3431	413	6201	17	0

Table 8. Projected Baseline Employment by Sector, Region $6 \frac{a}{a}$

^a The sectors shown are the only sectors that change as addition of projects occur.

		Thermal			Bus./	Prof./			
	Com.	Power	Retail		Pers.	Soc.		Project	
Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	F.I.R.E.	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Induced	Total
976 9an									
561	823	0	4,661	983	1,738	1,458	3,997	0	24,015
563	820	0	4,683	1,001	1,761	1,482	3,969	0	24,218
520	776	0	4,566	985	1,750	1,452	3,801	0	23,429
522	774	0	4,587	1,002	1,773	1,475	3,794	0	23,630
523	771	0	4,607	1,020	1,795	1,499	3,787	0	23,832
525	768	0	4.627	1.038	1.818	1.523	3.780	0	24 034
527	766	õ	4,646	1,055	1,839	1,546	3,773	õ	24,034
528	763	õ	4.665	1,073	1,861	1,570	3,767	Õ	24,230
530	761	õ	4,683	1,091	1,882	1,594	3,761	Õ	24,647
531	759	õ	4,701	1,108	1,903	1,617	3,755	Õ	24,047
551	133	Ū	4,701	1,100	1,703	1,017	5,755	v	24,000
533	756	0	4,719	1,126	1,924	1,641	3,749	0	25,060
534	754	0	4,736	1,144	1,944	1,665	3,744	0	25,268
536	752	0	4,752	1,162	1,964	1,688	3,738	0	25,477
537	750	0	4,769	1,180	1,984	1,712	3,733	0	25,687
539	748	0	4,784	1,198	2,003	1,736	3,728	0	25,898
540	746	0	4,800	1,216	2,023	1,759	3.723	0	26.110
542	744	0	4,815	1,234	2.042	1,783	3.718	Ō	26,323
543	743	0	4.830	1,253	2,061	1,807	3.714	Ō	26,538
545	741	0	4,845	1,271	2.079	1.830	3.709	Ō	26.754
546	739	0	4,859	1,289	2,097	1,854	3,705	0	26,971
5/7	727	0	1. 072	1 207	2 115	1 070	2 701	0	27 100
547	726	0	4,015	1,307	2,110	1,070	3, /01	0	27,109
550	/ JO 72/	0	4,00/	1 244	2,133	1,901	3,090 2,602	0	21,409
551	734	0	4,900	1,344	2,101	1,923	2,072 2,600	0	27,051
221	733	U O	4,913	1 201	2,108 2,106	1,949	3,000 2 601	U	2/,000
223	/ 31	U	4,920	1,301	2,100	1,972	3,084	U	20,078

Table 8.1. Projected Baseline Employment by Sector, Region 6.

						<u> </u>		Whs1.	<u></u>		· · · •									
				Pet.		Contract		Trade					Therma	1		Bus.	Prof.			
Ag	ricul-	Metal	Coa1	Exp.	Other	Const- Lu	umber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal		Com.	Power	Retail	F.I.	/Pers.	/Soc.		Project	
	ture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	ruction 1	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.	Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	R.E.	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Induced	Total
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	2	52	0	7	0	0	1	4	0	34	8	9	13	29	72	231
1988	0	0	0	0	4	105	0	14	0	0	3	9	0	63	16	16	24	54	139	447
1989	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	12	0	0	1	3	0	25	5	6	7	18	17	100
1990	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	12	0	0	1	2	0	26	6	6	7	18	17	102
1991	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	13	0	0	1	3	0	25	6	6	7	19	17	104
1992	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	14	0	0	2	3	0	29	7	8	8	21	17	117
1993	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	16	0	0	1	4	0	33	8	9	10	24	17	130
1994	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	18	0	0	2	4	0	36	9	10	11	26	17	143
1995	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	18	0	0	2	4	0	36	10	10	10	26	17	142
1996	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	19	0	0	2	4	0	36	10	9	11	25	17	141
1997	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	19	0	0	1	4	0	45	10	9	11	25	17	141
1998	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	19	0	0	2	3	0	35	9	9	10	24	17	140
1999	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	19	0	0	1	3	0	34	9	10	11	24	17	139
2000	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	19	0	0	2	3	0	34	10	10	11	24	17	138
2001	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	19	0	0	2	4	0	34	10	10	10	23	17	138
2002	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	19	0	0	1	3	0	33	9	10	11	24	17	137
2003	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	19	0	0	2	3	0	33	10	9	11	23	17	136
2004	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	18	0	0	2	3	0	33	9	10	10	23	17	136
2005	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	18	0	0	1	3	0	32	10	9	11	23	17	135

Table 9. Change in Projected Employment by Sector from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6.

								Whs1.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·										
				Pet.		Contract		Trade					Therma	1		Bus.	Prof.			
I	Agricul-	Metal	Coa1	Exp.	Other	Const- I	Lumber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal		Com.	Power	Retail	F.I.	/Pers.	/Soc.		Project	
	ture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	ruction	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.	Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	R.E.	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Induced	Total
1981	L 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	4 O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
198	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	70	0	0	0	3	63	0	13	0	0	2	8	0	51	12	13	18	41	113	333
1988	в О	0	0	0	4	96	0	23	0	0	4	11	0	7 9	20	20	18	65	178	526
1989) 0	0	0	0	3	71	0	30	0	0	4	10	0	81	20	21	27	64	166	498
1990	0 0	0	0	0	1	11	0	27	0	0	3	5	0	55	14	14	16	40	87	274
1991	L 0	0	0	0	1	13	0	28	0	0	2	6	0	56	14	15	16	41	87	278
1992	20	0	0	0	2	15	0	32	0	0	3	7	0	64	16	17	18	47	109	331
1993	30	0	0	0	2	16	0	37	0	0	3	8	0	73	19	20	22	53	131	383
1994	40	0	0	0	2	19	0	42	0	0	4	9	0	80	21	22	24	59	154	435
1995	50	0	0	0	1	20	0	42	0	0	4	8	0	80	21	22	24	58	154	434
1996	50	0	0	0	1	20	0	42	0	0	4	8	0	78	21.	22	24	57	154	432
1997	70	0	0	0	2	20	0	42	0	0	3	8	0	78	22	21	24	56	154	431
1998	в О	0	0	0	1	20	0	43	0	0	4	7	0	77	21	21	24	55	154	428
1999) 0	0	0	0	1	20	0	43	0	0	3	8	0	76	21	22	24	55	154	427
2000	0 0	0	0	0	2	20	0	43	0	0	4	8	0	75	21	22	24	54	154	425
2001	LO	0	0	0	1	20	0	43	0	0	4	8	0	74	22	22	24	53	154	424
2002	2 0	0	0	0	2	21	0	43	0	0	3	7	0	73	21	21	24	53	154	422
2003	30	0	0	0	1	21	0	43	0	0	4	8	0	73	22	21	24	52	154	420
2004	4 0	0	0	0	2	21	0	42	0	0	4	7	0	72	21	21	24	51	154	420
2005	50	0	0	0	1	22	0	42	0	0	3	7	0	71	22	20	24	51	154	418

Table 10. Change in Projected Employment by Sector from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6.

	W	estside							
	(No	Projects)	Wests	ide 9026		Wests	ide 207	18
			Percent			Percent			Percent
	Population	Change	Change	Population	Change	Change	Population	Change	Change
1980	48,741			48,741			48,741		
1981	49,160	419	1	49,160	419	1	49,160	419	1
1982	49,617	457	1	49,617	457	1	49,617	457	1
1983	49,197	-420	-1	49,197	-420	-1	49,197	-420	-1
1984	49,641	444	1	49,641	444	1	49,641	444	1
1985	50,132	491	1	50,132	491	1	50,132	491	1
1986	50,656	523	1	50,656	523	1	50,656	523	1
1987	51,154	498	1	51,377	721	1	51,550	894	2
1988	51,658	504	1	51,957	580	1	52,237	687	1
1989	52,153	495	1	52,332	375	1	52,770	532	1
1990	52,628	475	1	52,799	467	1	53,067	298	1
1991	53,156	528	1	53,328	529	1	53,576	509	1
1992	2 53,786	630	1	53,973	645	1	54,248	672	1
1993	3 54,466	680	1	54,659	686	1	54,969	721	1
1994	55,114	648	1	55,326	668	1	55,660	691	1
1995	5 55,616	501	1	55,844	518	1	56,208	548	1
1996	56,184	569	1	56,410	566	1	56,795	586	1
1997	7 56,539	355	1	56,794	383	1	57,170	375	1
1998	3 56,786	247	1	57,041	248	0	57,498	329	1
1999	9 57,118	332	1	57,371	329	1	57,871	372	1
2000) 57,317	199	0	57,568	198	0	58,114	243	0
2001	57,677	360	1	57,924	356	1	58,467	353	1
2002	2 58,007	330	1	58,252	329	1	58,785	318	1
2003	3 58,404	397	1	58,646	394	1	59,183	399	1
2004	4 58,809	405	1	59,049	403	1	59,581	398	1
2005	5 59 , 014	205	0	59,251	202	0	59,779	198	0

Table 11. Projected Population for the Westside Scenarios, Region 6.

Public Sector Effects

Development of either Westside project would create, both directly and indirectly, a heightened demand for public services as well as provide a base for generating additional public revenue. The economic and population growth associated with water development generate demand for a variety of public services such as education, law enforcement, road construction, recreation and social welfare. Tables 12-14 provide projections of the number of primary and secondary students that would be within region 6 without either project and the increase in students that would result from the development of either project.

Concomitantly, the economic and demographic changes expand such sources of revenue as property taxes, user fees, sales taxes, and intergovernmental grants and transfer payments to finance required services such as education. The Wyoming School Foundation program, for example, provides transfer payments to support public school systems.

People may hold the hypothesis that irrigation projects are financially beneficial to state government because such projects increase the state's revenue base. While it is true that revenues increase, irrigation projects also induce additional state expenditures as well. The key issue then is whether the increases in state revenue exceed the increases in state costs.

Tables 15-17 and 18-20 provide projections of the increases in state revenue and costs, and net fiscal balance associated with the Westside 9,026 acre and 20,718 acre projects, respectively. Neither project is projected to provide a positive net revenue to the state treasury. Wyoming state government heavily depends upon mineral royalties and severance payments for state revenue; therefore, it should not be a surprise that some irrigation projects would have a negative fiscal impact on state government in Wyoming.

Local governments in Wyoming use property and sales taxes to generate a

substantial portion of their revenue. Both Westside projects are projected to increase the net revenues of local governments within region 6 (Tables 21 and 22). Effected municipalities would experience small fiscal deficits from the projects, while counties would experience small fiscal surpluses which more than offset the municipal deficits. Results of the fiscal impact assessment indicate that public sector, overall would not benefit from either proposed Westside project. Given our current tax system, the secondary fiscal costs outweigh the secondary fiscal benefits of these projects.

		Big Horn	······	1	Hot Springs	,		Park			Washakie	
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
1981	1,255	1,239	2,494	502	532	1,034	2,065	2,308	4,373	962	1,034	1,996
1982	1,250	1,276	2,526	518	521	1,039	2,049	2,252	4,301	9 65	1,052	2,017
1983	1,231	1,240	2,471	510	495	1,005	2,024	2,164	4,188	974	1,026	2,000
1984	1,228	1,219	2,447	507	491	998	2,022	2,126	4,148	973	994	1,967
1985	1,433	1,203	2,636	587	468	1,055	2,326	2,079	4,405	1,159	931	2,090
1986	1.473	1,189	2.662	600	478	1.078	2,350	2.033	4.383	1,188	930	2.118
1987	1,504	1,189	2,693	613	492	1,105	2,366	2,027	4,393	1,210	936	2,146
1988	1,530	1,205	2,735	628	505	1,133	2,408	2.044	4,452	1,245	950	2,195
1989	1,587	1,206	2,793	644	505	1,149	2,455	2.042	4,497	1,285	954	2,239
1990	1,528	1,356	2,884	630	556	1,186	2,368	2,259	4,627	1,256	1,083	2,339
1991	1,569	1,382	2,951	640	567	1,207	2,436	2,261	4,697	1,282	1,104	2,386
1992	1,608	1,400	3,008	646	581	1,227	2,489	2,280	4,769	1,303	1,124	2,427
1993	1,636	1,423	3,059	651	597	1,248	2,553	2,323	4,876	1,330	1,154	2,484
1994	1,679	1,464	3,143	659	606	1,265	2,608	2,397	4,987	1,357	1,183	2,540
1995	1,607	1,488	3,095	626	630	1,256	2,506	2,444	4,950	1,293	1,233	2,526
1996	1.631	1.528	3,159	627	641	1,268	2,545	2.524	5,069	1,297	1,263	2,560
1997	1,645	1,556	3,201	626	646	1,272	2,566	2,565	5,131	1,301	1,279	2,580
1998	1,653	1,565	3,218	625	652	1,277	2,576	2,617	5,193	1,299	1,298	2,597
1999	1,659	1,601	3,260	622	662	1,284	2,580	2,661	5,241	1,303	1,328	2.631
2000	1,655	1,480	3,135	614	608	1,222	2,580	2,486	5,066	1,301	1,229	2,530
2001	1,659	1,494	3,153	611	606	1,217	2,573	2,520	5,093	1,305	1,230	2,535
2002	1,659	1,505	3,164	609	602	1,211	2,564	2,542	5,106	1,308	1,232	2,540
2003	1,659	1,514	3,173	608	597	1,205	2,561	2,561	5,122	1,318	1,236	2,554
2004	1,662	1,518	3,180	609	591	1,200	2,557	2,575	5,132	1,329	1,237	2,566
2005	1,665	1,516	3,181	612	582	1,194	2,561	2,579	5,140	1,350	1,230	2,580

Table 12. Projected Baseline Number of Students by County, Region 6.

		Big Horn		I	lot Springs			Park			Washakie	
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	6	5	11	2	2	4	1	1	2	22	20	42
1988	8	7	15	3	3	6	1	1	2	28	25	53
1989	5	4	9	2	1	3	0	0	0	20	16	36
1990	5	4	9	2	1	3	0	0	0	20	16	36
1991	5	4	9	2	1	3	0	0	0	21	16	37
1992	6	4	10	2	2	4	0	0	0	23	17	40
1993	4	3	7	2	2	4	0	0	0	25	19	44
1994	5	4	9	2	2	4	0	0	0	27	21	48
1995	4	3	7	2	2	4	0	0	0	27	23	50
1996	3	2	5	2	2	4	0	0	0	27	24	51
1997	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	27	24	51
1998	2	2	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	26	24	50
1999	2	1	3	2	2	4	0	0	0	25	24	49
2000	1	1	2	2	2	4	0	0	0	24	24	48
2001	1	1	2	2	2	4	0	0	0	23	23	46
2002	$\overline{1}$	ī	2	2	2	4	Ō	0	0	22	23	45
2003	1	1	2	2	2	4	0	0	0	22	22	44
2004	ī	1	2	2	2	4	Ō	Õ	Õ	21	21	42
2005	1	1	2	1	2	3	Õ	0	Ō	21	20	41

Table 13. Projected Increase in Students by County, Region 6, from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario.

		Big Horn]	Hot Springs			Park			Washakie	
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
											_	-
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	11	10	21	4	3	7	1	1	2	38	35	73
1 9 88	16	14	30	6	5	11	1	1	2	58	51	109
1989	17	14	31	6	5	11	1	1	2	65	54	119
1990	13	10	23	5	4	9	1	1	2	50	39	89
1991	13	9	22	4	3	7	1	1	2	51	38	89
1992	15	11	26	5	4	9	1	1	2	56	41	97
1993	13	10	23	5	4	9	1	1	2	63	47	110
1994	12	9	21	5	4	9	1	1	2	69	54	123
1995	12	10	22	5	5	10	1	1	2	70	57	127
1996	12	10	22	5	5	10	1	1	2	71	60	131
1997	8	7	15	5	5	10	1	1	2	70	60	130
1998	7	6	13	5	5	10	1	1	2	68	61	129
1999	7	6	13	5	5	10	1	1	2	66	60	126
2000	6	6	12	4	4	8	1	1	2	63	60	123
2001	6	5	11	4	4	8	1	1	2	60	60	120
2002	4	4	8	4	4	8	1	1	2	58	59	117
2003	5	5	10	4	4	8	1	1	2	57	58	115
2004	5	5	10	4	4	8	1	1	2	55	56	111
2005	4	4	8	4	4	8	1	1	2	54	53	107

Table 14. Projected Increase in Students by County, Region 6, from Addition of Westside 20,718 Scenario.

				Special	Total
	Sales and	Highway	Cig TAB	Districts	Increase
	Use Tax	Tax	Liq Beer	Fund	in Revenue
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0
1987	119	32	6	1	158
1988	222	43	8	1	274
1989	89	26	5	1	121
1990	92	25	4	1	122
1991	95	25	4	1	125
1992	109	27	5	1	142
1993	123	28	5	1	157
1994	138	30	5	1	174
1995	138	30	5	1	174
1996	138	30	5	1	174
1997	138	30	5	1	174
1998	138	30	5	1	174
1999	138	29	5	1	172
2000	138	28	5	1	172
2001	138	28	5	1	172
2002	138	28	5	1	172
2003	138	27	5	1	171
2004	138	27	5	1	171
2005	138	27	5	1	171

Table 15. Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6.

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			Sales/Use		Cigarette		General		Total
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Educational	Tax	Highway	and	Highway	Government	Highway	Increase in
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Transfers	Transfers	Fund	Tobacco	Operating	Functions	Construction	Expenditures
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1982 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1983 0	1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1984 0	1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984 1985 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1986 0	1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985000000000019860000000000198779395372107531019881117273941417435198968334254809250199068343249749239199170363248729240199278464252779263199378464252789269199484524256829293199686524253799285199788523249769282199889523249729276199983523245679255200178523243629249200275523240599230200466522136539220200566522134509214	1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19881117273941417435198968334254809250199068343249749239199170363248729240199278414252779263199378464252789269199484524257859293199588524256829293199686524251769282199788523249729276199889523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629240200371523138569230200469522136539232200566522136539232	1987	79	39	5	3	72	107	5	310
198968334254809250199068343249749239199170363248729240199278414252779263199378464252789269199484524257859293199588524256829293199686524251769285199788523249729276199889523245679261199983523244659255200178523243629240200275523243659255200178523243629240200275523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1988	111	72	7	3	94	141	7	435
199068343249749239199170363248729240199278414252779263199378464252789269199484524257859293199588524256829293199686524253799285199788524251769282199889523249729276199983523245679255200178523243629240200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1989	68	33	4	2	54	80	9	250
1991 1992 1993 1993 1994 	1990	68	34	3	2	49	74	9	239
199278414252779263199378464252789269199484524257859293199588524256829293199686524253799285199788524251769282199889523249729276199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1991	70	36	3	2	48	72	9	240
199378464252789269199484524257859293199588524256829293199686524253799285199788524251769282199889523249729276199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523240599240200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1992	78	41	4	2	52	77	9	263
199484524257859293199588524256829293199686524253799285199788524251769282199889523249729276199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1993	78	46	4	2	52	78	9	269
199588524256829293199686524253799285199788524251769282199889523249729276199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1994	84	52	4	2	57	85	9	293
1996 1997 1998 1998 1998 200086 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 3 32 2 2 51 2 44 52 2 4479 51 76 49 49 659 9 282 276 261 261 2552001 2002 2003 2003 2004 2003 2004 6678 52 52 52 52 3 32 2 44 45 4462 66 99 240 240 230 230 230 230 222 22001 2003 2004 200578 6652 2 23 3 2 2 2 162 43 62 669 9 240 230 230 222 230 222 2 2	1995	88	52	4	2	56	82	9	293
199788524251769282199889523249729276199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1996	86	52	4	2	53	79	9	285
199889523249729276199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1997	88	52	4	2	51	76	9	282
199983523245679261200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1998	89	52	3	2	49	72	9	276
200080523244659255200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	1999	83	52	3	2	45	67	9	261
200178523243629249200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	2000	80	52	3	2	44	65	9	255
200275523240599240200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	2001	78	52	3	2	43	62	9	249
200371523138569230200469522136539222200566522134509214	2002	75	52	3	2	40	59	9	240
200469522136539222200566522134509214	2003	71	52	3	1	38	56	9	230
2005 66 52 2 1 34 50 9 214	2004	69	52	2	1	36	53	9	222
	2005	66	52	2	1	34	50	9	214

Table 16. Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6.

••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	Total Increase	Total Increase	Net Increase
	in Revenue	in Expenses	or Decrease
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	158	310	-152
1988	274	435	-161
1989	121	250	-129
1990	122	239	-117
1991	125	240	-115
1992	142	263	-121
1993	157	269	-112
1994	174	293	-119
1995	174	293	-119
1996	174	285	-111
1997	174	282	-108
1998	173	276	-103
1999	172	261	-89
2000	172	255	-83
2001	172	249	-77
2002	171	240	-69
2003	171	230	-59
2004	171	222	-51
2005	171	214	-43

Table 17. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario, Region 6.

				Special	Total
	Sales and	Highway	Cig TAB	Districts	Increase
	Use Tax	Tax	Lig Beer	Fund	in Revenue
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0
1987	176	56	10	2	244
1988	279	82	15	3	379
1989	291	87	16	3	397
1990	200	62	11	3	276
1991	206	59	11	3	279
1992	239	65	12	3	319
1993	235	71	13	3	359
1994	305	77	14	3	399
1995	305	79	14	4	402
1006	205	80	1.4	4	602
1990	205	00 77	14	4	403
1000	205	76	14	4	400
1990	305	70	14	4	299
1999	305	75	13	4	297
2000	305	75	15	4	265
2001	305	72	13	4	394
2002	305	70	13	4	392
2003	305	71	13	4	393
2004	305	70	13	4	392
2005	305	70	13	4	392

Table 18. Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside20,718 Scenario, Region 6.

		Sales & Use	<u></u>	Cigarette		General		Total
	Educational	Tax	Highway	and	Highway	Government	Highway	Increase in
	Transfers	Transfers	Fund	Tobacco	Operating	Functions	Construction	Expenditures
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 9 82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	141	57	9	4	127	189	19	546
1988	205	90	13	6	182	272	33	801
1989	226	94	13	7	190	283	46	859
19 9 0	168	75	9	5	128	191	46	622
1991	168	77	8	4	118	176	46	597
1992	184	90	9	5	128	191	55	662
1993	203	102	10	5	137	204	65	726
1994	222	114	10	5	147	219	75	792
1995	231	114	10	5	147	218	75	800
1996	233	114	10	5	146	216	75	799
1997	224	114	9	5	135	200	75	762
1998	222	114	9	5	127	187	75	739
1999	215	114	8	4	121	180	75	717
2000	211	114	8	4	114	168	75	694
2001	202	114	8	4	110	163	75	676
2002	200	114	7	4	104	154	75	658
2003	193	114	7	4	103	153	75	649
2004	191	114	7	4	97	144	75	632
2005	184	114	7	4	90	134	75	608

Table 19. Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6.

	Total Increase	Total Increase	Net Increase
	in Revenue	in Expenses	or Decrease
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	244	546	-302
1988	379	801	-422
1989	397	859	-462
1990	276	622	-346
1991	279	597	-318
1992	319	662	-343
1993	359	726	-367
1994	399	792	-393
1995	402	800	-398
1996	403	799	-396
1997	403	762	-359
1998	399	739	-340
1999	397	717	-320
2000	395	694	-299
2001	394	676	-282
2002	392	658	-266
2003	393	649	-256
2004	392	632	-240
2005	392	608	-216

Table 20. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario, Region 6.

			Municipalities			
	State	Big Horn	Hot Springs	Park	Washakie	within Region
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	-117	2	1	2	27	-22
1995	-119	6	2	3	48	-21
2000	-83	6	2	2	50	-12
2005	-43	6	2	3	55	-1

Table 21. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Westside 9,026 Scenario

•

			Counties									
	State	Big Horn	Hot Springs	Park	Washakie	within Region						
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)						
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1990	-346	8	3	4	25	-45						
1995	-398	13	3	6	38	-57						
2000	-299	16	5	6	43	-32						
2005	-216	15	4	7	49	-11						

Table 22.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance fro	m
	Addition of the Westside 20,718 Scenario	

CHAPTER V

Results of the Middle Fork Analyses

While the Westside scenarios develop water for agricultural use only, building a reservoir on the Middle Fork of the Powder River could provide a substantial amount of water for nonagricultural uses. The analyses presented in this chapter examine the expected impacts associated with two Middle Fork scenarios. The first involves construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed Middle Fork Dam and Reservoir with it supplying water for the supplemental irrigation of 5,100 acres of cropland. The second scenario is similar to the first, except that the project would also supply water for the operation of a coal-gasification plant with the capacity to produce 375 million standard cubic feet of gas daily. Since this second scenario would involve the processing of locally mined coal using a capital intensive process, the property and coal severance tax revenues expected with this scenario are substantial.

An overview of the construction, operation and maintenance costs of the Middle Fork reservoir project and coal-gasification project are provided in Tables 23 and 24, respectively. Construction of a 375 MMSCFD coal-gasification plant is estimated to cost more than 50 times as much as the Middle Fork reservoir. Addition of this large-scale energy plant as an additional user of Middle Fork water would greatly multiply the economic, demographic and public-sector impacts associated with the Middle Fork project.

Regional Economic Impact Projections

Construction of the Middle Fork reservoir for supplemental irrigation of cropland would cost nearly the same as the Westside 9,026 acre project, but would generate far less economic activity. The first Middle Fork project

scenario is projected to affect business activity, income and employment only slightly, but the impact projections for the second scenario, which adds a 375 MMSCFD coal-gasification plant, are substantial (Tables 25-32). For the second scenario business activity, income and employment in region 1 respectively are projected to increase by 8.9, 13.3 and 20.3 percent during the first year of construction. These growth rates would create significant in-migration into the region - especially into Campbell County. Initially, the region would be unable to supply the additional private and public services demanded by project related workers. Furthermore, the population of region 1 is projected to increase by 5.5 percent during the first year of project construction (Table 33).

	Construction				
	Contract	Payroll &	Material &	Payroll &	Agricultural
Year	Construction	Salaries	Supplies	Salaries	Revenue
		(1980	dollars)		
1986					
1987					
1988	2,371,774	3,107,300			
1989	3,452,574	2,026,500			
1990			105,438	54,040	307,989
1991			105,438	54,040	307,989
•			•	•	•
•			٠	•	•
2005			105,438	54,040	307,989

Table 23. Middle Fork Dam and Reservoir Project

^a Construction costs exclude fees for engineering and legal services, interest during construction and allowances for contingencies.

	Constructio	n Costs $\frac{a}{}$	Operatio Maintenano	on and ce Costs		
	Contract	Payroll &	Material &	Payroll &		
Year	Construction	Salaries	Supplies	Salaries		
		(1980 do:	llars)	·····	<u></u>	
1986						
1987						
1988	69,993,420	47,285,000				
1989	69,993,420	47,285,000				
1990	11	11				
1991	11	**				
1992	69,993,420	47,285,000	14,659,803	13,510,000	•	
1993			29,319,606	27,020,000		
1994			29,319,606	27,020,000		
•			•	•		
•			•	•		
•				•		
2005			29,319,606	27,020,000		

Table 24. 375 MMSCFD Coal Gasification Project

^a Construction costs exclude fees for engineering and legal services, interest during construction and allowances for contingencies.

				Middle Fork Reservoir &
	Middle Fork	Middle Fork		Gasification
	(No Project)	Reservoir	Coal Gasification	Plant
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	2,206,972	2,206,972	2,206,972	2,206,972
1982	2,250,871	2,250,871	2,250,871	2,250,871
1983	2,273,318	2,273,318	2,273,318	2,273,318
1984	2,339,581	2,339,581	2,339,581	2,339,581
1985	2,398,463	2,398,463	2,398,463	2,398,463
1986	2,454,951	2,454,951	2,454,951	2,454,951
1987	2,512,538	2,512,538	2,512,538	2,512,538
1988	2,569,410	2,578,081	2,789,489	2,798,160
1989	2,630,195	2,639,354	2,850,274	2,859,433
1990	2,690,276	2,690,804	2,910,355	2,910,883
1991	2,745,270	2,745,798	2,965,349	2,965,877
1992	2,795,376	2,795,904	3,043,641	3,044,169
1993	2,845,485	2,846,013	2,922,449	2,922,977
1994	2,895,593	2,896,121	2,972,557	2,973,085
1995	2,945,700	2,946,228	3,022,664	3,023,192
1996	2,995,809	2,996,337	3,072,773	3,073,301
1997	3,045,915	3,046,443	3,122,879	3,123,407
1998	3,096,024	3,096,552	3,172,988	3,173,516
1999	3,146,131	3,146,659	3,223,095	3,223,623
2000	3,196,241	3,196,769	3,273,205	3,273,733
2001	3,246,345	3,246,873	3,323,309	3,323,837
2002	3,296,456	3,296,984	3,373,420	3,373,948
2003	3,346,565	3,347,093	3,423,529	3,424,057
2004	3,396,669	3,397,197	3,473,633	3,474,161
2005	3,446,779	3,447,307	3,523,743	3,524,271

Table 25. Projected Business Activity for the Middle Fork Scenarios, Region 1.

			Middle Fork
	Change in Busin	ess Activity	Reservoir and
	Middle Fork Reservoir	Coal Gasification	Coal Gasification
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0
1988	8,671	220,079	228,750
1989	9,159	220,079	229,238
1990	528	220,079	220,607
1991	528	220,079	220,607
1992	528	248,265	248,793
1993	528	76,964	77,492
1994	528	76,964	77,492
1995	528	76,964	77,492
1996	528	76,964	77,492
1997	528	76,964	77,492
1998	528	76,964	77,492
1999	528	76,964	77,492
2000	528	76,964	77,492
2001	528	76,964	77,492
2002	528	76,964	77,492
2003	528	76,964	77,492
2004	528	76,964	77,492
2005	528	76,964	77,492

Table 26. Projected Increase in Business Activity from Addition of the Middle Fork Scenario, Region 1.

	<u></u>	<u></u>		Middle Fork
	Middle Fork	Middle Fork	Middle Fork	Reservoir &
	(No Projects)	Reservoir	Industrial	Industrial
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	877,016	877,016	877,016	877,016
1982	891,795	891,795	891,795	891,795
1983	883,616	883,616	883,616	883,616
1984	910,552	910,552	910,552	910,552
1985	932,422	932,422	932,422	932,422
1986	952,649	952,649	952,649	952,649
1987	973,630	973,630	973,630	973,630
1988	994,120	1,000,655	1,119,710	1,126,245
1989	1,017,300	1,022,843	1,142,890	1,148,433
1990	1,039,993	1,040,316	1,165,583	1,165,906
1991	1,059,192	1,059,515	1,184,782	1,185,105
1992	1,075,037	1,075,360	1,224,329	1,224,652
1993	1,090,882	1,091,205	1,143,739	1,144,062
1994	1,106,727	1,107,050	1,159,584	1,159,907
1995	1,122,571	1,122,894	1,175,428	1,175,751
1996	1,138,416	1,138,739	1,191,273	1,191,596
1997	1,154,261	1,154,584	1,207,118	1,207,441
1998	1,170,106	1,170,429	1,222,963	1,223,286
1999	1,185,951	1,186,274	1,238,808	1,239,131
2000	1,201,796	1,202,119	1,254,653	1,254,976
2001	1,217,641	1,217,964	1,270,498	1,270,821
2002	1,233,485	1,233,808	1,286,342	1,286,665
2003	1,249,330	1,249,653	1,302,187	1,302,510
2004	1,265,175	1,265,498	1,318,032	1,318,355
2005	1,281,020	1,281,343	1,333,877	1,334,200

Table 27. Projected Personal Income for the Middle Fork Scenarios, Region 1.

<u></u>			Middle Fork
	Change in Perso	nal Income	Reservoir and
	Middle Fork Reservoir	Coal Gasification	Coal Gasification
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0
1988	6,535	125,590	132,125
1989	5,543	125,590	131,133
1990	323	125,590	125,913
1991	323	125,590	125,913
1992	323	149,292	149,615
1993	323	52,857	53,180
1994	323	52,857	53,180
1995	323	52,857	53,180
1996	323	52,857	53,180
1997	323	52,857	53,180
1998	323	52,857	53,180
1999	323	52,857	53,180
2000	323	52,857	53,180
2001	323	52,857	53,180
2002	323	52,857	53,180
2003	323	52,857	53,180
2004	323	52,857	53,180
2005	323	52,857	53,180

Table 28. Projected Increase in Personal Income from Addition of the Middle Fork Scenarios.

						_	<u> </u>	Whls.						-						
				Pet.	(Contract		Trade	_			_	Therma	1		Bus.	Prof.			
	Agricul-	Metal	Coa1	Exp.	Other	Const-	Lumber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal		Com.	Power	Retail	F.I.	/Pers.	/Soc.	_		
	ture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	ruction	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.	Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	<u>R.E.</u>	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Projec	t Total
	·																			
1981	1848	3	2255	2536	496	5495	563	2085	132	0	831	1049	155	6778	1270	2489	1922	5263	1158	36,329
1982	1842	3	2165	2562	496	5224	570	2079	133	0	828	1048	152	6890	1281	2529	1953	5264	1223	36,242
1983	1835	3	2083	2587	489	4650	577	2068	134	0	820	1029	150	6927	1262	2525	1934	5147	892	35,111
1984	1829	3	2006	2611	500	4818	583	2067	135	0	824	1040	148	7098	1291	2589	1991	5217	1054	35,803
1985	1823	3	1936	2633	511	49 77	589	2063	136	0	825	1045	146	7202	1312	2642	2037	5258	1142	36,281
1986	1817	٦	1871	2654	521	5135	595	2058	137	0	826	1049	145	7283	1 3 3 1	2692	2079	5288	1206	36,691
1987	1812	3	1810	2675	532	5298	601	2054	137	Ő	827	1054	143	7370	1351	2743	2122	5321	1281	37,135
1988	1807	3	1753	2694	542	5461	606	2050	138	ů 0	828	1058	141	7450	1370	2793	2164	5351	1356	37,567
1989	1802	3	1701	2713	553	5634	611	2048	139	0	830	1064	140	7560	1392	2847	2212	5393	1456	38,097
1990	1797	3	1651	2730	564	5808	616	2045	140	Õ	831	1070	139	7661	1413	2900	2259	5432	1556	38,614
1770	2171	5	1001	2750	504	5000	010	2013	110	Ū	051	2070	107		1110	2700	2237	5,52	1000	50,011
1991	1792	3	1605	2747	574	5976	621	2041	140	0	831	1072	137	7719	1429	2946	2298	5452	1605	38,991
1992	1788	3	1561	2763	584	6139	626	2035	141	0	830	1072	136	7738	1441	2985	2330	5456	1605	39,234
1993	1784	3	1520	2779	594	6305	630	2030	142	0	829	1072	135	7757	1452	3024	2362	5460	1605	39,482
1994	1779	3	1481	2794	604	6473	635	2025	142	0	829	1072	134	7775	1463	3063	2393	5464	1605	39,733
1995	1775	3	1444	2808	614	6644	639	2020	143	0	828	1071	133	77 93	1475	3101	2425	5467	1605	39,987
1996	1771	3	1409	2822	624	6818	643	2015	144	0	827	1071	132	78 10	1486	3139	2456	5471	1605	40,245
1997	1768	3	1377	2835	633	6995	647	2011	144	0	826	1071	131	7827	1496	3177	2487	5474	1605	40,506
1998	1764	3	1345	2847	643	7175	651	2006	145	0	825	1071	130	7843	1507	3214	2518	5477	1605	40,771
1999	1761	3	1316	2860	653	7358	654	2002	145	0	824	1071	130	7859	1518	3251	2549	5480	1605	41,038
2000	1757	3	1287	2871	663	7544	658	1998	146	0	824	1070	129	7875	1528	3288	2580	5483	1605	41,310
2001	1754	3	1260	2883	673	7733	661	1994	146	0	823	1070	128	7891	1538	3325	2611	5486	1605	41,584
2002	1751	3	1235	2894	683	7 9 26	665	1990	147	0	822	1070	127	7906	1548	3361	2641	5489	1605	41,862
2003	1748	3	1210	2904	693	8122	668	1986	147	0	822	1070	127	7 9 21	1558	3397	2672	5492	1605	42,144
2004	1745	3	1187	2914	703	8321	671	1983	148	0	821	1070	126	7935	1568	3432	2702	5495	1605	42,429
2005	1742	3	1164	2924	713	8525	674	1979	148	0	820	1070	126	7949	1577	3468	2733	5497	1605	42,717

Table 29. Projected Baseline Employment by Sector, Region 1.

	<u></u>							Whls.					<u> </u>				<i>,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</i>			
				Pet.	Contract		Trade					Therma	1		Bus.	Prof.				
	Agricul-	Metal	Coal	Exp.	Other	Const-	Lumber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal		Com.	Power	Retail	F.I.	/Pers.	/Soc.			
	ture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	ruction	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.	Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	R.E.	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Project	: Total
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	2 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	3 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	+ 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	5 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	5 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	3 0	0	0	0	3	104	0	3	0	0	2	5	0	42	9	12	15	33	117	345
1989) 0	0	0	0	3	144	0	2	0	0	2	5	0	47	8	11	12	29	80	343
1990) 0	0	0	0	0	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	2	5	114
1991	L 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	1	1	2	5	17
1992	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	1	2	5	17
1993	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	5	14
1994	+ 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	1	2	5	15
1999	5 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	2	5	13
1990	5 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	5	14
199	70	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	5	15
1998	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	1	2	5	16
1999) 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	1	2	5	15
200	0 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	2	5	14
200	LO	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	2	5	13
2003	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	5	14
200	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	5	15
2004	4 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	5	12
200	50	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	5	14

Table 30. Projected Increase in Employment by Sector from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1.

								Whls.					-							
				Pet.	(Contract		Trade					Therma	1		Bus.	Prof.			
	Agricul-	Metal	Coa1	Exp.	0the r	Const-	Lumber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal		Com.	Power	Retail	F.I.	/Pers.	/Soc.			
·	ture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	ruction	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.	Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	R.E.	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Project	Total
1981	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	2 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	5 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	3 0	0	0	0	72	2931	0	47	0	0	55	11	0	1,087	173	247	274	652	1,750	7,299
1989	0	0	0	0	71	2954	0	46	0	0	54	9	0	1,073	171	246	273	642	1,750	7,289
1990	0 0	0	0	0	71	2978	0	45	0	0	53	7	0	1,060	170	245	273	631	1,750	7,283
1991	. 0	0	0	0	71	3002	0	44	0	0	52	5	0	1,047	169	244	272	622	1,750	7,278
1992	2 0	0	0	0	74	3082	0	52	0	0	88	121	0	1,240	197	286	322	721	2,250	8,433
1993	3 0	0	0	0	6	131	0	22	0	0	49	41	0	592	67	98	113	248	1,000	2,367
1994	+ 0	0	0	0	6	132	0	22	0	0	18	40	0	586	67	97	114	244	1,000	2,326
1995	5 0	0	0	0	6	133	0	22	0	0	17	41	0	578	66	97	113	241	1,000	2,314
1996	5 0	0	0	0	6	134	0	21	0	0	17	40	0	572	65	97	113	237	1,000	2,302
1997	0	0	0	0	7	135	0	21	0	0	17	39	0	565	65	96	113	234	1,000	2,292
1998	3 0	0	0	0	7	136	0	21	0	0	17	38	0	559	65	96	113	231	1,000	2,283
1999	0	0	0	0	7	137	0	20	0	0	17	37	0	553	64	96	113	228	1,000	2,272
2000) 0	0	0	0	7	139	0	20	0	0	16	36	0	547	63	95	112	225	1,000	2,260
2001	0	0	0	0	7	140	0	19	0	0	16	37	0	541	63	95	112	222	1,000	2,252
2002	2 0	0	0	0	6	141	0	19	0	0	16	36	0	535	63	94	112	219	1,000	2,241
2003	3 0	0	0	0	6	143	0	19	0	0	15	35	0	529	62	94	112	216	1,000	2,231
2004	+ 0	0	0	0	6	144	0	18	0	0	15	35	0	524	62	94	112	213	1,000	2,223
2005	5 0	0	0	0	6	145	0	18	0	0	15	34	0	518	62	93	111	211	1,000	2,213

Table 31. Projected Increase in Employment by Sector from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1.

		*******						Whls.												
				Pet.		Contract		Trade					Therma	1		Bus.	Prof.			
	Agricul-	Metal	Coal	Exp.	Other	Const-	Lumber	/Ag.	Pet.	Metal		Com.	Power	Retail	F.I.	/Pers.	/Soc.			
	ture	Mining	Mining	Ext.	Mining	ruction	Prod.	Proc.	Ref.	Proc.	Trans.	Util.	Gen.	Trade	R.E.	Serv.	Serv.	Gov.	Project	Total
1981	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	2 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	+ 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	5 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	5 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	3 0	0	0	0	75	3,035	0	50	0	0	57	16	0	1,129	182	259	289	685	1,867	7,644
1989	0	0	0	0	74	3,098	0	48	0	0	56	14	0	1,120	179	257	285	671	1,830	7,632
1990) 0	0	0	0	71	3,079	0	45	0	0	53	7	0	1,064	170	246	274	633	1,755	7,397
1991	0	0	0	0	71	3,003	0	44	0	0	53	6	0	1,051	170	245	273	624	1,755	7,295
1992	2 0	0	0	0	74	3,083	0	53	0	0	89	121	0	1,244	197	287	323	723	2,255	8,450
1993	3 0	0	0	0	6	132	0	22	0	0	50	41	0	595	68	99	113	250	1,005	2,381
1994	+ 0	0	0	0	6	133	0	22	0	0	18	40	0	590	68	98	115	246	1,005	2,341
1995	5 0	0	0	0	6	134	0	22	0	0	17	42	0	581	66	98	113	243	1,005	2,327
1996	5 0	0	0	0	6	135	0	22	0	0	17	41	0	575	65	98	114	238	1,005	2,316
1997	70	0	0	0	8	136	0	21	0	0	17	39	0	568	66	97	114	236	1,005	2,307
1998	30	0	0	0	7	137	0	22	0	0	17	38	0	563	66	97	114	233	1,005	2,299
1999) ()	0	0	0	7	138	0	20	0	0	18	37	0	557	64	97	114	230	1,005	2,287
2000	0 0	0	0	0	7	140	0	20	0	0	16	36	0	551	63	96	113	227	1,005	2,274
2001	LO	0	0	0	7	141	0	19	0	0	16	38	0	544	64	95	112	224	1,005	2,265
2002	2 0	0	0	0	6	142	0	19	0	0	16	36	0	538	64	95	113	221	1,005	2,255
2003	3 0	0	0	0	6	144	0	20	0	0	15	35	0	532	63	95	113	218	1,005	2,246
2004	+ 0	0	0	0	6	145	0	18	0	0	15	35	0	527	62	95	113	214	1,005	2,235
2005	5 0	0	0	0	6	146	0	18	0	0	16	34	0	521	63	94	111	213	1,005	2,227

Table 32. Projected Increase in Employment by Sector from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenarios, Region 1.

<u></u>						Mi	ddle For	k	Middle Fork Reservoir				
	Middle For	rk (No Pro	ojects)	Middle F	ork Rese	rvoir	Coal G	asificat	ion	and Coal	Gasifica	tion	
			Percent			Percent			Percent			Percent	
	Population	Change	Change	Population	Change	Change	Population	Change	Change	Population	Change	Change	
1980	68,529			68,529			68,529			68,529			
1981	69,248	719	1	69,248	719	1	69,248	719	1	69,248	719	1	
1982	69,440	192	0	69,440	192	0	69,440	192	0	69,440	192	0	
1983	69,361	-79	0	69,361	-79	0	69,361	-79	0	69,361	-79	0	
1984	70,395	1,035	1	70,395	1,035	1	70,395	1,035	1	70,395	1,035	1	
1985	71,533	1,138	2	71,533	1,138	2	71,533	1,138	2	71,533	1,138	2	
1986	72,651	1,118	2	72,651	1,118	2	72,651	1,118	2	72,651	1,118	2	
1987	73,819	1,168	2	73,819	1,168	2	73,819	1,168	2	73,819	1,168	2	
1988	74,940	1,121	2	75,000	1,181	2	77,876	4,057	5	77,912	4,093	6	
1989	76,155	1,215	2	76,202	1,202	2	79,101	1,225	2	79,136	1,225	2	
1990	76,864	709	1	76,876	673	1	79,874	773	1	79,897	761	1	
1991	77,299	435	1	77,308	432	1	80,314	439	1	80,335	438	1	
1992	77,645	347	0	77,654	346	0	81,013	699	1	81,031	696	1	
1993	78,211	566	1	78,220	566	1	80,914	-99	0	80,924	-108	0	
1994	78,614	403	1	78,623	403	1	81,383	469	1	81,392	469	1	
1995	78,923	309	0	78,932	309	0	81,644	261	0	81,653	261	0	
1996	79,342	419	1	79,351	419	1	82,043	400	0	82,053	400	0	
1997	79,653	311	0	79,662	312	0	82,341	297	0	82,350	297	0	
1998	79,936	283	0	79,946	283	0	82,601	261	0	82,611	261	0	
1999	80,289	353	0	80,296	350	0	82,929	328	0	82,938	327	0	
2000	80,570	281	0	80,577	281	0	83,227	298	0	83,235	296	0	
2001	80,998	428	1	81,007	430	1	83,676	449	1	83,683	449	1	
2002	81,522	524	1	81,531	524	1	84,207	530	1	84,214	530	1	
2003	82,072	550	1	82,080	549	1	84,778	571	1	84,786	572	1	
2004	82,572	500	1	82,581	500	1	85,257	479	1	85,266	479	1	
2005	82,749	177	0	82,758	177	0	85,409	152	0	85,417	152	0	

Table 33. Projected Population from Addition of Middle Fork Scenarios, Region 1.

Public Sector Effects

Projections of the impact of the two Middle Fork scenarios on public school systems in region 1 are very dissimilar (Tables 34-37). Only 11 additional students would require educational services during the first year of project construction, if only the Middle Fork reservoir is developed. But an additional 700 students are projected to require educational services during the first year of project construction if construction of the coal-gasification plant and Middle Fork reservoir both began in the same year. Demands for all other public services (i.e., law enforcement, fire protection, road construction, recreation and public welfare) would be affected similarly.

Projections of the increases in state revenues, costs and net fiscal balances associated Middle Fork project scenarios are provided in Tables 38-46. Both projects would provide positive net revenue to the state treasury. Construction and operation of Middle Fork reservoir for the supplemental irrigation of existing cropland would generate only a small amount of state revenue, but the state costs associated with this project are even less. State costs are low because the project is projected to have an insignificant impact on the region's population. Construction and operation of a 375 MMSCFD coal-gasification plant changes the fiscal situation for the state in several ways (Table 43). First, during the 5 years the plant is under construction, annual net revenue projections from the state's perspective range from -\$1,075,000 to -\$1,377,000. Once the plant begins operation, it is projected to provide large net revenues to the state, because of the severance tax revenue generated from mining coal for the plant. Annual net revenue for the state would average about \$5.5 million as the plant operates during the period covered in this analysis.

County and municipal governments within region 1 are projected to

experience nearly no fiscal impact from the development of the Middle Fork reservoir when it only supplies supplemental irrigation water. Slight fiscal balance gains at the county level merely offset slight fiscal balance losses among municipalities. Construction and operation of a coal gasification plant, however, is projected to cause increases in fiscal balances at both the county and municipal levels. The high wage levels and capital intenseness of this industry cause its fiscal impacts to be positive for local public sectors.

		Campbell			Crook		Johnson			Sheridan		Weston			
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Tota1	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	<u>Total</u>
1981	2,737	2,457	5,194	527	579	1,106	649	633	1,282	2,301	2,327	4,628	691	710	1,401
19 82	2,777	2,395	5,172	517	578	1,095	629	650	1,279	2,293	2,331	4,624	675	699	1,374
1983	2,797	2,369	5,166	506	561	1,067	630	653	1,283	2,300	2,320	4,620	691	687	1,378
1984	2,927	2,457	5,384	513	535	1,048	631	635	1,266	2,326	2,298	4,624	716	659	1,375
1985	3,585	2,568	6,153	615	509	1,124	744	623	1,367	2,714	2,236	4,950	829	642	1,471
1986	3,857	2,688	6,545	620	495	1,115	738	628	1,366	2,738	2,204	4,942	827	623	1,450
1987	4,126	2,820	6,946	626	492	1,118	746	620	1,366	2,763	2,211	4,974	827	612	1,439
1988	4,365	2,995	7,360	646	482	1,128	754	623	1,377	2,795	2,234	5,029	825	614	1,439
1989	4,611	3,182	7,793	662	484	1,146	762	618	1,380	2,821	2,273	5,094	826	609	1,435
1990	4,557	3,666	8,223	638	549	1,187	718	697	1,415	2,677	2,535	5,212	768	682	1,450
1991	4,631	3,834	8,465	651	549	1,200	717	687	1,404	2,693	2,556	5,249	762	676	1,438
1992	4,672	3,984	8,656	660	548	1,208	726	682	1,408	2,707	2,563	5,270	756	672	1,428
1993	4,717	4,126	8,843	673	562	1,235	729	688	1,417	2,720	2,587	5,307	745	673	1,418
1994	4,721	4,242	8,963	681	578	1,259	732	696	1,428	2,724	2,608	5,332	728	682	1,410
1995	4,474	4,363	8,837	646	595	1,241	683	702	1,385	2,542	2,653	5,195	666	672	1,338
1996	4,400	4,468	8,868	649	604	1,253	683	700	1,383	2,535	2,677	5,212	649	669	1,318
1997	4,326	4,555	8,881	648	611	1,259	680	709	1,389	2,518	2,701	5,219	630	661	1,291
1998	4,261	4,618	8,879	643	621	1,264	678	707	1,385	2,500	2,721	5,221	611	647	1,258
1999	4,210	4,663	8,873	637	628	1,265	676	709	1,385	2,486	2,731	5,217	592	630	1,222
2000	4,187	4,342	8,529	626	574	1,200	672	635	1,307	2,474	2,477	4,951	576	559	1,135
2001	4,182	4,281	8,463	618	575	1,193	670	632	1,302	2,465	2,477	4,942	561	544	1,105
2002	4,197	4,212	8,409	612	576	1,188	672	633	1,305	2,455	2,467	4,922	550	530	1,080
2003	4,249	4,162	8,411	605	575	1,180	672	633	1,305	2,439	2,447	4,886	540	517	1,057
2004	4,319	4,119	8,438	597	570	1,167	673	632	1,305	2,420	2,422	4,842	531	503	1,034
2005	4,407	4,082	8,489	592	563	1,155	673	628	1,301	2,418	2,391	4,809	523	488	1,011

Table 34. Projected Baseline Number of Students by County, Region 1.

					CLOOK		Jonnson			Sneridan		Weston			
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
	_	_	-	_											
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	0	0
1989	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1992	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1993	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1994	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	• 0	0	0	0	0	0
1995	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1998	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	- 1	-	0	0	Õ	0 0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0
2003	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	õ	0	õ	0	0	0
2004	-	3	4	ů 0	0 0	õ	õ	õ	0	õ	0 0	õ	õ	õ	ů 0
2005	1	0	1	õ	ů 0	Õ	ů 0	õ	0 0	0	õ	õ	0	ů 0	ů 0

Table 35. Projected Increase in Number of Students by County from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir, Region 1.

		Campbell			Crook		Johnson			Sheridan		Weston			
	Primary	Secondary	Tota1	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
19 81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	337	311	648	3	2	5	2	3	5	7	8	15	11	9	20
1989	343	304	647	3	2	5	2	3	5	7	7	14	12	10	22
1990	360	307	667	3	3	6	3	3	6	8	7	15	11	11	22
1991	372	304	676	3	3	6	3	2	5	8	7	15	11	10	21
1992	431	346	777	3	3	6	3	2	5	8	8	16	11	10	21
1993	415	306	721	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	2	5	8	6	14
1994	425	330	755	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	4	7	6	13
1995	410	331	741	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	2	5	7	7	14
1996	402	336	738	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	2	5	7	6	13
1997	395	340	735	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	- 2	5	7	6	13
1998	385	346	731	1	1	2	1	- 1	2	3	- 3	6	6	6	12
1999	367	342	709	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	6	5	6	11
2000	351	340	691	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	5	5	5	10
2001	336	338	674	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	3	5	5	5	10
2002	323	336	659	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	4	4	8
2003	306	331	637	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	2	4	4	4	8
2004	303	319	622	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	2	4	3	4	7
2005	296	304	600	2	1	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	4	4	8

Table 36. Projected Increase in Number of Students by County from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1.
		Campbell			Crook			Johnson			Sheridan			Weston		
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total	
		_								0	<u>^</u>	0	0	0	0	
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1988	339	31.2	651	3	2	5	3	4	7	8	9	17	11	9	20	
1989	334	305	639	3	2	5	3	4	7	13	8	21	12	10	22	
1990	361	307	668	3	3	6	4	4	8	8	8	16	11	11	22	
1991	372	304	676	3	3	6	4	3	7	8	8	16	11	10	21	
1992	432	346	778	3	3	6	4	3	7	8	8	16	11	10	21	
1993	415	306	721	3	3	6	2	1	3	3	2	5	8	6	14	
1994	425	330	755	1	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	4	7	6	13	
1995	410	332	742	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	2	5	7	7	14	
1996	402	336	738	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	2	5	7	6	13	
1997	395	340	735	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	5	7	6	13	
1998	385	346	731	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	6	6	6	12	
1999	367	342	709	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	6	5	6	11	
2000	351	340	691	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	6	5	5	10	
2001	336	338	674	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	3	5	5	5	10	
2001	373	336	659	1	- 2	3	- 1	1	2	2	2	4	4	4	8	
2002	311	332	643	2	2	ů L	1	-	- 2	2	2	4	4	4	8	
2003	303	319	622	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	- 2	4	3	4	7	
2004	202	301	601	2	- 1	- 2	1	- 1	2	2	2	Д	<u>с</u>	4	8	
2005	271	504	001	2	Ŧ	5	*	*	L	L	2	-	-	-	÷	

Table 37. Projected Increase in Number of Students by County from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenarios, Region 1.

	<u>,</u>			Special	
	Sales and	Highway	Cig. — Tab	Districts	Total Increase
	Use Tax	Tax	Liq Beer	Fund	in Revenue
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	Õ	Õ	Õ	Ő
1983	0 0	ů 0	ů	Õ	Õ
1984	0 0	0 0	Õ	Õ	ů
1985	0	0 0	0	Ő	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	Õ	0	Õ	0 0
1088	1/3	6	1	0 0	150
1080	130	4	1	Õ	135
1990	13		0	Õ	14
1990	15	1	0	0	14
1991	14	1	0	0	15
1992	14	1	0	0	15
1993	14	1	0	0	15
1994	14	1	0	0	15
1995	14	1	1	0	16
1996	14	1	0	0	15
1997	14	1	0	0	15
1998	14	1	0	0	15
1999	14	1	0	0	15
2000	14	1	0	0	15
2001	14	1	0	0	15
2002	14	1	0	0	15
2003	14	1	Ō	Ō	15
2004	14	- 1	0	0	15
2005	14	1	Ō	0	15

Table 38. Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1.

- <u></u>	Education	Sales & Use Tax	Highway	Cigarette and	Highway Oper-	General Gov't	Highway Constr-	Total Expend-
	Transfers	Transfers	Fund	Tobacco	ating	Functions	uction	itures
·	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	14	50	1	0	9	11	2	87
1989	8	47	1	0	2	14	2	74
1990	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	10
1991	2	3	0	0	1	1	2	9
1992	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	8
1993	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	8
1994	1	4	0	0	1	1	2	9
1995	3	4	0	0	1	1	2	11
1996	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	8
1997	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	10
1998	2	3	0	0	1	1	2	9
1999	4	3	0	0	1	1	2	11
2000	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	6
2001	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	7
2002	2	4	0	0	1	1	1	9
2003	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	7
2004	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	5
2005	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	5

Table 39. Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1.

	Total Increase	Total Increase	Net Increase
	in Revenues	in Expenditures	or Decrease
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0
1988	150	87	63
1989	135	74	61
1990	14	10	4
1991	15	9	6
1992	15	8	7
1993	15	8	7
1994	15	9	6
1995	15	11	4
1996	16	8	8
1997	15	10	5
1998	15	9	6
1999	15	11	4
2000	15	6	9
2001	15	7	8
2002	15	9	6
2003	15	7	8
2004	15	5	10
2005	15	5	10

Table 40.	Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Add	lition
	of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1.	

							Coal			Total
		Mineral			Special	Mineral	Tax	Cap-Facil	Water	Increase
	Sales &	Highway	Hwy.	Cig-Tab	Dist.	General	Revenue	Revenue	D ev.	in
	Use Tax	Fund	Tax	Liq-Beer	Fund	Fund	Acct.	Acct.	Acct.	Revenues
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	3,687	0	402	72	11	0	0	0	0	4,172
1989	3,687	0	396	71	12	0	0	0	0	4,166
1990	3,686	0	401	72	14	0	0	0	0	4,173
1991	3,687	0	399	72	15	0	0	0	0	4,173
1992	4,414	0	447	81	17	0	0	0	0	4,959
1993	2,104	1,121	368	66	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,833
1994	2,104	1,121	380	68	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,847
1995	2,104	1,121	373	67	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,839
	-	-					-		-	
1996	2,104	1,121	370	66	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,835
1997	2,104	1,121	367	66	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,832
1998	2.104	1,121	366	66	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,832
1999	2,104	1,121	362	64	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,826
2000	2.104	1,121	357	64	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,821
	•	-					•	-	•	-
2001	2,104	1,121	354	64	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,818
2002	2,104	1,121	351	63	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,814
2003	2.104	1,121	346	62	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,808
2004	2,104	1,121	343	61	18	535	2,248	1,687	1.687	9,804
2005	2,104	1,121	340	60	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,800
	-,,									

Table 41. Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1.

		Sales &	** <u>***********************************</u>	Cigarette	Highway	General	Highway	Total
	Education	Use Tax	Highway	and	Oper-	Gov't	Constr-	Expend-
	Transfers	Transfers	Fund	Tobacco	ating	Functions	uction	itures
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	1,067	1,812	63	32	913	1,360	0	5,247
1989	1,061	1,886	61	31	882	1,313	1	5,235
1990	1,097	1,964	60	31	879	1,308	2	5,341
1991	1,113	1,985	59	30	859	1,278	1	5,325
1992	1,281	2,343	66	34	954	1,421	237	6,336
1993	1,158	1,280	53	27	757	1,127	466	4,868
1994	1,214	1,294	53	27	764	1,137	466	4,955
1995	1,196	1,265	50	26	729	1,084	466	4,816
1996	1,190	1,261	48	25	702	1,045	466	4,737
1997	1,184	1,259	47	24	678	1,010	466	4,668
1998	1,176	1,249	45	24	655	974	466	4,589
1999	1,144	1,245	43	23	627	933	466	4,481
2000	1,111	1,242	42	22	599	800	466	4,282
2001	1,079	1,246	40	21	573	853	466	4,278
2002	1,054	1,239	38	20	546	813	466	4,176
2003	1,026	1,231	35	20	519	772	466	4,069
2004	985	1,236	34	18	494	735	466	3,968
2005	962	1,237	33	18	470	700	466	3,886
								-

Table 42. Projected Increase in State Expenditures from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1.

	Total Increase	Total Increase	Net Increase
	in Revenues	in Expenditures	or Decrease
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0
1988	4,172	5,247	-1,075
1989	4,166	5,235	-1,069
1990	4,173	5,341	-1,168
1991	4,173	5,325	-1,152
1992	4,959	6,336	-1,377
1993	9,833	4,868	4,965
1994	9,847	4,955	4,892
1995	9,839	4,816	5,023
1996	9,835	4,737	5,098
1997	9,832	4,668	5,164
1998	9,832	4,589	5,243
1999	9,826	4,481	5,345
2000	9,821	4,282	5,539
2001	9,818	4,278	5,540
2002	9,814	4,176	5,638
2003	9,808	4,069	5,739
2004	9,804	3,968	5,836
2005	9,800	3,886	5,914

Table 43. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1.

							Coal			Total
		Mineral			Special	Mineral	Tax	CAP-FACIL	Water	Increase
	Sales &	Highway	Hwy.	Cig-Tab	Dist.	General	Revenue	Revenue	Dev.	in
	Use Tax	Fund	Tax	Liq-Beer	Fund	Fund	Acct.	Acct.	Acct.	Revenues
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	3,830	0	408	73	11	0	0	0	0	4,322
1989	3,817	0	400	72	12	0	0	0	0	4,301
1990	3,799	0	402	72	14	0	0	0	0	4,287
1991	3,701	0	400	72	15	0	0	0	0	4,188
1992	4,428	0	448	81	17	0	0	0	0	4,974
1993	2,118	1,121	369	66	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,848
1994	2,118	1,121	381	68	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,862
1995	2,118	1,121	374	68	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,855
	-	·					•	·	-	
1996	2,118	1,121	371	66	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,850
1997	2,118	1,121	368	66	17	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,847
1998	2,118	1,121	367	66	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,847
1999	2,118	1.121	363	64	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9.841
2000	2,118	1,121	358	64	18	535	2,248	1,687	1.687	9.836
	-,						-,	-,		
2001	2,118	1.121	355	64	18	535	2,248	1,687	1.687	9.833
2002	2,118	1,121	352	63	18	535	2,248	1,687	1.687	9,829
2003	2,118	1,121	347	62	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9.823
2004	2,118	1,121	344	61	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,819
2005	2,118	1,121	341	60	18	535	2,248	1,687	1,687	9,815
		-,	U 1 1			200	2,2.0	2,000	.,	2,010

Table 44. Projected Increase in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenarios, Region 1.

		Sales &		Cigarette	Highway	General	Highway	Total
	Education	Use Tax	Highway	and	Oper-	Gov't	Constr-	Expend-
	Transfers	Transfers	Fund	Tobacco	ating	Functions	uction	itures
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	1,081	1,862	64	32	922	1,371	2	5,334
1989	1,069	1,933	62	31	884	1,327	3	5,309
1990	1,099	1,967	60	31	880	1,310	4	5,351
1001	1 116	1 000	50	20	040	1 270	2	5 22/
1991	1,115	1,900	59	30	000	1,2/9	220	2,334 6 344
1992	1,282	2,345	60	34	955	1,423	239	0,344
1993	1,158	1,283	53	27	758	1,129	408	4,8/0
1994	1,215	1,298	53	27	765	1,138	468	4,964
1995	1,199	1,269	50	26	730	1,085	468	4,827
1996	1,191	1,264	48	25	703	1,046	468	4,745
1997	1,186	1,262	47	24	679	1,012	468	4,678
1998	1,178	1,252	45	24	656	975	468	4,598
1999	1.148	1.248	43	23	628	934	468	4,492
2000	1,111	1,245	42	22	599	801	468	4,288
2001	1,079	1,250	40	21	574	854	467	4,285
2002	1,056	1,243	38	20	547	814	467	4,185
2003	1,027	1,234	35	20	520	773	467	4,076
2004	985	1,239	34	18	494	736	467	3,973
2005	962	1,240	33	18	470	701	467	3,891

Table 45. Projected Increase in State Expenditures from the Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and the Coal Gasification Plant Scenarios, Region 1

	Total Increase	Total Increase	Net Increase
	in Revenues	in Expenditures	or Decrease
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0
1988	4,322	5,334	-1,012
1989	4,301	5,309	-1,008
1990	4,287	5,351	-1,064
1991	4,188	5,334	-1,146
1992	4,974	6,344	-1,370
1993	9,848	4,876	4,972
1994	9,862	4,964	4,898
1995	9,855	4,827	5,028
1996	9,850	4,745	5,105
1997	9,847	4,678	5,169
1998	9,847	4,598	5,249
1999	9,841	4,492	5,349
2000	9,836	4,288	5,548
2001	9,833	4,285	5,548
2002	9,829	4,185	5,644
2003	9,823	4,076	5,747
2004	9,819	3,973	5,846
2005	9,815	3,891	5,924

Table 46. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in State Revenues from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1

				County			Municipalities
	State	Campbel1	Crook	Johnson	Sheridan	Weston	within Region
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	4	1	1	31	2	0	- 5
1995	4	1	0	0	0	0	-1
2000	9	0	0	0	1	0	-3
2005	10	0	0	1	1	0	-1

Table 47. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir Scenario, Region 1

		County							
	State	Campbell	Crook	Johnson	Sheridan	Weston	within Region		
	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)		
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1990	-1,168	1,043	22	54	55	33	587		
1995	5,023	765	12	14	35	15	768		
2000	5,539	765	11	13	37	17	670		
2005	5,914	797	12	14	35	14	325		

Table 48. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Middle Fork Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1

		Municipalities					
	State	Campbel1	Crook	Johnson	Sheridan	Weston	within Regions
<u></u>	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	-1,064	1,104	23	25	57	33	582
1995	5,028	767	12	13	35	15	767
2000	5,548	765	11	13	38	17	667
2005	5,924	797	12	15	36	14	324

Table 49. Projected Net Increase or Decrease in Fiscal Balance from Addition of the Middle Fork Reservoir and Coal Gasification Scenario, Region 1

CHAPTER VI

Summary and Conclusions

While the role of states in the development of water resources has grown considerably during the last few years, few attempts have been directed towards assessing the secondary benefits and costs of alternative water projects from the perspective of an individual state. This paucity of research is partially explained by the fact that alternative water projects traditionally have been evaluated on the basis of national economic efficiency, and that socioeconomic impact assessment approaches and methods for assessing water projects have not been readily available. This study represents an attempt to examine whether impact assessment approaches and methods can be used to identify and quantify the secondary effects and distributional effects of several alternative water projects in Wyoming.

Overall, our impact assessment of alternative Wyoming water projects reveals that both the secondary impacts on business activity and employment by sector and the distribution of the total fiscal impacts on municipal, county and state government can be assessed with the WEDAM model. The secondary effects and distribution effects of the alternative water projects for the Westside and Middle Fork are dissimilar in many ways. For example, development of Westside water for irrigation has substantially larger business activity, income and employment multipliers associated with it than those for development of Middle Fork water for irrigation. The fiscal impact of developing Westside water for irrigation is projected to be negative for state government, while this effect for state government is projected to be positive for developing Middle Fork water for irrigation. In many ways, these results underscore the uniqueness of each water development alternative. An yet,

79

irrigation projects have qualities in common with one another. The fiscal impacts of the three proposed irrigation projects examined in this study each are projected to be positive for affected counties and negative for affected municipalities. The economic and fiscal impacts of water development are contingent upon numerous endogenous and exogenous factors such as the nature and strength of sector interrelationships in local economies, state and local tax policies, national market forces, and the capital intensity of businesses using water. With such inherent differences in the economic and fiscal impacts associated with alternative water projects, questions of whether proposed water developments would generate fiscal benefits (net revenue) for local and state government should be raised. More extensive analyses than the one presented here may be required to check the accuracy of our fiscal projections. The results of our analysis suggest that only one of the four development scenarios examined would generate much of any net revenue for the public sector, under Wyoming's present tax laws.

If the approaches and methods used to assess the expected impacts of alternative water development projects in the study were chosen for more extensive use in Wyoming, more research would be warranted to determine how they could be improved to more accurately and thoroughly assess the most important socioeconomic effects of water development. These approaches and methods were developed to make realistic projections of the impacts of large-scale energy developments. Therefore, additional research could better orient impact assessment models for the evaluation of water projects.

80

REFERENCES

Agee, Douglas E. <u>Westside Irrigation Project Water Payment Possibilities</u> <u>Worland - Manderson - Basin Area, Wyoming</u>. Report prepared for the Governor's Interdepartmental Water Conference. Division of Agricultural Economics, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY, 1977.

Agee, Douglas E. (personal communication), Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY, 1984.

Banner, J. T. and Associates, Inc. <u>Engineering Feasibility Report on the</u> <u>Middle Fork Powder River Dam and Reservoir</u>. Report prepared for the Reservoir Corporation. J. T. Banner and Associates, Inc., Laramie, WY, 1970.

Brosz, Don (personal communication), Department of Agricultural Engineering, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY, 1984.

Clyde, Criddle and Woodward, Inc. <u>Study of Big Horn Westside Irrigation on</u> the Westside Irrigation District. Prepared for the Big Horn Basin Irrigation and Development Association. Clyde, Criddle and Woodward, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT, 1975

Coon, Randel C., et al. Expansion and Adaptation of the North Dakota Economic - Demographic Assessment Model (NEDAM) for Wyoming: Technical Description. Agricultural Economics Miscellaneous Report No. 63, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University, Fargo ND, 1983.

Deaver, Kenneth L. and David L. Brown. <u>Social and Economic Trends in Rural</u> <u>America</u>. White House Rural Development Paper, Economics, Statistics and <u>Cooperative Service</u>, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1979.

Engineering News Report. (selected issues), McGraw Hill, New York.

Furtney, Steve and Steve Sommers. <u>Wyoming Population and Employment Forecast</u> <u>Report</u>. Division of Research and Statistics, Department of Administration and Fiscal Control, State of Wyoming, Cheyenne, WY, 1984.

Jacobs, James J. "Development of Water Resources: An Evaluation of the Westside Irrigation Project." (unpublished paper), February, 1984.

Jacobs, James J. (personal communication), Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY, 1984.

Kempler, Jack. (personal communication), J. T. Banner and Associates, Laramie, WY, 1984.

Leistritz, F. Larry, and Steven H. Murdock. <u>The Socioeconomic Impact of</u> <u>Resource Development: Methods for Assessment</u>. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc., 1981.

Leistritz, F. Larry, et al. <u>North Dakota Economic - Demographic Assessment</u> <u>Model (NEDAM) Technical Description</u>. Agricultural Economics Report No. 158, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, 1982. Leistritz, F. Larry (personal communication), Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, 1984.

Murdock, Steve and Eldon Schriner. "Community Service Satisfaction and Stages of Community Development: An Examination of Evidence from Impacted Communities." Journal of Community Development Society. Vol. 10, Springs, 1979.

Nelson Engineering. <u>Westside Project Plan Formulation Document</u>. Prepared for the Wyoming Water Development Commission, Nelson Engineering, Inc., Jackson, WY, 1985.

Ransom-Nelson, Bill (personal communication), Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, 1984.

U. S. Department of Interior. <u>Westside Irrigation Project</u>. Special Report, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region, September, 1983.

U. S. Department of Interior. Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Reservoir on the Middle Fork of Powder River. Bureau of Land Management, Wyoming BLM Office, Cheyenne, WY, 1976.