

**Questions for the Record Submitted to Ms. Denise Flanagan
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Federal Payments to Local Governments
provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs
and S. 430, S. 1643 and S. 2108
November 21, 2019**

Question from Chairman Lisa Murkowski

Question: Understanding that anticipating projected PILT payments is a difficult task, please provide an estimate of the impact of S. 2108 for payments for the State of Alaska (at the borough and census area level) for FY 2019, had the bill been enacted at the time payments were distributed.

Response: Including the same variables used to calculate 2019 PILT payments and applying the new population values, the overall payment to the State of Alaska would increase by approximately \$571,000. The table below provides estimated adjustments at the local government level.

<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</u>	<u>EST. PAYMENT INCREASE</u>
ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH	\$7,287
BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	\$13,098
DENALI BOROUGH	\$74,338
HOONAH-ANGOON CENSUS AREA	\$61,102
LAKE & PENINSULA BOROUGH	\$158,971
MUNICIPALITY-SKAGWAY	\$38,520
PETERSBURG BOROUGH	\$23,878
WRANGELL BOROUGH	\$152,666
YAKUTAT BOROUGH	\$41,012
TOTAL	\$570,872

Note: Due to the variability of program inputs, these estimates are provided for order of magnitude only and do not fully indicate the impact of this legislation on future payments.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to Ms. Denise Flanagan
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Federal Payments to Local Governments
provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs
and S. 430, S. 1643 and S. 2108
November 21, 2019**

Questions from Ranking Member Joe Manchin III

Question 1: As I understand it, S. 2108, the *Small County PILT Parity Act*, would increase the authorization level for the PILT program and modify the formula for distributing PILT payments. If funding for PILT remains flat (in other words if Congress doesn't appropriate additional funding to cover the difference between full funding at the current authorization level and the increased authorization level), how would the payments to West Virginia counties be impacted?

Response: Payments are calculated annually based on statutory formula inputs described in 31 U.S.C. 69. If Congress appropriates a fixed dollar amount for PILT that is less than the sum of total calculated payments under the PILT formula for a given fiscal year, then the amount paid to each municipality is based on a pro rata share of the total appropriated funding for that year (less program administrative expenses). So legislation that would increase the authorized PILT payments for select local governments would result in a corresponding decrease in the available funds to be paid to all other local governments receiving PILT payments that year.

In a "full funding" situation, such as Congress enacted in FY 2019, the Department issues the amount of the full statutory calculation less \$400,000 for administrative costs. In such a scenario, each local government, including West Virginia counties, would receive the full payment with no funding limit (less a proportionate share of administrative expenses).

Question 2: The Administration testified that it does not support S. 1643, the *Forest Management for Rural Stability Act*, which would set up a new program to pay out Secure Rural Schools payments and Refuge Revenue payments. Would the Administration be supportive of a legislative effort to combine Refuge Revenue payments with PILT payments? Would that lessen the Administrative burden on the agency?

Response: Refuge Revenue payments and PILT payments are managed by two different parts of the Department. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service maintains the personnel and systems required to collect data, manage program requirements, and issue Refuge Revenue payments, while Interior's Office of Budget maintains the personnel and systems required to collect data, manage program requirements, and issue PILT Payments. A full analysis of both programs would be required to determine whether combining the two programs would create any efficiencies or reduce Administrative burden.

Question 3: S. 2108, the *Small County PILT Parity Act*, would modify the PILT formula and change the amount of funding distributed under the program for certain counties. The counties that would be

**Questions for the Record Submitted to Ms. Denise Flanagan
 Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
 Federal Payments to Local Governments
 provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs
 and S. 430, S. 1643 and S. 2108
 November 21, 2019**

impacted are counties with populations of less than 5,000 individuals and whose payments are subject to the population cap, under the PILT formula.

- a. How many counties have a population under 5,000 and are subject to the population cap (and would have their funding changed should S. 2108 be enacted)?**

Response: The table below reflects estimates based on FY 2019 program data inputs. Due to the variability of program inputs from year to year, the actual number of affected counties may differ from these figures and may change over time.

DESCRIPTION	# of COUNTIES
Counties with <5,000 population	302
Counties with <5,000 population with payments changes under S. 2108	46
Counties with <5,000 population subject to population cap with payments changes under S. 2108	43

- b. Please provide us a table listing the counties whose payments would be impacted; the amount of PILT funding each impacted county actually received in 2017, 2018, and 2019; and the re-calculated amount of PILT funding each impacted county would have received in 2017, 2018, and 2019 if S. 2108 was previously enacted?**

Response: Attachment A displays the information requested for each PILT payment year. Please note the following:

- 1) The FY 2017 PILT program was subject to fixed appropriations of \$465 million, so the estimated increases associated with S .2108 would cause a corresponding decrease (~0.5%) in available funds to be paid to other local governments receiving PILT payments in that year. The offsetting reductions are not reflected in this table.
- 2) FY 2018 PILT estimates reflect the lack of authorization of the Secure Rural Schools program and are generally higher than FY 2017 and FY 2019.

The population dollar values used in producing these estimates were deflated from the 2019 values reflected in S. 2108 based on the actual Consumer Price Index (CPI) in use for the PILT program in that year (2.25% for FY 2019, 1.84% for FY 2018). The dollar values used in the computations are shown in the table below for reference:

**Questions for the Record Submitted to Ms. Denise Flanagan
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Federal Payments to Local Governments
provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs
and S. 430, S. 1643 and S. 2108
November 21, 2019**

POPULATION	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
1,000	\$ 244.31	\$ 248.80	\$ 254.40
2,000	\$ 221.51	\$ 225.58	\$ 230.66
3,000	\$ 203.59	\$ 207.33	\$ 212.00
4,000	\$ 190.56	\$ 194.06	\$ 198.43
5,000	\$ 179.15	\$ 182.45	\$ 186.56

Note: Due to the variability of program inputs, program impact estimates provide order of magnitude only and may not fully indicate the impact of this legislation on future payments.

- c. Of the impacted counties listed above, which counties would receive less funding if S. 2108 was enacted, even if Congress appropriated funding at the new increased authorization level?**

Response: Based on FY 2019 payment information, the Department estimates enactment of S. 2108 would cause a decreased PILT payment for the counties listed below:

STATE	LOCAL GOVERNMENT	2017	2018	2019
AK	HAINES BOROUGH		-\$4,232	
ID	ONEIDA COUNTY	-\$7,830	-\$16,128	-\$32,156
NM	HILDAGO COUNTY	-\$33,256	-\$8,654	-\$9,414
NM	CATRON COUNTY	-\$11,139		
NV	MINERAL COUNTY		-\$35,455	
UT	PIUTE COUNTY		-\$18,659	-\$10,507

Under the current PILT statute, payments for counties with populations below 5,000 are calculated using the actual population times the population dollar value for 5,000. So, for example, in 2019 Oneida County has a population of 4,427 and the 5,000 population dollar value is \$186.56, making their population cap amount \$825,901.12.

S. 2108 requires all counties be rounded to the nearest population segment and then calculate the dollar value. In the case of Oneida County in 2019, for example, their population (4,427) rounds down to 4,000 before being multiplied by the higher population dollar value of \$198.43. Under S. 2108, their population cap is \$793,720.00, which lowers their PILT payment.

- d. If S. 2108 was enacted, how much would you predict it would increase the PILT program's authorization level for FY 20?**

Response: The FY 2020 calculation is not yet available. The PILT calculation is driven by four key variables: 1) prior year payments; 2) inflation; 3) acreage; and 4) population. Updates to each of these

**Questions for the Record Submitted to Ms. Denise Flanagan
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Federal Payments to Local Governments
provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs
and S. 430, S. 1643 and S. 2108
November 21, 2019**

variables are required to be collected on an annual basis. The Department is currently initiating the FY 2020 program and anticipates having calculations available in time to issue payments before July 1st.

Based on FY 2019 payment information, the Department estimates enactment of S. 2108 would have increased the total authorized level for 2019 PILT payments by approximately \$2.0 million.

Question 4: During the hearing, a couple of my colleagues asked about the impact that the expiration of Secure Rural Schools program would have on counties' PILT payments. How would counties' payments change if Secure Rural Schools was not authorized and if Congress appropriated the same level of funding for PILT for FY 20 and FY 21 as it did for FY 19? Would urban counties receive higher payments and rural counties receive lower payments under this scenario because of the difference between appropriated funding and the increased authorization level?

Response: The expiration of Secure Rural Schools (SRS) in FY 2018 does not impact the FY 2020 PILT payment, because the final authorized payment for SRS was made in FY 2019. Payments made under SRS in one year (e.g. 2019) are deductible under the PILT program the following year (e.g. 2020).

If SRS payments are not made in FY 2020, the Department would expect the overall PILT payment calculation for FY 2021 to increase. PILT variables change the statutory calculation annually, but for reference, the full statutory calculation increased by 18.7% between FY 2017 (which included deductions for SRS payments) and FY 2018 (which did not).

In FY 2019, Congress provided full funding for the PILT program. In a full funding scenario, the Department would issue the full statutory calculation less the \$400,000 retained by the Department for the program's administrative expenses. If Congress provided full funding in FY 2020 and FY 2021, the Department would pay out the full statutory calculation less administrative expenses. The full statutory calculation would be increased by approximately \$2 million with passage of S. 2108. The full statutory calculation in FY 2021 would also be expected to increase if SRS payments were not issued during FY 2020. In this full funding scenario, regardless of the level of the statutory calculation, each local government receives the full payment (less a proportionate share of administrative expenses), regardless of their status as "urban" or "rural."

**Questions for the Record Submitted to Ms. Denise Flanagan
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Federal Payments to Local Governments
provided through the Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs
and S. 430, S. 1643 and S. 2108
November 21, 2019**

Questions from Senator Steve Daines

Questions: Due to the complexity of the PILT formula and the fluctuations in prior year payments, assessing the positive impact on small counties that my bipartisan Small County PILT Parity Act will have can be difficult. Because the Department has the most up-to-date information, would you provide the committee and myself with the following information for counties with populations less than 5,000:

- a. Projected FY19 payments had S. 2108 been enacted before payments were dispersed.**

Response: The table below reflects estimates based on FY 2019 program data inputs.

DESCRIPTION	# of COUNTIES
Counties with <5,000 population	302
Counties with <5,000 population with payments changes under S. 2108	46

The table in Attachment B shows the estimated impact of S. 2108 for the 46 counties with populations of less than 5,000 and anticipated payment changes.

- b. Projected FY20 payments if Secure Rural Schools is not reauthorized, assuming enactment of S. 2108 (to the maximum extent practicable).**

Response: The FY 2020 calculation is not yet available. The PILT calculation is driven by four key variables: 1) prior year payments; 2) inflation; 3) acreage; and 4) population. Updates to each of these variables are required to be collected on an annual basis. If SRS payments are not made in FY 2020, the Department would expect the overall PILT payment calculation for FY 2021 to increase. For reference, the full statutory calculation increased by 18.7% between FY 2017 (which included deductions for SRS payments) and FY 2018 (which did not).

The expiration of SRS in FY 2018 does not impact the FY 2020 PILT payment, because the final authorized payment for SRS was made in FY 2019. Payments made under SRS in one year (e.g. 2019) are deductible under the PILT program the following year (e.g. 2020).

- c. Projected FY20 payments if Secure Rural Schools is reauthorized, assuming enactment of S. 2108 (to the maximum extent practicable).**

Response: The FY 2020 calculation is not yet available. The PILT calculation is driven by four key variables: 1) prior year payments; 2) inflation; 3) acreage; and 4) population. Updates to each of these variables are required to be collected on an annual basis. PILT program growth is not standardized from one year to the next because these variables adjust independently. The Department estimates the passage of S. 2108 would increase the statutory calculation by \$2 million over and above the normal program growth factors.

Estimated 2017 Impacts of S.2108

	STATE	COUNTY	2017 ACTUAL PILT PAYMENT	2017 PAYMENT CALCULATED USING ALT POP VALUES	DELTA
1	ALASKA	YAKUTAT BOROUGH	\$ 109,505	\$ 148,649	\$ 39,144
2	ALASKA	BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	\$ 159,345	\$ 166,665	\$ 7,320
3	ALASKA	MUNICIPALITY-SKAGWAY	\$ 171,746	\$ 225,500	\$ 53,754
4	ALASKA	LAKE & PENINSULA BOROUGH	\$ 279,210	\$ 439,729	\$ 160,519
5	ALASKA	DENALI BOROUGH	\$ 342,806	\$ 439,729	\$ 96,923
6	ALASKA	HOONAH-ANGOON CENSUS AREA	\$ 381,034	\$ 439,729	\$ 58,695
7	ALASKA	WRANGELL BOROUGH	\$ 425,515	\$ 439,729	\$ 14,214
8	ALASKA	HAINES BOROUGH	\$ 353,000	\$ 461,763	\$ 108,763
9	ALASKA	PETERSBURG BOROUGH	\$ 567,532	\$ 606,233	\$ 38,701
10	ALASKA	ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH	\$ 596,828	\$ 606,233	\$ 9,405
11	CALIFORNIA	SIERRA COUNTY	\$ 159,632	\$ 217,278	\$ 57,646
12	COLORADO	SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$ 79,946	\$ 80,687	\$ 741
13	COLORADO	MINERAL COUNTY	\$ 129,691	\$ 176,051	\$ 46,360
14	COLORADO	HINSDALE COUNTY	\$ 138,365	\$ 187,790	\$ 49,425
15	IDAHO	CLARK COUNTY	\$ 157,201	\$ 213,396	\$ 56,195
16	IDAHO	BUTTE COUNTY	\$ 329,995	\$ 447,984	\$ 117,989
17	IDAHO	ADAMS COUNTY	\$ 208,457	\$ 280,721	\$ 72,264
18	IDAHO	CUSTER COUNTY	\$ 730,092	\$ 756,577	\$ 26,485
19	IDAHO	ONEIDA COUNTY	\$ 690,360	\$ 682,530	\$ (7,830)
20	MONTANA	PETROLEUM COUNTY	\$ 84,853	\$ 115,185	\$ 30,332
21	MONTANA	PRAIRIE COUNTY	\$ 158,456	\$ 171,315	\$ 12,859
22	MONTANA	CARTER COUNTY	\$ 210,792	\$ 218,049	\$ 7,257
23	MONTANA	GARFIELD COUNTY	\$ 234,730	\$ 242,495	\$ 7,765
24	MONTANA	MCCONE COUNTY	\$ 286,247	\$ 425,395	\$ 139,148
25	MONTANA	MEAGHER COUNTY	\$ 179,537	\$ 228,968	\$ 49,431
26	MONTANA	JUDITH BASIN COUNTY	\$ 263,528	\$ 359,570	\$ 96,042
27	MONTANA	SWEET GRASS COUNTY	\$ 541,699	\$ 649,599	\$ 107,900
28	MONTANA	PHILLIPS COUNTY	\$ 511,406	\$ 524,313	\$ 12,907
29	NEBRASKA	THOMAS COUNTY	\$ 103,524	\$ 147,288	\$ 43,764
30	NEBRASKA	SIoux COUNTY	\$ 222,571	\$ 229,871	\$ 7,300
31	NEVADA	ESMERALDA COUNTY	\$ 148,090	\$ 201,028	\$ 52,938
32	NEVADA	EUREKA COUNTY	\$ 360,133	\$ 439,729	\$ 79,596
33	NEW HAMPSHIRE	HARTS LOCATION TOWN	\$ 7,324	\$ 9,943	\$ 2,619
34	NEW HAMPSHIRE	ELLSWORTH TOWN	\$ 14,826	\$ 20,127	\$ 5,301
35	NEW HAMPSHIRE	WATERVILLE VALLEY	\$ 43,945	\$ 59,654	\$ 15,709
36	NEW HAMPSHIRE	CHATHAM TOWN	\$ 60,022	\$ 76,324	\$ 16,302
37	NEW MEXICO	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 122,233	\$ 166,817	\$ 44,584
38	NEW MEXICO	CATRON COUNTY	\$ 617,372	\$ 606,233	\$ (11,139)
39	NEW MEXICO	HIDALGO COUNTY	\$ 728,804	\$ 695,548	\$ (33,256)
40	SOUTH DAKOTA	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 213,504	\$ 229,724	\$ 16,220
41	TEXAS	KENEDY COUNTY	\$ 72,705	\$ 98,695	\$ 25,990
42	UTAH	DAGGETT COUNTY	\$ 138,513	\$ 183,172	\$ 44,659
43	UTAH	PIUTE COUNTY	\$ 246,314	\$ 415,162	\$ 168,848
44	UTAH	RICH COUNTY	\$ 412,832	\$ 439,729	\$ 26,897
45	UTAH	WAYNE COUNTY	\$ 480,893	\$ 501,629	\$ 20,736
46	VERMONT	SEARSBURG TOWN	\$ 19,114	\$ 20,349	\$ 1,235
47	VERMONT	STRATTON TOWN	\$ 37,514	\$ 47,532	\$ 10,018
48	VERMONT	MOUNT TABOR TOWN	\$ 45,731	\$ 62,078	\$ 16,347
	TOTAL		\$ 12,577,472	\$ 14,602,494	\$ 2,025,022

Estimated 2018 Impacts of S.2108

	STATE	COUNTY	2018 ACTUAL PILT PAYMENT	2018 PAYMENT CALCULATED USING ALT POP VALUES	DELTA
1	ALASKA	YAKUTAT BOROUGH	\$ 109,565	\$ 149,414	\$ 39,849
2	ALASKA	BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	\$ 163,710	\$ 170,934	\$ 7,224
3	ALASKA	MUNICIPALITY-SKAGWAY	\$ 195,873	\$ 246,131	\$ 50,258
4	ALASKA	LAKE & PENINSULA BOROUGH	\$ 284,761	\$ 450,816	\$ 166,055
5	ALASKA	DENALI BOROUGH	\$ 356,043	\$ 450,810	\$ 94,767
6	ALASKA	HOONAH-ANGOON CENSUS AREA	\$ 378,829	\$ 450,807	\$ 71,978
7	ALASKA	WRANGELL BOROUGH	\$ 439,538	\$ 450,803	\$ 11,265
8	ALASKA	HAINES BOROUGH	\$ 426,976	\$ 422,744	\$ (4,232)
9	ALASKA	PETERSBURG BOROUGH	\$ 574,079	\$ 621,501	\$ 47,422
10	ALASKA	ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH	\$ 600,878	\$ 621,499	\$ 20,621
11	CALIFORNIA	SIERRA COUNTY	\$ 435,825	\$ 520,075	\$ 84,250
12	COLORADO	SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$ 118,057	\$ 164,071	\$ 46,014
13	COLORADO	MINERAL COUNTY	\$ 133,447	\$ 181,981	\$ 48,534
14	COLORADO	HINSDALE COUNTY	\$ 143,758	\$ 196,004	\$ 52,246
15	IDAHO	CLARK COUNTY	\$ 156,782	\$ 213,803	\$ 57,021
16	IDAHO	CAMAS COUNTY	\$ 168,434	\$ 210,328	\$ 41,894
17	IDAHO	BUTTE COUNTY	\$ 450,209	\$ 615,775	\$ 165,566
18	IDAHO	ADAMS COUNTY	\$ 701,284	\$ 765,923	\$ 64,639
19	IDAHO	CUSTER COUNTY	\$ 746,722	\$ 775,627	\$ 28,905
20	IDAHO	ONEIDA COUNTY	\$ 780,516	\$ 764,388	\$ (16,128)
21	MONTANA	PETROLEUM COUNTY	\$ 89,148	\$ 121,569	\$ 32,421
22	MONTANA	PRAIRIE COUNTY	\$ 163,075	\$ 171,060	\$ 7,985
23	MONTANA	CARTER COUNTY	\$ 219,314	\$ 225,441	\$ 6,127
24	MONTANA	GARFIELD COUNTY	\$ 238,819	\$ 248,603	\$ 9,784
25	MONTANA	MCCONE COUNTY	\$ 302,169	\$ 443,064	\$ 140,895
26	MONTANA	MEAGHER COUNTY	\$ 306,475	\$ 424,215	\$ 117,740
27	MONTANA	JUDITH BASIN COUNTY	\$ 342,173	\$ 439,311	\$ 97,138
28	MONTANA	GRANITE COUNTY	\$ 567,035	\$ 574,528	\$ 7,493
29	MONTANA	SWEET GRASS COUNTY	\$ 635,827	\$ 750,969	\$ 115,142
30	MONTANA	PHILLIPS COUNTY	\$ 639,380	\$ 661,538	\$ 22,158
31	MONTANA	MINERAL COUNTY	\$ 721,846	\$ 734,706	\$ 12,860
32	NEBRASKA	THOMAS COUNTY	\$ 130,532	\$ 178,005	\$ 47,473
33	NEBRASKA	SIOUX COUNTY	\$ 226,423	\$ 238,324	\$ 11,901
34	NEVADA	ESMERALDA COUNTY	\$ 144,021	\$ 196,400	\$ 52,379
35	NEVADA	EUREKA COUNTY	\$ 349,478	\$ 450,809	\$ 101,331
36	NEVADA	MINERAL COUNTY	\$ 781,024	\$ 745,569	\$ (35,455)
37	NEW HAMPSHIRE	HARTS LOCATION TOWN	\$ 7,474	\$ 10,193	\$ 2,719
38	NEW HAMPSHIRE	ELLSWORTH TOWN	\$ 15,679	\$ 21,381	\$ 5,702
39	NEW HAMPSHIRE	WATERVILLE VALLEY	\$ 44,664	\$ 60,909	\$ 16,245
40	NEW HAMPSHIRE	CHATHAM TOWN	\$ 62,530	\$ 78,280	\$ 15,750
41	NEW MEXICO	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 116,768	\$ 160,859	\$ 44,091
42	NEW MEXICO	CATRON COUNTY	\$ 639,528	\$ 775,636	\$ 136,108
43	NEW MEXICO	HIDALGO COUNTY	\$ 739,903	\$ 731,249	\$ (8,654)
44	OREGON	WHEELER COUNTY	\$ 213,405	\$ 216,990	\$ 3,585
45	SOUTH DAKOTA	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 230,065	\$ 245,683	\$ 15,618
46	TEXAS	KENEDY COUNTY	\$ 73,652	\$ 100,437	\$ 26,785
47	UTAH	DAGGETT COUNTY	\$ 192,793	\$ 241,775	\$ 48,982
48	UTAH	PIUTE COUNTY	\$ 267,261	\$ 248,602	\$ (18,659)
49	UTAH	RICH COUNTY	\$ 422,767	\$ 450,805	\$ 28,038
50	UTAH	WAYNE COUNTY	\$ 492,589	\$ 613,577	\$ 120,988
51	VERMONT	SEARSBURG TOWN	\$ 19,507	\$ 20,870	\$ 1,363
52	VERMONT	STRATTON TOWN	\$ 37,555	\$ 48,750	\$ 11,195
53	VERMONT	MOUNT TABOR TOWN	\$ 46,853	\$ 63,893	\$ 17,040
	TOTAL		\$ 16,845,018	\$ 19,137,434	\$ 2,292,416

Estimated 2019 Impacts of S.2108

	STATE	COUNTY	2019 ACTUAL PILT PAYMENT	2019 PAYMENT CALCULATED USING ALT POP VALUES	DELTA
1	ALASKA	YAKUTAT BOROUGH	\$ 112,783	\$ 153,795	\$ 41,012
2	ALASKA	BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	\$ 161,625	\$ 174,723	\$ 13,098
3	ALASKA	MUNICIPALITY-SKAGWAY	\$ 197,075	\$ 235,595	\$ 38,520
4	ALASKA	LAKE & PENINSULA BOROUGH	\$ 301,997	\$ 460,968	\$ 158,971
5	ALASKA	DENALI BOROUGH	\$ 386,630	\$ 460,968	\$ 74,338
6	ALASKA	HOONAH-ANGOON CENSUS AREA	\$ 399,866	\$ 460,968	\$ 61,102
7	ALASKA	WRANGELL BOROUGH	\$ 469,960	\$ 622,626	\$ 152,666
8	ALASKA	PETERSBURG BOROUGH	\$ 611,637	\$ 635,515	\$ 23,878
9	ALASKA	ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH	\$ 628,228	\$ 635,515	\$ 7,287
10	CALIFORNIA	SIERRA COUNTY	\$ 220,838	\$ 297,286	\$ 76,448
11	COLORADO	SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$ 92,679	\$ 141,148	\$ 48,469
12	COLORADO	MINERAL COUNTY	\$ 142,796	\$ 194,721	\$ 51,925
13	COLORADO	HINSDALE COUNTY	\$ 148,116	\$ 201,940	\$ 53,824
14	IDAHO	CLARK COUNTY	\$ 162,743	\$ 221,922	\$ 59,179
15	IDAHO	BUTTE COUNTY	\$ 348,666	\$ 474,829	\$ 126,163
16	IDAHO	ADAMS COUNTY	\$ 339,795	\$ 359,836	\$ 20,041
17	IDAHO	CUSTER COUNTY	\$ 777,735	\$ 793,115	\$ 15,380
18	IDAHO	ONEIDA COUNTY	\$ 753,803	\$ 721,647	\$ (32,156)
19	MONTANA	PETROLEUM COUNTY	\$ 97,497	\$ 130,566	\$ 33,069
20	MONTANA	PRAIRIE COUNTY	\$ 167,372	\$ 175,354	\$ 7,982
21	MONTANA	CARTER COUNTY	\$ 227,802	\$ 231,379	\$ 3,577
22	MONTANA	GARFIELD COUNTY	\$ 241,038	\$ 254,206	\$ 13,168
23	MONTANA	MCCONE COUNTY	\$ 314,296	\$ 454,999	\$ 140,703
24	MONTANA	MEAGHER COUNTY	\$ 189,886	\$ 233,877	\$ 43,991
25	MONTANA	JUDITH BASIN COUNTY	\$ 272,173	\$ 367,577	\$ 95,404
26	MONTANA	SWEET GRASS COUNTY	\$ 584,107	\$ 689,153	\$ 105,046
27	NEBRASKA	THOMAS COUNTY	\$ 108,539	\$ 157,686	\$ 49,147
28	NEBRASKA	SIOUX COUNTY	\$ 223,615	\$ 242,962	\$ 19,347
29	NEVADA	ESMERALDA COUNTY	\$ 158,455	\$ 216,075	\$ 57,620
30	NEVADA	EUREKA COUNTY	\$ 365,565	\$ 460,968	\$ 95,403
31	NEW HAMPSHIRE	HARTS LOCATION TOWN	\$ 7,643	\$ 10,422	\$ 2,779
32	NEW HAMPSHIRE	ELLSWORTH TOWN	\$ 16,032	\$ 21,861	\$ 5,829
33	NEW HAMPSHIRE	WATERVILLE VALLEY	\$ 45,299	\$ 61,772	\$ 16,473
34	NEW HAMPSHIRE	CHATHAM TOWN	\$ 65,806	\$ 80,014	\$ 14,208
35	NEW MEXICO	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 124,430	\$ 171,339	\$ 46,909
36	NEW MEXICO	CATRON COUNTY	\$ 668,681	\$ 793,115	\$ 124,434
37	NEW MEXICO	HIDALGO COUNTY	\$ 726,661	\$ 717,247	\$ (9,414)
38	OREGON	WHEELER COUNTY	\$ 215,244	\$ 216,481	\$ 1,237
39	SOUTH DAKOTA	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 209,647	\$ 232,322	\$ 22,675
40	TEXAS	KENEDY COUNTY	\$ 77,737	\$ 106,004	\$ 28,267
41	UTAH	PIUTE COUNTY	\$ 242,617	\$ 232,110	\$ (10,507)
42	UTAH	RICH COUNTY	\$ 445,725	\$ 460,968	\$ 15,243
43	UTAH	WAYNE COUNTY	\$ 506,870	\$ 529,394	\$ 22,524
44	VERMONT	SEARSBURG TOWN	\$ 20,133	\$ 21,332	\$ 1,199
45	VERMONT	STRATTON TOWN	\$ 37,656	\$ 49,830	\$ 12,174
46	VERMONT	MOUNT TABOR TOWN	\$ 48,282	\$ 65,840	\$ 17,558
	TOTAL		\$ 12,665,780	\$ 14,631,970	\$ 1,966,190

Estimated 2019 Impacts of S.2108

	STATE	COUNTY	2019 ACTUAL PILT PAYMENT	2019 PAYMENT CALCULATED USING ALT POP VALUES	DELTA
1	ALASKA	YAKUTAT BOROUGH	\$ 112,783	\$ 153,795	\$ 41,012
2	ALASKA	BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH	\$ 161,625	\$ 174,723	\$ 13,098
3	ALASKA	MUNICIPALITY-SKAGWAY	\$ 197,075	\$ 235,595	\$ 38,520
4	ALASKA	LAKE & PENINSULA BOROUGH	\$ 301,997	\$ 460,968	\$ 158,971
5	ALASKA	DENALI BOROUGH	\$ 386,630	\$ 460,968	\$ 74,338
6	ALASKA	HOONAH-ANGOON CENSUS AREA	\$ 399,866	\$ 460,968	\$ 61,102
7	ALASKA	WRANGELL BOROUGH	\$ 469,960	\$ 622,626	\$ 152,666
8	ALASKA	PETERSBURG BOROUGH	\$ 611,637	\$ 635,515	\$ 23,878
9	ALASKA	ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH	\$ 628,228	\$ 635,515	\$ 7,287
10	CALIFORNIA	SIERRA COUNTY	\$ 220,838	\$ 297,286	\$ 76,448
11	COLORADO	SAN JUAN COUNTY	\$ 92,679	\$ 141,148	\$ 48,469
12	COLORADO	MINERAL COUNTY	\$ 142,796	\$ 194,721	\$ 51,925
13	COLORADO	HINSDALE COUNTY	\$ 148,116	\$ 201,940	\$ 53,824
14	IDAHO	CLARK COUNTY	\$ 162,743	\$ 221,922	\$ 59,179
15	IDAHO	BUTTE COUNTY	\$ 348,666	\$ 474,829	\$ 126,163
16	IDAHO	ADAMS COUNTY	\$ 339,795	\$ 359,836	\$ 20,041
17	IDAHO	CUSTER COUNTY	\$ 777,735	\$ 793,115	\$ 15,380
18	IDAHO	ONEIDA COUNTY	\$ 753,803	\$ 721,647	\$ (32,156)
19	MONTANA	PETROLEUM COUNTY	\$ 97,497	\$ 130,566	\$ 33,069
20	MONTANA	PRAIRIE COUNTY	\$ 167,372	\$ 175,354	\$ 7,982
21	MONTANA	CARTER COUNTY	\$ 227,802	\$ 231,379	\$ 3,577
22	MONTANA	GARFIELD COUNTY	\$ 241,038	\$ 254,206	\$ 13,168
23	MONTANA	MCCONE COUNTY	\$ 314,296	\$ 454,999	\$ 140,703
24	MONTANA	MEAGHER COUNTY	\$ 189,886	\$ 233,877	\$ 43,991
25	MONTANA	JUDITH BASIN COUNTY	\$ 272,173	\$ 367,577	\$ 95,404
26	MONTANA	SWEET GRASS COUNTY	\$ 584,107	\$ 689,153	\$ 105,046
27	NEBRASKA	THOMAS COUNTY	\$ 108,539	\$ 157,686	\$ 49,147
28	NEBRASKA	SIOUX COUNTY	\$ 223,615	\$ 242,962	\$ 19,347
29	NEVADA	ESMERALDA COUNTY	\$ 158,455	\$ 216,075	\$ 57,620
30	NEVADA	EUREKA COUNTY	\$ 365,565	\$ 460,968	\$ 95,403
31	NEW HAMPSHIRE	HARTS LOCATION TOWN	\$ 7,643	\$ 10,422	\$ 2,779
32	NEW HAMPSHIRE	ELLSWORTH TOWN	\$ 16,032	\$ 21,861	\$ 5,829
33	NEW HAMPSHIRE	WATERVILLE VALLEY	\$ 45,299	\$ 61,772	\$ 16,473
34	NEW HAMPSHIRE	CHATHAM TOWN	\$ 65,806	\$ 80,014	\$ 14,208
35	NEW MEXICO	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 124,430	\$ 171,339	\$ 46,909
36	NEW MEXICO	CATRON COUNTY	\$ 668,681	\$ 793,115	\$ 124,434
37	NEW MEXICO	HIDALGO COUNTY	\$ 726,661	\$ 717,247	\$ (9,414)
38	OREGON	WHEELER COUNTY	\$ 215,244	\$ 216,481	\$ 1,237
39	SOUTH DAKOTA	HARDING COUNTY	\$ 209,647	\$ 232,322	\$ 22,675
40	TEXAS	KENEDY COUNTY	\$ 77,737	\$ 106,004	\$ 28,267
41	UTAH	PIUTE COUNTY	\$ 242,617	\$ 232,110	\$ (10,507)
42	UTAH	RICH COUNTY	\$ 445,725	\$ 460,968	\$ 15,243
43	UTAH	WAYNE COUNTY	\$ 506,870	\$ 529,394	\$ 22,524
44	VERMONT	SEARSBURG TOWN	\$ 20,133	\$ 21,332	\$ 1,199
45	VERMONT	STRATTON TOWN	\$ 37,656	\$ 49,830	\$ 12,174
46	VERMONT	MOUNT TABOR TOWN	\$ 48,282	\$ 65,840	\$ 17,558
	TOTAL		\$ 12,665,780	\$ 14,631,970	\$ 1,966,190