

# Montana Communities Explore Tourism Potential

Powder River County, MT

Laurel, MT

Hill County, MT

The 1997 Montana Community  
Tourism Assessment Process

# Montana Communities Explore Tourism Potential

Powder River County, MT  
Laurel, MT  
Hill County, MT

## The 1997 Montana Community Tourism Assessment Process

Prepared by:  
Paul L. Grant  
Norma P. Nickerson  
Rita J. Black

Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research  
School of Forestry  
The University of Montana  
Missoula, MT 59812  
(406)243-5686

Research Report 53

November 1997





## **Executive Summary**

This report presents information, including present levels and characteristics of travel, and residents' opinions about tourism for the three Montana communities of Powder River County, Laurel, and Hill County along with characteristics for a statewide sample.

### **Visitors**

- In 1996, over 3.5 million travel groups visited Montana. Of those, approximately 117,000 traveled through Powder River County, about 2 million went through Laurel, and roughly 198,000 traveled through Hill County.
- Over \$1.4 billion was spent statewide in 1996 by nonresident travelers. That figure amounts to about \$1,740 spent by nonresident travelers for every resident in Montana. Powder River County received about \$1 million of that money (averaging \$520 for each resident of Powder River County). Laurel received approximately \$3.6 million (averaging \$564 for each resident of Laurel). Hill County received about \$7.9 million (averaging \$452 for each resident of Hill County).
- Nonresidents that visited Hill County spent the most money in that county as compared to visitors to Laurel and Powder River County. Hill County visitors also stayed in Montana the longest. Visitors that traveled through Laurel spent the most money in Montana.
- Travelers through Powder River County were slightly older and were more likely to be traveling as a family. Travelers through Laurel were most likely to have visited Montana before and were more likely to stay in a motel. Travelers in Hill County were most likely to camp and least likely to stay at the home of a friend or relative.
- Visitors to all sample areas were likely to be from Washington state. Powder River County mostly hosted South Dakotans while Hill County mostly hosted Minnesotans.
- Nonresidents visiting Hill County were most likely to use AAA to plan their trip. Visitors to all sample areas identified AAA as the most useful source of information in planing their trips.
- Laurel visitors were more likely to use highway information signs while in Montana. Visitors to Hill County cited people in visitor information centers as the most helpful information source while in Montana.
- Hill County visitors were most likely to be on vacation. They were attracted by Glacier National Park and Montana's mountains. Visitors to Powder River County and to the state were also attracted primarily by Glacier National Park while Laurel visitors were most attracted by Yellowstone National Park.
- The most popular Montana activity of travel groups in all samples was watching wildlife. Nonresidents traveling through Powder River County were more likely to visit Montana's historic and interpretive sites. Visitors in Hill County were more likely to day hike in Montana than visitors in the other samples.

### **Resident Opinions about Tourism**

- All four sample groups indicated the overall benefits of tourism outweigh the negative impacts, that state tourism promotion benefits their community economically, that tourism would help their communities grow in the right direction, and that they supported continued tourism promotion by the state of Montana.
- In general, respondents from the four sample groups did not believe there would be a personal financial benefit from increased tourism nor that increased tourism would improve the quality of life for Montanans.
- Although all groups were relatively neutral toward tourism development, Powder River County and

- Hill County respondents were slightly more supportive than were statewide and Laurel respondents.
- All four sample groups indicated that tourism has a positive influence on Montana’s well-being. However, statewide and Laurel respondents were split regarding whether tourism has a positive or negative effect on their communities and on themselves personally. Powder River County and Hill County respondents were more positive regarding tourism’s influence on their communities and on them personally.
  - The top advantage of tourism was the economic benefits and increased number of jobs.
  - The perceived disadvantages varied by sample. Statewide, Laurel, and Hill County respondents were most concerned with traffic and congestion. All samples were somewhat concerned with overcrowding. Powder River County respondents were concerned with increased crime. However, several respondents from each sample said there were no disadvantages to increased tourism.
  - Statewide respondents perceived the future of their communities as the brightest while Powder River County respondents were less positive about their community.
  - Respondents from the three communities did not feel that tourism was the major contributor to traffic congestion in their communities.
  - Powder River County and Hill County respondents rated safety from crime as very important and felt its current condition was good. However, respondents from both communities perceived tourism will have a negative impact on safety from crime.
  - Respondents from all three communities rated the conditions of Montana’s highways and roads and of local roads as poor, and all samples perceived tourism will negatively affect roads.
  - Respondents from Powder River County rated the current condition of their community’s museums and cultural centers as good. Hill County respondents rated their museums and cultural centers as neither good nor bad. Both sets of respondents perceived tourism will positively influence their museums and cultural centers.
  - Laurel and Hill County respondents were concerned about infrastructure. Both communities rated their infrastructure as poor, and both stated that tourism will negatively impact it.
  - Most respondents were neutral about the current condition of their communities. Particular areas of concern included roads, long-term development planning, and job opportunities.
  - The majority of respondents from all four samples felt their communities were growing at a rate of “about right”.

# Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<i>Visitors .....</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Resident Opinions about Tourism.....</i>	<i>i</i>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SECTION I.....</b>	<b>1</b>
THE NONRESIDENT TRAVEL STUDY METHODOLOGY .....	1
FINDINGS: A PROFILE OF CURRENT VISITORS .....	2
<i>Group Characteristics.....</i>	2
<i>Information Sources.....</i>	5
<i>Types of Trips .....</i>	9
<i>Economic Characteristics .....</i>	14
<b>SECTION II .....</b>	<b>15</b>
METHODOLOGY: THE MONTANA RESIDENT OPINION STUDY .....	15
RESIDENT RESPONSE CONSIDERATIONS .....	15
RESIDENTS’ OPINIONS ABOUT MONTANA, THEIR COMMUNITY, AND TOURISM .....	16
<i>Respondent Characteristics.....</i>	17
<i>Community Attachment and Change.....</i>	19
<i>The Importance of Factors of Well-Being .....</i>	21
<i>Perceived Conditions of Montana, the Community, and Personal Well-Being .....</i>	22
<i>Perceived Influence of Tourism on Well-Being .....</i>	24
<i>Support for Tourism Development.....</i>	26
<i>Advantages/Disadvantages of Tourism Development .....</i>	28
COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC QUESTION RESULTS .....	30
<i>Powder River County.....</i>	30
<i>Laurel.....</i>	33
<i>Hill County.....</i>	37
<b>COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: STATEWIDE RESIDENT OPINION SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: POWDER RIVER GENERAL COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: LAUREL APPEARANCE COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: LAUREL GENERAL COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: HILL COUNTY GENERAL COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: STATEWIDE GENERAL COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>76</b>

## List of Tables

TABLE 1: SAMPLE SIZES AND RESPONSE RATES FOR THE SURVEY SAMPLES USED IN THIS REPORT .....	2
TABLE 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF NONRESIDENT TRAVELERS VISITING MONTANA – SUMMER, ‘96.....	4
TABLE 3: RESIDENCE OF VISITORS TO MONTANA DURING SUMMER, ‘96: TOP SIX STATES/PROVINCES .....	5
TABLE 4: SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED <i>PRIOR</i> TO VISIT TO MONTANA – SUMMER, ‘96 .....	7
TABLE 5: <i>MOST USEFUL</i> SOURCE OF INFORMATION USED <i>PRIOR</i> TO VISIT TO MONTANA – SUMMER, ‘96 .....	7
TABLE 6: SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED <i>WHILE</i> VISITORS WERE IN MONTANA – SUMMER, ‘96 .....	8
TABLE 7: <i>MOST HELPFUL</i> SOURCE OF INFORMATION USED <i>WHILE</i> VISITORS WERE IN MONTANA – SUMMER, ‘96 .....	8
TABLE 8: PURPOSE OF TRIP TO MONTANA BY NONRESIDENT TRAVELERS – SUMMER, ‘96 .....	10
TABLE 9: ATTRACTION OF MONTANA AS A VACATION DESTINATION BY NONRESIDENT VACATION TRAVELERS - SUMMER, ‘96 .....	12
TABLE 10: RECREATION ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION OF VISITORS TO MONTANA - SUMMER, ‘96 .....	14
TABLE 11: VISITATION AND EXPENDITURES OF NONRESIDENT TRAVELERS TO MONTANA - ‘96.....	15
TABLE 12: SAMPLE SIZES AND RESPONSE RATES FOR THE SURVEY SAMPLES USED IN THIS REPORT .....	16
TABLE 13: EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESIDENT RESPONDENTS .....	17
TABLE 14: EMPLOYMENT SECTOR OF RESIDENT RESPONDENTS .....	18
TABLE 15: EMPLOYMENT TYPE FOR RESIDENT RESPONDENTS .....	18
TABLE 16: RESPONDENTS’ COMMUNITY SIZE .....	19
TABLE 17: RESPONDENTS’ RESIDENCY CHARACTERISTICS .....	20
TABLE 18: COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT STATEMENTS .....	21
TABLE 19: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY GROWTH .....	21
TABLE 20: THE PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS OF WELL-BEING.....	22
TABLE 21: THE PERCEIVED CONDITION OF MONTANA.....	23
TABLE 22: THE PERCEIVED CONDITION OF THE COMMUNITY.....	23
TABLE 23: THE PERCEIVED CONDITION OF THE INDIVIDUAL .....	24
TABLE 24: TOURISM’S PERCEIVED INFLUENCE ON MONTANA.....	25
TABLE 25: TOURISM’S PERCEIVED INFLUENCE ON THE COMMUNITY.....	26
TABLE 26: TOURISM’S PERCEIVED INFLUENCE ON THE INDIVIDUAL.....	26
TABLE 27: STATEMENTS OF AGREEMENT WITH VARIOUS ASPECTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT.....	27
TABLE 28: STATEMENTS OF AGREEMENT ABOUT TOURISM GROWTH CONCERNS.....	28
TABLE 29: THE TOP ADVANTAGE OF INCREASED TOURISM IN THE COMMUNITY .....	29
TABLE 30: THE MAIN DISADVANTAGE OF INCREASED TOURISM IN THE COMMUNITY .....	29
TABLE 31: IMPORTANCE RATINGS .....	30
TABLE 32: RESPONDENTS’ REACTIONS TO PEOPLE VISITING POWDER RIVER COUNTRY .....	31
TABLE 33: POWDER RIVER COUNTY TOURISM SUMMARY AND COMPARISON .....	32
TABLE 34: LAUREL’S APPEARANCE.....	33
TABLE 35: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF LAUREL AS A TOURISM DESTINATION.....	34
TABLE 36: LAUREL CONDITION/INFLUENCE COMPARISON.....	36
TABLE 37: LOCAL ATTRACTIONS VISITED BY HILL COUNTY RESPONDENTS.....	37
TABLE 38: HILL COUNTY CONDITION /INFLUENCE COMPARISON .....	39

## **Introduction**

This report is intended to provide a comprehensive profile of current visitors and resident opinions about tourism in the three communities participating in the 1997 Montana Community Tourism Assessment Process (CTAP). CTAP is facilitated by Travel Montana and the Montana State University Extension Service. Each year three communities are chosen to participate in the CTAP program from the eligible pool of applicants. The 1997 communities included Powder River County, Laurel, and Hill County. Montana communities that have previously used the process include Choteau, Libby, Lewistown, Glendive, Fort Belknap Indian Community, Ravalli County, Three Forks, Glacier County, Deer Lodge, and Livingston. The initial assessment process takes about nine months to complete.

At the conclusion of the assessment process, members of the CTAP committee decide whether further tourism development would be beneficial to the community and, if so, suitable projects are identified and pursued. The decisions about how to proceed are based on consideration of a wide variety of information including present levels and characteristics of travel, existing travel-related infrastructure and attractions, the area's need for economic development, and residents' opinions about tourism. The resident tourism committees are encouraged to continue beyond that time with work that was started using CTAP.

The Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research at The University of Montana (ITRR) supports CTAP by providing technical assistance to the communities through this visitor and resident profile report. Funding for this research came from the Lodging Facility Use Tax.

For ease of understanding, the reader needs to be aware that two separate studies were used for this report. First, the current visitor profile for each community was developed based on research conducted by ITRR during the summer of 1996. At that time, a four-month survey was conducted of nonresident summer travelers in Montana. A profile of visitors was developed from the subset of surveys that represented nonresident travelers passing through each of the communities. Second, the assessment of resident opinions was developed based on mail-back questionnaires obtained from sampled residents in each community in September, October, and November of 1997. A statewide sample of resident opinions was also obtained, and the results of that sample and the profile of nonresident visitors are reported at the state level for comparison to local conditions.

This report, therefore, has two sections. The first section provides the visitor profile for each community and the state. The second section provides an assessment of residents' attitudes toward tourism in their respective community or the state.

## **SECTION I**

Data collected for this section of the report came from the ITRR 1996 Nonresident Summer Travel Study.

### **The Nonresident Travel Study Methodology**

Travelers to Montana during the summer of 1996 (June 1 – September 30) were intercepted for the Nonresident Travel Study. The traveler population was defined as those persons who entered Montana by private vehicle or commercial air carrier during the study period and whose primary residence was not in Montana at that time. Specifically excluded from the study were those persons traveling in a plainly marked commercial vehicle such as a scheduled or charter bus or semi truck. Also excluded were those travelers who entered Montana by train. Other than the exclusions mentioned above, the study attempted to assess all types of travel to the state including travel for pleasure, business, passing through or any

other reason.

Data were obtained through a mail-back diary questionnaire that was administered to a sample of intercepted travelers who entered the state. During the four months, 12,941 groups were contacted. Usable questionnaires were returned by 5,800 groups for a response rate of 45%. (For a complete discussion of the methodology and results of the 1996 Nonresident Summer Travelers to Montana Study, please refer to ITRR Reports 51<sup>1</sup> and 52<sup>2</sup>.) To apply this data to specific communities, visitors were identified by travel routes indicated on the questionnaire map. A sample of 169 surveys/respondents were identified as having traveled through Powder River County, 1,632 as having traveled through Laurel, and 287 as having traveled through Hill County visitors. Travelers could have visited more than one of the communities and therefore could be included in more than one sample. The statewide sample included all travelers. Because this study represented nonresident travel, none of the data included Montana residents visiting the area. Table 1 shows the sizes of the nonresident travel samples.

**Table 1:** Sample Sizes and Response Rates for the Survey Samples Used in this Report

	Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
Nonresident groups contacted:	12,941			
Usable nonresident travel questionnaires returned:	5,800			
Nonresident Travel Study response rate:	45%			
Sample size of nonresident travel groups:		169	1,632	287
Percent of all nonresident travel groups:		3%	30%	5%

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey and the 1997 Resident Opinion Survey, ITRR

## Findings: A Profile of Current Visitors

According to the ITRR visitor estimation model, there were 3,550,000 visitor groups (averaging 2.6 people per group) to Montana during 1996<sup>3</sup>. During the entire year (1996), it is estimated that 117,000 of those groups passed through Powder River County, 1,193,000 through Laurel, and 198,000 groups passed through Hill County. While it cannot be estimated from the data, it is likely that the majority of the groups passing through a community did not stop. The profile represents all nonresidents passing through—even if they did not stop in an area.

### Group Characteristics

Table 2 shows travel group characteristics. There were some differences between the travel groups to each community and to the entire statewide sample. The following results indicate those differences:

<sup>1</sup> Parrish, J., Nickerson, N., and McMahon, K. (1997). *Nonresident Summer Travelers to Montana: Profiles and Characteristics*. Research Report 51, Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research, School of Forestry, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT 113 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Parrish, J., Nickerson, N., and McMahon, K. (1997). *Nonresident Summer Travelers to Montana: All Visitors, Cultural Visitors, Canadian Visitors, Highway and Air Traveler Characteristics*. Research Report 52, Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research, School of Forestry, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT 106 pp.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of travelers is estimated each year, while the profile of visitors is only re-evaluated every few years. Therefore, this report represents traveler characteristics that were estimated from data collected in the summer of 1996, while the estimated number of travelers and their total economic impacts have been adjusted to represent the entire year of 1996.

Statewide. The average travel party size of Montana visitors was 2.6. Seventy-five percent of Montana travelers had visited the state before this trip. Most summer visitors to Montana in 1996 traveled as couples (38%). Thirty-four percent of Montana visitors traveled with family. Thirty-one percent of male visitors in this sample were 30-49 years old and 24 percent were 50-64 years old. Thirty-three percent of female visitors were 30-49 years old and 25 percent were 50-64 years old. The majority of summer visitors' choice of accommodation while in Montana was motels/hotels (59%) and they stayed, on average, 3.2 nights.

Powder River County. The average travel party size of visitors traveling through Powder River County was 2.7. The majority of nonresident visitors traveling through Powder River County tended to be traveling as a family unit (43%). Twenty-six percent of male visitors were 30-49 years old and twenty-eight percent were 50-64 years old. Thirty-two percent of female visitors to this area were 30-49 years old and 29 percent were 50-64 years old. Travelers passing through this county stayed in Montana for a shorter amount of time (2.9 nights, compared to 3.2 nights statewide), and they stayed in hotels or motels (61%).

In summary, when compared to all nonresidents traveling through the state, travelers through Powder River County were more likely to be a family group, as opposed to a couple, consisted of slightly older males, and stayed a fraction longer.

Laurel. The average travel party size of visitors traveling through the Laurel area was 2.7. Over four-fifths of the visitors (80%) traveling through Laurel had visited Montana before. The majority of nonresident visitors passing through Laurel were couples (39%), followed by families (34%). Thirty percent of male visitors in this sample were 30-49 years old and 24 percent were 50-64 years old. Thirty-two percent of female visitors were 30-49 years old and 26 percent were 50-64 years old. The choice of accommodations for these visitors was hotel/motels (63%), and they stayed in Montana 3.2 nights on average.

In summary, travelers through Laurel were very similar to all nonresident travelers to Montana but were slightly more likely to have been to Montana in the past compared to all travelers.

Hill County. The average travel party size of visitors traveling through Hill County was 2.5. Over three quarters of the visitors (78%) traveling through Hill County had visited Montana before. The majority of nonresident visitors passing through Hill County were couples (52%). Twenty-four percent of male visitors in this sample were 30-49 years old and 27 percent were 50-64 years old. Twenty-nine percent of female visitors were 30-49 years old and another 29 percent were 50-64 years old. The choice of accommodations for these visitors was hotel/motels (58%), and they stayed in Montana an average of 3.8 nights.

In summary, nonresidents traveling through Hill County had the highest likelihood of traveling as a couple (hence, a smaller group size), were older, stayed in the state longer than all nonresident travelers to Montana, and were the least likely group to stay at a home of a friend or relatives.

**Table 2:** Characteristics of Nonresident Travelers Visiting Montana – Summer, '96

Characteristics:	Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
Group Type				
Couple	<b>38%</b>	35%	<b>39%</b>	<b>52%</b>
Family	34%	<b>43%</b>	34%	31%
Alone	17%	14%	18%	9%
Friends	7%	4%	4%	5%
Family & Friends	3%	3%	3%	2%
Business Associates	1%	<1%	1%	1%
Group or Club	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Group Size	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>
Males				
0-17 Years Old	19%	26%	20%	18%
18-29 Years Old	10%	5%	10%	7%
30-49 Years Old	<b>31%</b>	26%	<b>30%</b>	24%
50-64 Years Old	24%	<b>28%</b>	24%	<b>27%</b>
65+ Years Old	16%	15%	16%	24%
Females				
0-17 Years Old	18%	22%	19%	19%
18-29 Years Old	10%	5%	10%	7%
30-49 Years Old	<b>33%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>29%</b>
50-64 Years Old	25%	29%	26%	<b>29%</b>
65+ Years Old	14%	12%	14%	16%
Have visited MT before	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>78%</b>
Total nights spent in MT	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.8
Home of friend, relative %	21	24	23	15
Hotel, motel %	<b>59</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>58</b>
Private campground %	18	24	21	30
Public campground %	16	18	14	27
Other %	5	8	4	4
Undeveloped camp %	4	4	4	4
Resort, guest ranch %	5	5	4	4
Condominium %	1	--	1	1

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

Visitors to the state, as well as to the three communities, differed in their places of residence. The only state represented in all sample areas was Washington State. Table 3 shows the states/provinces which were the top six visitor origins. These visitors accounted for approximately 45% of all visitors to each community and to the state. Each column in Table 3 lists the states which had the highest representation of visitors to that area in descending order.

**Table 3:** Residence of Visitors to Montana During Summer, '96: Top Six States/Provinces

Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
Washington	South Dakota	Washington	Minnesota
California	Washington	Wyoming	Washington
Idaho	Iowa	Minnesota	Wisconsin
Wyoming	Minnesota	California	Alberta
Colorado	Wyoming	North Dakota	California
Foreign Countries (Excluding Canada)	Wisconsin	Colorado	North Dakota

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

### Information Sources

During the sampling process, nonresident travel parties indicated which information sources were used to gather information for their trip *prior* to arriving in Montana as well as *while* they were in Montana. Also, respondents indicated which of those information sources were most useful to them. A list of 11 information sources was included in the questionnaire.

Statewide. Forty percent of the visitors did not use any of these sources prior to their trip. The top three most frequently used information sources were AAA (31%), travel guide books (22%) and national park brochures (20%) (Table 4). The *most useful* sources of information were AAA (39%), travel guide books (19%), the Montana Travel Planner (12%) and national park brochures (11%) (Table 5).

Visitors were also asked where they received travel information *while* in Montana. Travel information sources used most frequently were persons in motel, restaurant, gas station, campgrounds, etc. (36%), highway information signs (35%), and brochure racks (33%) (Table 6). Visitors then indicated which source was *most helpful* while traveling in Montana. Twenty-four percent of respondents stated persons in motels, restaurants, gas stations, campgrounds, etc., were most helpful, followed closely by persons in visitor information centers (22%) (Table 7).

Powder River County. Forty-one percent of travelers through Powder River County did not use any information sources prior to their trip. The most frequently used information sources for this sample were AAA (24%), travel guide books (21%), and national park brochures and the Montana Travel Planner (20%) each (Table 4). The *most useful* sources were AAA (27%), travel guide books (26%), and the Montana Travel Planner (26%) (Table 5).

Visitors traveling through Powder River County were asked where they received travel information *while* in Montana. Travel information sources used most frequently were persons in motel, restaurant, gas station, campgrounds, etc. (45%), highway information signs (45%), and brochure racks (42%) (Table 6). Visitors then indicated which source was most helpful while traveling in Montana. *Most helpful* sources were persons in motels, restaurants, gas stations, campgrounds, etc. (32%) and brochure racks (23%) (Table 7).

In summary, travelers through Powder River County were similar to statewide travelers in their information gathering before the trip. However, these travelers did not use AAA as much but used travel guidebooks and the Montana Travel Planner more. While in Montana, this group of travelers depended more on highway information signs and brochure racks than the rest of Montana nonresident travelers.

Laurel. Forty-three percent of visitors traveling through the Laurel area did not use any information sources prior to their trip. The three most frequently used information sources for this sample were AAA (29%), travel guide books (19%), and national park brochures (17%) (Table 4). The sources that were *most useful* were AAA (39%), travel guide books (19%), and the Montana Travel Planner (15%) (Table 5).

Nonresident travelers through the Laurel area were also asked where they received travel information *while* in Montana. Travel information sources used most frequently were highway information signs (41%), persons in motels, restaurants, gas stations, campgrounds, etc. (36%), and brochure racks (33%) (Table 6). Visitors then indicated which source was *most helpful* while traveling in Montana. *Most helpful* sources were highway information signs (24%), and persons in motels, restaurants, gas stations, campgrounds, etc. (22%) (Table 7).

Nonresident travelers through Laurel mirrored the state in information gathering prior to their trip. Once in Montana, however, this travel group was more dependent on highway information signs than the rest of the nonresident travelers in Montana.

Hill County. Thirty-two percent of travelers through Hill County did not use any information sources prior to their trip. The three most frequently used information sources for this sample were AAA (33%), travel guide books (27%), and national park brochures (27%) (Table 4). *The most useful* sources were AAA (37%), travel guide books (19%), and the Montana Travel Planner (16%) (Table 5).

Visitors traveling through Hill County were asked where they received travel information *while* in Montana. Travel information sources used most frequently were persons in motels, restaurants, gas stations, campgrounds, etc. (48%), brochure racks (47%), and highway information signs (41%) (Table 6). The *most helpful* sources were persons in visitor information centers (32%) and persons in motels, restaurants, gas stations, campgrounds, etc. (28%) (Table 7).

Travelers through Hill County were more likely to use an information source than to not use a source as compared to all nonresident travelers. In addition, while in Montana, travelers through Hill County used more sources and rated people in visitor centers as most helpful, while other travelers rated people in businesses as most helpful.

**Table 4:** Sources of Information Used *Prior* to Visit to Montana – Summer, '96 \*

Sources of Information Used for Trip <i>Prior</i> to Visit to Montana: (could be more than one)	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
None of the Sources	<b>40</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>43</b>	32
AAA	31	24	29	<b>33</b>
Travel Guide Book	22	21	19	27
National Park Brochures	20	20	17	27
Montana Travel Planner	13	20	14	22
1-800 State Travel Number	7	9	7	13
Chamber or Visitor Bureau	7	3	6	9
Information From Private Businesses	7	5	6	7
Internet Travel Information	5	4	4	7
State Park Brochures	4	5	4	5
Regional Travel Number	1	1	<1	1
Attend a Travel Trade Show	<1	--	1	<1

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

\* Visitors could choose more than one information source.

**Table 5:** *Most Useful* Source of Information Used *Prior* to Visit to Montana – Summer, '96 \*

<i>Most Useful</i> Source of Information Used for Trip <i>Prior</i> to Visit to Montana:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
AAA	<b>39</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>37</b>
Travel Guide Book	19	26	19	19
Montana Travel Planner	12	26	15	16
National Park Brochures	11	8	8	10
Information From Private Businesses	6	3	5	5
Chamber or Visitor Bureau	5	2	6	5
1-800 State Travel Number	4	5	5	7
Internet Travel Information	3	1	3	<1
State Park Brochures	1	1	1	1
Regional Travel Number	<1	1	1	--
Attend a Travel Trade Show	<1	--	<1	--

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

\* Percent total may not equal 100% due to rounding.

**Table 6:** Sources of Information Used *While* Visitors Were in Montana – Summer, '96 \*

Sources of Information Used for Trip <i>While</i> in Montana: (could be more than one)	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Person in Motel, Restaurant, Gas Station, Etc.	<b>36</b>	<b>45</b>	36	<b>48</b>
Highway Information Signs	35	<b>45</b>	<b>41</b>	41
Brochure Rack	33	42	33	47
Person in Visitor Information Center	26	28	25	39
None of the Sources Used	24	20	23	13
Other	18	16	16	17
Business Billboards	10	18	14	12
Computer Touch Screen Info Center	<1	1	<1	1

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR  
 \* Visitors could choose more than one information source.

**Table 7: *Most Helpful*** Source of Information Used *While* Visitors Were in Montana – Summer, '96 \*

<i>Most Helpful</i> Source of Information Used for Trip <i>While</i> in Montana:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Person in Motel, Restaurant, Gas Station, Etc.	<b>24</b>	<b>32</b>	22	28
Person in Visitor Information Center	22	14	20	<b>32</b>
Highway Information Signs	19	15	<b>24</b>	13
Other	18	14	17	12
Brochure Rack	15	23	16	14
Business Billboards	2	2	3	2
Computer Touch Screen Info Center	--	--	<1	--

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR  
 \* Percent total may not equal 100% due to rounding.

## Types of Trips

Nonresident travel parties were asked all reasons for traveling to Montana. (Many visitors had more than one reason.) Travelers were then asked to identify their *primary* reason (one answer per respondent) for traveling to Montana. The first column of Table 8 lists all reasons while the second column lists the primary reason.

Statewide. More than three-quarters of all sampled visitors (77%) traveled to Montana for vacation/recreation/pleasure. Other popular purposes of trip included passing through the state (31%) and visiting friends or relatives (31%).

With respect to statewide travelers' *primary* reason for visiting the state, nearly half of all sampled visitors (49%) were in Montana for vacation/recreation/pleasure. Passing through the state (21%) and visiting friends or relatives (16%) were also stated as primary reasons.

Powder River County. Nonresidents traveling through Powder River County were in Montana for vacation/recreation/pleasure (81%). Other trip purposes included passing through Montana (43%) and visiting family and friends (36%).

Forty-five percent of this sample chose vacationing in Montana as their *primary* reason. Passing through Montana (29%) and visiting family and friends (18%) were the next highest choices by this travel group.

In summary, travelers through Powder River County were slightly less likely to be primarily on vacation and were more likely to be passing through than all nonresident travelers to the state.

Laurel. The most popular reason to visit Montana for visitors traveling through the Laurel area was for vacation/recreation/pleasure (71%). Other popular purposes of trip included passing through Montana (41%) and visiting family and friends (36%).

Thirty-eight percent of this sample chose vacationing in Montana as their *primary* reason. Passing through Montana (30%) and visiting family and friends (18%) were the next highest choices by this travel group.

In summary, nonresidents traveling through Laurel were much more likely to be passing through the state and were much less likely to be on vacation compared to all nonresident travelers.

Hill County. Eighty-five percent of visitors traveling through Hill County indicated they were traveling to Montana for vacation/recreation/pleasure. Other popular purposes of trip included passing through the state (35%) and visiting friends or relatives (26%).

Fifty-eight percent of those traveling through Hill County were in Montana *primarily* for vacation/recreation/pleasure. Passing through the state (22%) and visiting friends or relatives (13%) were also stated as primary reasons for visiting.

In summary, travelers through Hill County were in Montana on vacation at a much higher rate than all nonresident travelers to the state.

**Table 8:** Purpose of Trip to Montana by Nonresident Travelers – Summer, '96

Travel Purpose:	Statewide %		Powder River County %		Laurel %		Hill County %	
	All Reasons*	Primary Reason**	All Reasons*	Primary Reason**	All Reasons*	Primary Reason**	All Reasons*	Primary Reason**
Vacation	<b>77</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>58</b>
Passing Through	31	21	43	29	41	30	35	22
Visit Family/Friends	31	16	36	18	36	18	26	13
Business	10	6	8	5	9	5	7	4
Recreational Shopping	9	1	7	--	9	1	8	--
Necessity Shopping	4	1	6	--	6	1	3	--
Other	4	3	6	2	5	4	4	3
Convention/Meeting	3	2	3	2	4	2	1	1
Medical	2	1	--	--	3	2	<1	--
		100%		100%		100%		100%

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

\* Visitors could choose more than one reason.

\*\* Percent total may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Travelers indicating vacation as one trip purpose were asked what attracted them to Montana as a vacation destination. Visitors were asked to check *all* things that attracted them to Montana and then to choose what one thing *primarily* attracted them to Montana (Table 9).

Statewide. Many vacationers were attracted by more than one feature. The top five attractions to Montana were the mountains (51%), Yellowstone National Park (39%), rivers (35%), Glacier National Park (31%) and open space (31%).

Glacier National Park (25%) was the most popular *primary* attraction to Montana for statewide travelers followed by Yellowstone National Park (22%) and mountains (12%).

Powder River County. Non-resident visitors traveling through Powder River County indicated the top attractions of Montana to be mountains (54%), Yellowstone National Park (37%), open space (35%), rivers (34%), wildlife watching (31%) and Glacier National Park (29%).

Glacier National Park (21%) was the most popular *primary* attraction to Montana for this group of travelers followed by Yellowstone National Park (19%) and mountains (15%).

In summary, when visitors checked things attracting them to Montana, those traveling through Powder River County were very similar to statewide travelers with the top attractions. However, these travelers were more likely than all travelers to be attracted to historic sites, Montana history, Native American history, and the Badlands. For primary attractions, the only difference was that people traveling through Powder River County were more than twice as likely to be primarily attracted by open space compared to statewide travelers.

Laurel. The top attractions indicated by the traveling nonresidents to this area were mountains (50%), Yellowstone National Park (33%), rivers (31%), open space (30%), and wildlife watching and uncrowded areas (25% each).

The *primary* attraction for this sample of travelers was Yellowstone National Park (20%). Glacier National Park and mountains were also primary attractions for these visitors (18% each).

To summarize, there appeared to be little difference between statewide travelers and travelers through Laurel when the traveler indicated all attractions. However, the nonresident traveling through Laurel was less likely to be attracted to the two national parks and slightly more likely to be attracted by mountains or open space as a primary attraction.

Hill County. The top attractions to Montana for this sample were Glacier National Park (59%), mountains (58%), open space (32%), rivers (29%), and wildlife watching and uncrowded areas (28% each).

Glacier National Park (54%) was the primary attraction for nonresident visitors who passed through Hill County, followed by mountains (9%) and Yellowstone National Park (6%).

In summary, the nonresident traveling through Hill County had Glacier National Park as a primary attraction to the state. This was more than double the percent of statewide visitors that were primarily attracted to Glacier.

**Table 9:** Attraction of Montana as a Vacation Destination by Nonresident Vacation Travelers - Summer, '96

Vacation Attraction:	Statewide %		Powder River County %		Laurel %		Hill County %	
	Types of Attractions*	Primary Attraction**						
Mountains	<b>51</b>	12	<b>54</b>	15	<b>50</b>	18	58	9
Yellowstone NP.	39	22	37	19	33	<b>20</b>	26	6
Rivers	35	1	34	<1	31	<1	29	1
Glacier NP	31	<b>25</b>	29	<b>21</b>	23	18	<b>59</b>	<b>54</b>
Open Space	31	6	35	14	30	8	32	3
Wildlife	28	2	31	1	25	1	28	2
Uncrowded Areas	27	4	28	4	25	4	28	4
Lakes	26	1	22	1	20	1	25	<1
Camping	19	2	25	1	19	3	24	2
Friendly People	18	3	24	2	18	3	18	3
National Forest	15	1	16	1	14	1	14	--
Hiking	15	1	14	1	12	1	18	1
Fishing	14	6	15	4	11	4	9	2
Historic Sites	13	2	25	2	16	3	14	2
Montana History	11	1	21	2	12	1	17	2
Indian Culture	10	1	18	1	12	1	10	1
Spec. Attraction	8	6	13	5	9	6	8	5
Wilderness Area	8	1	11	2	7	1	7	--
N Great Plains	6	<1	15	--	7	<1	12	1
Badlands	6	1	21	2	9	1	12	1
State Park	6	<1	7	--	5	<1	3	--
Special Event	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	2
		100%		100%		100%		100%

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

\* Visitors could choose more than one type of attraction.

\*\* Percent total may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 10 lists activity participation rates by nonresident travelers in Montana. Wildlife watching was the top activity in all samples.

Statewide. Wildlife watching was the most popular activity among the statewide sample (45%). Other activities in which visitors participated in, in order of popularity, were visiting family or friends (34%), nature photography (33%), recreational shopping (32%), day hiking (29%), visiting historic/interpretive sites (29%), camping in developed areas (28%), picnicking (26%), and visiting museums (21%).

Powder River County. Forty-four percent of nonresident travelers passing through Powder River County watched wildlife in Montana. Other popular Montana activities participated in by this sample were visiting historic/interpretive sites (41%), visiting family/friends (35%), and camping in a developed area (33%). While people who traveled through Powder River County were similar to all Montana nonresident travelers, the one noticeable difference was that this group was more likely to visit historic/interpretive sites.

Laurel. Nonresidents who passed through the Laurel area were likely to watch wildlife in Montana and to visit family or friends in Montana (40% and 39% respectively). These activities were followed by visiting historic/interpretive sites (33%) and camping in developed areas (30%). In summary, the nonresidents sampled who traveled through Laurel were nearly identical to the statewide sample.

Hill County. Wildlife watching in Montana (48%) was the most popular recreational activity for nonresident travelers through Hill County. Nature photography and camping in developed areas were the next most popular activities by this travel group (41% each), followed closely by day hiking (37%). In summary, the recreational activities of the nonresident travelers passing through Hill County were quite different than the activities of the statewide sample. The four most popular outdoor activities for Hill County visitors were wildlife watching, nature photography, camping, and day hiking while the top four for statewide nonresident travelers were wildlife watching, visiting family and friends, nature photography and recreational shopping.

**Table 10:** Recreation Activity Participation of Visitors to Montana - Summer, '96 \*

Recreation Activity:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Wildlife watching	<b>45</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>48</b>
Visiting family/friends	<b>34</b>	35	<b>39</b>	30
Nature photography	33	27	27	<b>41</b>
Rec. shopping	32	27	28	31
Day hiking	29	30	25	37
Hist./Interpretive Sites	29	<b>41</b>	33	33
Camping/Developed Area	28	33	30	<b>41</b>
Picnicking	26	29	26	30
Visiting museums	21	27	23	21
Fishing	15	13	11	12
Swimming in pools	14	11	16	16
Gambling	10	10	11	11
Camping in Primitive Areas	10	13	10	14
Visit Native Amer. Sites	10	18	13	14
Nature Studies	9	8	8	12
Special Events/Festivals	8	11	11	4
Swimming in natural areas	7	9	6	7
River Rafting/Floating	6	5	6	6
Golfing	5	4	5	6

Source: 1996 Summer Nonresident Travel Survey, ITRR

\*Visitors could choose more than one activity.

## Economic Characteristics

Information about the number of visitors to an area and how much they spend is very useful for planning purposes. Table 11 summarizes visitation and expenditures in Montana and in the three communities. In the summer of 1996, over 2,188,000 visitor groups traveled in Montana. Using a model based on 1996 highway counts and border counts, ITRR staff estimated that 3,550,000 travel groups visited Montana throughout the year. Of those 3.5 million travel groups, approximately 117,000 went through Powder River County, about 1,193,000 through Laurel, and around 198,000 went through Hill County. In terms of total expenditures, over \$1.4 billion was spent statewide in 1996.

Statewide. On average, nonresident travelers to Montana spent \$97 per day for 4.3 days, totaling in excess of \$1.4 billion dollars spent in the state during 1996. This amounted to about \$1,740 per person living in the state.

Powder River County. Nonresident travelers to Montana who drove through Powder River County spent \$9 on average in the county for a total of a little over one million dollars. Therefore nonresidents dropped approximately \$520 per person in the county.

Laurel. While Laurel had about one-third of all travel groups drive through their community, on average, each group only spent about \$3 in the community for approximately \$3.5 million dollars spent in Laurel. This amounted to about \$564 spent by nonresidents per each person living in Laurel.

Hill County. Nonresidents passing through Hill County spent about \$40 per group for a total of \$7.89 million dollars in the county. Nonresidents, therefore, spent approximately \$452 per each person in the county.

**Table 11:** Visitation and Expenditures of Nonresident Travelers to Montana – '96

Distribution of Expenditures in Sample Area:	Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
Hotel, Lodge, B&B %	19%	11%	23%	26%
Campground, RV. Park %	1%	5%	1%	6%
Auto Rental %	3%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation %	<1%	0%	0%	0%
Gasoline, Oil %	21%	53%	40%	23%
Restaurant, Bar %	17%	20%	13%	17%
Groceries, Snacks	8%	5%	19%	14%
Retail Sales %	24%	6%	1%	13%
Miscellaneous Services %	6%	2%	2%	1%
Average Daily Travel Group Exp. in MT (1996\$)	\$97	\$90	\$98	\$90
Total Travel Group Exp. in MT (1996\$)	\$418	\$370	\$438	\$431
Total Travel Group Exp. in Sample Area (1996\$)	\$418	\$9	\$3	\$40
Length of Stay in Montana	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.8
Total Travel Groups to Sample Area in 1996	3,550,000	117,000	1,190,000	198,000
Total Expenditures in Sample Area in 1996	\$1,490,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,600,000	\$7,900,000
Expenditures in Area - Per Capita (1990 US Census)	\$1,740	\$520	\$564	\$452

## Section II

Data collection for this section of the report came from the ITRR Resident Opinion Study conducted in the fall of 1997.

### Methodology: The Montana Resident Opinion Study

A mail-back questionnaire was administered to a sample of residents in the three CTAP communities and to a statewide sample of Montana residents during September, October, and November 1997. That mailing was followed one week later by a reminder postcard and two weeks after that by a replacement questionnaire to those residents who had not yet responded.

### Resident Response Considerations

A nonresponse bias check was not conducted at the conclusion of the sampling effort. Nonresponse bias checks are generally conducted to determine if people in the sample who did not respond to the questionnaire differed on key issues from those who did respond. In this case, the key questions that may have differed between respondents and nonrespondents involved statements about support for tourism

development. These key questions could only be answered after answering numerous other questions asked in the survey. Therefore, it was not possible to develop a condensed telephone nonresponse questionnaire. Because of this reason, it was decided that comparable data could not be generated from telephone nonrespondent interviews.

The reader is cautioned to remember that these results represent opinions from about forty percent of those residents polled. It was assumed that respondents did not differ from nonrespondents in their opinions. Table 12 summarizes sample sizes and response rates for the Resident Opinion Study.

**Table 12:** Sample Sizes and Response Rates for the Survey Samples used in this Report

	Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
Resident questionnaires sent out:	1,000	500	500	500
Undeliverables:	37	38	18	60
Resident questionnaires returned:	378	196	187	156
Resident Opinion Study response rate:	39%	42%	39%	35%
Female/male response ratio	53/47	56/44	57/43	45/55

## Residents’ Opinions about Montana, Their Community, and Tourism

Residents of an area may hold a variety of opinions about tourism and other forms of economic development. They may have perceptions of the specific impacts of tourism, both positive and negative. Opinions are a good measure of determining the level of support for community and industry actions.

As a community pursues tourism as a development strategy, the goals of that effort generally include an improved economy, more jobs for local people, community stability, and ultimately, a protected or improved quality of life for the community’s residents. Understanding residents’ perceptions of the conditions of their surroundings and tourism’s influence on those conditions can provide guidance toward appropriate development decisions.

The resident opinion questionnaire addressed topics which create a picture of perceived current conditions and tourism’s role in the community. The following general areas are covered in this section:

- 1) Respondent profile and level of community attachment.
- 2) Importance of and condition of personal, community, and statewide issues.
- 3) The influence of tourism on personal, community, and statewide issues.
- 4) Individual community analysis.

To summarize results, several indexes were developed through a weighted average of the means. Indexes were calculated for “attachment to community,” “perceived condition of well being,” “tourism’s influence,” and “tourism support.”

## Respondent Characteristics

A person’s employment status, type of job, and economic work sector can all influence personal well-being and support for tourism. In general, the more dependent a person is financially on the tourism industry, the higher the support for tourism. Table 13 shows employment status of the respondents. Table 14 lists the economic sector that the respondents worked in. Table 15 indicates the respondents’ job title or type of occupation. Table 16 presents the respondents’ community size.

Statewide. The majority of respondents to the statewide survey were employed, were in the services sector, and were professionals or managers. One-third of the respondents were retired. Fifty-five percent of the statewide sample lived in a community larger than 20,000, followed by 25 percent who lived in a rural area.

Powder River County. A majority of the Powder River County respondents were self-employed or employed, worked in agriculture, and were managers. Compared to the state, Powder River County respondents were much more likely to be self-employed and were more likely to represent the agriculture, services, and retail industries. Fifty-nine percent of the Powder River County respondents lived in a rural area compared to 41 percent who lived in a town.

Laurel. Laurel respondents were employed, were in the services sector, and were generally managers. In comparison to the state, Laurel respondents were less likely to be self-employed and were more likely to be in the retail sector. All respondents lived in town.

Hill County. Respondents from Hill County were employed in the services sector or in agriculture and generally considered themselves managers. Compared to the state, Hill County respondents were less likely to be in the health care sector and were much more likely to be in agriculture. Eighty-one percent of the respondents resided in a town compared to 19 percent who lived in a rural area.

**Table 13:** Employment Status of Resident Respondents

Employment Status: (could be more than one)	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Employed	<b>44%</b>	44%	<b>46%</b>	<b>54%</b>
Retired	31%	21%	34%	26%
Self-Employed	24%	<b>51%</b>	14%	21%
Homemaker	14%	21%	24%	15%
Unemployed	3%	1%	3%	3%
Student	3%	1%	3%	1%

**Table 14:** Employment Sector of Resident Respondents

Employment Sector:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Services	<b>23%</b>	28%	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>
Health Care, Medical Services	12%	5%	10%	6%
Education	10%	2%	5%	14%
Agriculture	9%	<b>39%</b>	4%	20%
Retail	8%	10%	17%	12%
Construction, Repair, Maintenance	8%	1%	4%	4%
Professional Services	7%	3%	2%	3%
Government	5%	4%	2%	3%
Visitor Services, Art, Entertainment	4%	1%	--	1%
Media, Communications	3%	1%	3%	--
Public Utilities	2%	1%	--	1%
Transportation Services	1%	--	8%	7%
Logging, Forestry, Wood Products	1%	2%	--	--
Mining	1%	1%	--	--
Food Service, Restaurant	1%	2%	2%	2%
Automotive Services	1%	1%	2%	--
Oil and Gas	1%	--	5%	2%
Manufacturing	1%	--	5%	1%
Wholesale	1%	--	1%	--

**Table 15:** Employment Type for Resident Respondents

Job Title:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Professional	<b>33%</b>	13%	13%	25%
Manager	30%	<b>45%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%</b>
Service Workers	7%	6%	11%	5%
Clerical	7%	8%	19%	13%
Farmers	6%	15%	2%	10%
Sales	6%	6%	10%	5%
Craftsman	5%	3%	5%	1%
Laborers	3%	2%	3%	3%
Transport	3%	2%	2%	2%
Farm labor	<1%	1%	--	--
Armed Services	--	--	--	--
Operatives	--	--	1%	1%

**Table 16:** Respondents' Community Size

Community Type:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Community of 20,000 or more	55%	--	--	--
Community of less than 20,000	20%	---	--	--
Town	--	41%	100%	81%
Rural area	25%	59%	--	19%

### Community Attachment and Change

One measure of community attachment is the length of time and percentage of life spent in a community or area. Table 17 lists years in Montana and in the community as well as how much of the respondent's lifetime that represented. Another measure of community attachment is based on opinions about the community (Table 18). Finally Table 19 presents the degree to which respondents felt their community was growing and at what rate.

Statewide. The average age of statewide respondents was 52 years. On average, these respondents have lived in Montana 73 percent of their lives and in their community 46 percent of their lives. In general, the higher percent of life one lives in a community, the more likely one is to be attached to that community.

The Index of Community Attachment (i.e., the mean averages) in Table 18 indicated that statewide respondents were quite attached to their community. At an average rating of 3.1 (on a scale with 4 as the high), these residents liked where they live. Only ten percent of the respondents were unable to honestly say whether the future of their community looked bright or not. The highest response came from involvement in community tourism decisions. It appears that citizens in the state felt very strongly that they should have a say in these types of decisions.

In summary, respondents around Montana were attached to their community even though nearly half of them felt that the roads were too congested and that their community was growing too fast. This indicated a potential increase in community involvement in communities throughout Montana.

Powder River County. The average age of the respondent was 52 years old which was the same as the average age of statewide respondents. Powder River County respondents appeared to be quite attached to their community since nearly two-thirds of their lives had been spent in their community compared to statewide respondents who spent a little less than half of their lives in their community.

Table 18 indicates that Powder River County respondents were positively attached to their community and felt quite strongly (like those in the state) that they should have a say in decisions about tourism in their community. While still positive, people in Powder River County were less sure of the future of their community compared to the state, and 14 percent of the respondents did not know whether the future was bright or not.

To summarize, Powder River County respondents were attached to their community but were less sure of its future as compared to statewide respondents. Because of this sentiment, respondents were probably ready to try different methods to insure the stability of the community.

Laurel. Like the statewide respondents, Laurel’s respondents’ average age was 52 years old, and they have lived in their community close to half their lives. Laurel respondents tended to be less attached to their community based on these data.

When comparing Laurel respondents to the state in Table 18, it appears that, based on a mean score of 2.9 (out of 4), Laurel respondents were slightly less attached to their community than the average state respondents (3.3 mean score). In addition, more than 10 percent of the people answered “don’t know” to three out of the four community attachment questions, thus indicating less commitment to their community.

In summary, Laurel respondents were less attached to their community than the average state respondents. While the number is not substantially different from the state, it appears that people in Laurel may be more likely to move away from their community.

Hill County. Hill County respondents were 52 years old on average and have spent nearly two-thirds of their lives in the county and 85 percent of their lives in Montana. These respondents would likely be very attached to their community.

Table 18 indicates that Hill County respondents were less attached to their community than statewide respondents (2.9 index score on a scale of 4 compared to 3.1 for the state). However, their index score was still positive. Hill County respondents were less likely to indicate that they would rather live in their community than anywhere else, and as many as 14 percent did not know how to answer that particular statement. Compared to the state, Hill County respondents were less enthusiastic about the future of their community and several (18%) did not know. These data indicate less attachment to the community.

In general Hill County respondents thought their community was not changing and was not congested. This was in opposition to the state respondents who thought their communities were growing and that roads were congested.

To summarize, Hill County respondents had a positive attachment to their community (although slightly lower than the state attachment) and have lived most of their lives in the state. While there were some people who would rather live somewhere else, the majority of the respondents would prefer to stay.

**Table 17:** Respondents’ Residency Characteristics

Residency:	Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
Mean years lived in community	24	33	25	33
Mean years lived in Montana	38	43	42	44
Age (Mean Years)	52	52	52	52
Percentage of life spent in community	46%	63%	48%	64%
Percentage of life spent in Montana	73%	83%	81%	85%

**Table 18: Community Attachment Statements**

	Statewide	Powder River County	Laurel	Hill County
It is important that the residents of my community be involved in decisions about tourism	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3
If I had to move away from my community, I would be very sorry to leave	3.3	3.2	2.9 (12%)*	2.9
I'd rather live in my community than anywhere else	3.1	3.0	2.7 (16%)*	2.6 (14%)*
I think the future of my community looks bright	2.8 (10%)*	2.3 (14%)*	2.7 (15%)*	2.6 (18%)*
Index of Community Attachment	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.9

\* % of respondents who indicated "Don't Know" on the survey (if 10% or more).

\*\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree)

**Table 19: Perceptions of Community Growth**

	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
<b>How is the population changing in your community?</b>				
Growing	78%	9%	88%	25%
Decreasing	7%	55%	1%	17%
Not changing	15%	37%	11%	59%
<b>If changing, is your community changing..</b>				
Too fast?	47%	36%	21%	21%
About right?	49%	42%	72%	60%
Too slow?	4%	22%	7%	19%
<b>Overall, are the roads in your community too congested?</b>				
% Yes	47%	7%	24%	8%

### The Importance of Factors of Well-Being

When evaluating the potential for tourism development, it is necessary to gain an understanding of residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism and to determine which impacts should receive more focus. For example, if we know that access to local government and the environment are perceived to be in poor condition, but only the environment is rated as an important aspect of well-being, then we have a better idea of where to focus development and planning efforts.

To that end, respondents rated the importance of various aspects of well-being. While items such as personal health and family relations are beyond the influence of tourism planning efforts, it is helpful to know the relative importance of those factors in relation to factors that tourism development can

influence.

Table 20 is a listing of various aspects of personal well-being in order of most important (rating equal to 4) to not at all important (rating equal to 0). Results showed that all aspects are important, but some aspects were slightly more important than others. There were very few differences between sample groups. All respondents placed personal health, relations with family and friends, and safety from crime in the top three.

**Table 20:** The Perceived Importance of Factors of Well-Being

The Importance of ..... to your current well-being:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Personal health	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5
Relations with family and friends	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Safety from crime	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.4
Education system	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.2
Financial situation	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1
Employment situation	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0
Natural environment	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Crowding and congestion	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.7
Housing	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.8
Leisure time and activities	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.8
Access to government	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Most Important) to 0 (Not at all Important)

### Perceived Conditions of Montana, the Community, and Personal Well-Being

When evaluating opinions about the benefits and costs of tourism development, it is helpful to have an idea of how respondents perceive current conditions of various aspects of their well-being. For example, if a particular resource is in poor condition, any negative influence on it by tourism development would be serious. Respondents were asked to rate the current condition of various aspects of well-being on a scale of very good (rating equal to 4) to very poor (rating equal to 1). Conditions of well-being were rated at three levels: the state of Montana, the respondent’s community, and the individual respondent. Tables 21-23 present these three levels of conditions and their mean rating.

Statewide. In general, respondents of the statewide sample rated their personal condition slightly higher than the condition of their community and the state. The ratings were consistently high (i.e., all above the “good” category) indicating that respondents throughout the state believed they are doing well, the community is doing well, and the state is doing well.

Powder River County. Respondents of Powder River County consistently rated the condition of their personal well being, the community’s well-being, and the state’s well-being as good. Compared to the state respondents, Powder River County respondents rated their community slightly higher, but they rated the state slightly lower. Only three areas had a mean score below the “good” level: Montana’s highways and roads, local roads, and local job opportunities. The overall ratings, however, were positive.

Laurel. Respondents of Laurel rated the condition of their personal well being as the highest, followed by the condition of the state and of their community. Their perception of the condition of their community was slightly lower than statewide respondents, indicating some dissatisfaction. Only three

items received a rating below the “good” score. These lower ratings all occurred with respect to the condition of their community. Laurel respondents rated the condition of their museums/cultural centers, long-term development planning, and job opportunities as the lowest. While their overall mean ratings were above “good,” those three areas could be areas of future concentration.

**Hill County.** Hill County respondents rated the conditions of themselves, their community, and the state above the “good” score for everything except job opportunities in the community. Compared to ratings by statewide respondents, Hill County respondents’ index averages were the same for the state conditions and for their personal conditions, but the index was slightly lower for conditions of their community. Overall, however, Hill County respondents believed conditions were good.

**Table 21:** The Perceived Condition of Montana

The Condition of Montana's:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Natural environment	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>
Parks and recreation areas	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9
Cultural and historic preservation	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.8
Highways and roads	2.4	1.8	2.2	2.3
Economy	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.2
Montana’s Condition (Index score)	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Very Good) to 1 (Very Poor).

**Table 22:** The Perceived Condition of the Community

The Condition of the Community's:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Emergency services (police, fire etc.)	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>
Overall livability	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0
Education system	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.0
Parks and recreation areas	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.9
Safety from crime	2.8	<b>3.2</b>	2.5	2.9
Museums and cultural centers	2.8	<b>3.2</b>	1.7	2.7
Infrastructure (water, sewer etc.)	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.4
Cost of living	2.3	2.7	2.5	2.5
Roads	2.2	1.7	2.0	2.1
Long-term development planning	2.1	2.2	1.8	2.0
Job opportunities	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.9
Community Condition (Index score)	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.4

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Very Good) to 1 (Very Poor).

**Table 23:** The Perceived Condition of the Individual

The Condition of your personal:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Overall happiness	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>
Present housing	3.2	3.1	<b>3.2</b>	3.1
Leisure time and activities	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.8
Employment situation	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0
Financial situation	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.7
Access to local government	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.8
Individual Condition (Index score)	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Very Good) to 1 (Very Poor).

### Perceived Influence of Tourism on Well-Being

An indication of support for tourism is the perceived influence of tourism on various aspects of well-being. Respondents were asked to indicate whether tourism influenced a particular aspect of well-being positively, negatively, or equally positively and negatively. Responses were scaled from -1 to +1 with a score of 0 being equally positive and negative. Respondents were asked to evaluate tourism's influence at three levels including the state of Montana, the respondent's community, and the individual respondent. Tables 24 - 26 present the perceived influence tourism has on each item. The closer the score is to one, the more positive an influence tourism has on that item. Conversely, the closer a score is to a negative one, the higher negative influence tourism has on that item.

A summary index of tourism's influence on well-being was developed from the individual items for each level of influence. The index scores represented a weighted average of the items in each table.

Statewide. Tourism's influence on the state, overall, was perceived as positive. Two items, highways and roads (-.28) and the natural environment (-.02) received negative influence ratings. However, these ratings were not substantially negative to offset the positive ratings of influence tourism was perceived to have on the state's economy and cultural/historic preservation.

The index rating of tourism's influence on the community was lower than the rating for the state. The perception was that tourism has a positive influence on three items (museums/cultural centers, job opportunities and parks/recreation). Three items received ratings of "both positive and negative" (education system, emergency services, and overall livability). Tourism was perceived to have a negative influence on infrastructure, safety from crime, cost of living, and roads in the community.

Statewide respondents perceived tourism to have a slightly negative influence on themselves as individuals. Most specifically, respondents believed that tourism negatively influences their present housing and their leisure time and activities.

In summary, respondents from a sample of statewide respondents believed that tourism has a strong positive influence on the economy as well as on culture and history. On the other hand, tourism negatively affects roads and safety from crime.

Powder River County. Respondents of Powder River County were more positive about tourism's

influences than respondents at the statewide level. The influence index was positive for each level: state, community, and individual. However, at the individual level, fifty percent or more of the respondents felt that they are not personally influenced (positively or negatively) by tourism at all. For those who did feel they were personally influenced by tourism, the perception was a positive influence except for leisure time and activities.

In general, Powder River County respondents felt that tourism had a very positive influence on the state's economy, on the state's and community's museums and cultural centers, and on job opportunities. The negative influences of tourism were on roads/highways and safety from crime.

Laurel. Laurel respondents perceived tourism to have a more positive effect on the community than did statewide respondents. Laurel respondents' perception was that roads, infrastructure, and safety from crime are negatively influenced by tourism. While the state's economy was perceived to be positively influenced by tourism, Laurel respondents were more likely to say that tourism has both a positive and negative influence to many items. However, many respondents (40 to 64 percent) perceived tourism to have no influence on them personally.

Hill County. Unlike the state, Hill County respondents generally viewed tourism as having a positive influence on the state, in the community, and on themselves personally. However, 46 to 72 percent of the respondents indicated that tourism had no influence on them personally. Hill County respondents were not nearly as certain about tourism's positive influence on the economy (.15) compared to the statewide respondents (.54). However, Hill County respondents believed tourism favorably influences their community's overall livability while statewide respondents were more likely to indicate both a positive and negative influence on community livability.

**Table 24:** Tourism's Perceived Influence on Montana

Tourism's Influence on Montana's:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Economy	<b>.54</b>	<b>.56</b>	<b>.53</b>	.15
Cultural and historic preservation	.35	.41	.21	<b>.39</b>
Parks and recreation areas	.11	.23	.14	.19
Natural environment	-.02	.02	.04	.04
Highways and roads	-.28	-.17	-.20	-.18
Tourism Influence Index	.14	.21	.15	.19

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 1 (Positive) to -1 (Negative)

**Table 25:** Tourism’s Perceived Influence on the Community

Tourism's influence on the community's:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Museums and cultural centers	<b>.64</b>	<b>.80</b>	.15	<b>.66</b>
Parks and recreation areas	.28	.38	.20	.43
Job opportunities	.28	.45	<b>.24</b>	.26
Education system	.07	.28 (44%)**	.17	.26 (45%)**
Emergency services	.02	.24	.12	.15
Overall livability	.01	.22	.14	.25
Infrastructure (water, sewer etc.)	-.19	-.18	-.27	-.18
Safety from crime	-.33	-.26	-.21	-.15
Cost of living	-.21	.07	-.04	-.04
Roads	-.43	-.36	-.36	-.03
Tourism Influence Index	.03	.19	0	.15

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 1 (Positive) to -1 (Negative)

\*\* Percent of respondents who indicated “No Influence” on the survey (if 40% or more)

**Table 26:** Tourism’s Perceived Influence on the Individual

Tourism's Influence on personal:	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Employment situation	<b>.21</b> (63%)**	.34 (50%)**	<b>.21</b> (55%)**	<b>.33</b> (65%)**
Financial situation	.17 (60%)**	<b>.43</b> (45%)**	.04 (51%)**	.16 (57%)**
Overall happiness	.01 (50%)**	.15 (50%)**	.07 (49%)**	.14 (56%)**
Present housing	-.10 (69%)**	.02 (68%)**	.03 (64%)**	.08 (72%)**
Leisure time and activities	-.20	-.11 (47%)**	-.14 (40%)**	-.04 (46%)**
Tourism Influence Index	-.01	.12	-.01	.13

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 1 (Positive) to -1 (Negative)

\*\* Percent of respondents who indicated “No Influence” on the survey (if 40% or more)

## Support for Tourism Development

In addition to tourism’s perceived influence on well-being, another method of measuring the degree of tourism support is to ask respondents questions specific to the tourism industry. Respondents were asked to strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or indicate “don’t know” for a number of tourism-related questions. Responses were coded on a scale from 4 for strongly agree to 1 for strongly disagree. Results should be interpreted as follows: a score of three or higher indicates a positive opinion, a score of two or less indicates a negative opinion, and a score of 2.5 indicates a neutral position.

Some questions addressed general support for tourism development while others addressed more specific aspects of tourism. Table 27 presents opinion scores for the tourism support questions and a summary of those scores (i.e., the Tourism Support Index, which is a weighted average score of the five items in the table). Table 28 provides an indication of tourism growth concerns for the state and for the respective communities.

Statewide. Opinions about tourism at the statewide level appeared to be close to neutral. Using 2.5 as a benchmark for neutral support, the overall index of 2.7 indicated people were on both sides of tourism support. Tourism growth concerns were also close to the middle point for each item. The item with the highest agreement was the willingness to support land-use regulations to control growth in the community (2.9).

Powder River County. Respondents from Powder River County appeared to generally support tourism, but similar to the state level, that support was not overwhelmingly strong. Powder River County respondents had an overall support index of 2.8 indicating some support for tourism. With respect to tourism growth issues, Powder River County was, again, on the border between supportive and not supportive.

Laurel. General support for tourism by Laurel respondents was nearly at the midpoint indicating half the respondents were supportive of tourism while the other half were not supportive (2.6). The same held true for tourism growth issues except that Laurel respondents seemed to be more willing to support land-use regulations to control growth in the community (2.9).

Hill County. Hill County respondents, like the state, supported tourism but not overwhelmingly. The overall index of 2.8 was just slightly over the midpoint of 2.5 indicating there were many people in the county on both sides of the issue. Regarding tourism growth issues, Hill County was, again, on the border between supportive and not supportive on each issue.

**Table 27:** Statements of Agreement with Various Aspects of Tourism Development

	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
Tourism promotion by the State of Montana benefits my community economically	<b>3.0</b> (13%)**	2.9 (15%)**	2.8 (29%)**	3.0 (19%)**
To be competitive with other states, I support continued tourism promotion by the State of Montana	<b>3.0</b> (5%)**	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.1</b> (10%)**	<b>3.1</b>
The overall benefits of tourism outweigh the negative impacts	2.8 (18%)**	2.9 (17%)**	2.8 (24%)**	2.9 (11%)**
Increased tourism would help my community grow in the right direction	2.5 (19%)**	3.0 (13%)**	2.7 (27%)**	2.9 (16%)**
If tourism increases in Montana, the overall quality of life for Montana residents will improve	2.3 (22%) **	2.6 (23%)**	2.4 (25%)**	2.5 (19%)**
I will benefit financially if tourism increases in my community	2.3	2.6 (15%)**	2.1 (15%)**	2.3 (17%)**
<b>Tourism Support Index</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree)

\*\* % of respondents who indicated “Don’t Know” on the survey (if 10% or more).

**Table 28: Statements of Agreement about Tourism Growth Concerns**

	Statewide*	Powder River County*	Laurel*	Hill County*
I would support land-use regulations to help control the type of future growth in my community	<b>2.9</b> (14%)**	2.3 (21%)**	<b>2.9</b> (20%)**	<b>2.7</b> (19%)**
Taking a vacation to Montana influences too many people to move to Montana	2.8 (14%)**	<b>2.6</b> 18%)**	2.7 (14%)**	2.5 (12%)**
In recent years, the state is becoming overcrowded because of more tourists	2.6 (14%)**	2.3 (16%)**	2.5 (17%)**	2.3 (13%)**
Tourism is the major contributor to traffic congestion in my community	2.5	2.0 (10%)**	2.2 (15%)**	2.2 (13%)**

\* Scores represent mean responses measured on a scale from 4 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree)

\*\* % of respondents who indicated “Don’t Know” on the survey (if 10% or more).

### Advantages/Disadvantages of Tourism Development

To further clarify the perceived benefits and costs of tourism development, respondents were asked to provide the top advantage and main disadvantage of increased tourism in their community. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording. The suggestions were then assigned to general categories for comparison. Table 29 lists the top advantages and Table 30 lists the main disadvantages of increased tourism.

The top advantages by all respondents were the improved economy and more employment. At least 69 percent of respondents from each sample indicated the economy and employment as the top advantages.

On the other hand, the perceived disadvantages of tourism were not as universal across the samples as were the advantages. Traffic and congestion was the main disadvantage for statewide respondents as well as for Laurel respondents. The top response from the Powder River County and Hill County samples was “none/no disadvantage” to tourism. The top response of those who cited a disadvantage in Powder River County stated overcrowding. The top response of those who cited a disadvantage in Hill County stated traffic and congestion.

**Table 29:** The Top Advantage of Increased Tourism in the Community

Top Advantage:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Improved economy, More dollars for business	<b>68%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>76%</b>
More employment	10%	6%	15%	11%
None (No Advantage)	9%	3%	6%	4%
Increased development (gas stations, restaurants, etc.)	3%	2%	9%	4%
Don't know	3%	1%	6%	1%
Encourages focus on mountains, Environment	2%	0%	0%	0%
Increased recreational activities	1%	0%	0%	0%
Increased tax revenues	0%	1%	0%	0%
Advertisement of community exposure	1%	1%	2%	1%
Lower property taxes	1%	0%	0%	0%
Location	0%	0%	2%	0%
Keep town alive	0%	2%	1%	2%
Help to pay for services otherwise couldn't afford	0%	1%	0%	0%

**Table 30:** The Main Disadvantage of Increased Tourism in the Community

Main Disadvantage:	Statewide %	Powder River County %	Laurel %	Hill County %
Traffic, Congestion	<b>32%</b>	8%	<b>28%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Overcrowding	11%	<b>12%</b>	16%	10%
None (No Disadvantage)	9%	<b>14%</b>	12%	<b>27%</b>
Might encourage people to move here	6%	7%	1%	2%
Don't know	5%	8%	9%	8%
Increase in minimum wage jobs, Seasonal jobs	4%	0%	2%	1%
Prices will increase	4%	2%	3%	3%
Nonresidents competing with locals for activities	3%	2%	0%	4%
Increased crime	3%	11%	9%	3%
Road conditions	2%	6%	2%	6%
More litter & garbage	2%	4%	1%	2%
Tax dollars, Higher taxes	2%	3%	1%	5%
Wear & tear on facilities/Infrastructure	2%	3%	--	3%
Nothing to do or see, Lack of facilities	2%	3%	5%	1%
Wrong type of people	2%	2%	2%	2%
Increase of infrastructures, Development	1%	1%	2%	1%
More responsibility handling any increase	<1%	1%	2%	2%
Negative attitude towards locals	<1%	2%	1%	--
Outfitters limiting resident hunting options	--	2%	--	--
Lose small town atmosphere	--	2%	--	2%

## Community-Specific Question Results

Each community tourism assessment team was given the opportunity to include questions specific to its community in the questionnaire. The content of these questions was decided during one of the community meetings for the CTAP process. The following sections of the report address these questions and other community-specific information. The sections are divided into each community: Powder River County, Laurel, and Hill County.

### Powder River County

Respondents from Powder River County ranked the best opportunities for future economic development in their community and what role tourism should play in their community. Industries were ranked one through six with one being the best opportunity. Agriculture and mining tied as the top economic opportunities in Powder River County.

- 1 Agriculture – 2.9 mean score
- 2 Mining – 2.9 mean score
- 3 Tourism/recreation – 3.4 mean score
- 4 Wood products – 3.5 mean score
- 5 Manufacturing – 4.2 mean score
- 6 Retail sales – 4.3 mean score

When asked what role tourism should have in their local economy compared to other industries, the majority said tourism should have an equal role with other industries (54%). However, a significant number (35%) indicated tourism should have a minor role. Only a small number of respondents (11%) indicated tourism should take a dominant role.

Powder River County respondents were asked to indicate how important historic preservation and the appearance of Broadus were in developing tourism in the county. The majority thought that each item was very important for tourism development (Table 31). In addition, respondents were asked to indicate their typical reaction to visitors in the area. Most respondents (68%) made a conscious effort to make visitors feel welcome while 30 percent had no specific reactions to visitors (Table 32).

**Table 31:** Importance Ratings

How important are the following factors in developing tourism in Powder River County?	Overall Mean	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not at all Important
Historic Preservation	2.3	55%	22%	5%
Community Appearance of Broadus	2.5	70%	15%	2%

**Table 32:** Respondents’ Reactions to People Visiting Powder River Country

	Percent Mentioned
Conscious effort to make them feel welcome	68%
No specific reaction	30%
Purposely ignore them	2%

Table 33 is a summary of many of the tables throughout this report for Powder River County. The first section of the table compares respondents’ rankings of the relative importance of various items with each item’s current condition and with respondents’ perceptions of tourism’s influence on that item. The second section of the table compares each item’s current condition and respondents’ perceptions of tourism’s influence on that item. For example, if a condition is rated as high/very good and respondents’ perceptions of tourism’s influence is high, this is a good match. On the other hand, if the condition is rated as low and tourism has a negative influence, this could be considered a problem area.

The column titled “Rated Condition Rank” contains respondents’ ratings of current conditions in their community and in Montana. The data are on a scale of one to four. A rating of 1 means the current condition of the item is rated as very poor. A rating of 4 means the current condition of the item is very good.

The column titled “Tourism Influence Score” contains respondents’ ratings of how tourism will influence current conditions in their community and in Montana. The data are on a scale of –1.0 to +1.0. A rating of –1.0 means that respondents perceive tourism to have a negative impact on that condition. A rating of +1.0 means that respondents perceive tourism to have a positive impact on that condition.

To summarize the first section of the table, it appears that safety from crime was very important to respondents, and its current condition (3.2) was rated as good. However, respondents perceived that tourism will negatively affect its condition (-.26). The education system was also important to respondents, and its current condition (3.1) was rated good. Forty-four percent of respondents did not perceive tourism would affect the education system. However, among the 56% of respondents who did perceive tourism would affect the education system, they perceived a positive effect (.28).

The current condition of Powder River County’s museums and cultural centers was also good (3.2), and respondents perceived tourism to have a positive effect on their current condition (.80). Respondents perceived that the current conditions of Montana’s highways and roads (1.8) and of Powder River County’s roads (1.7) are poor. They also perceived tourism to have a negative impact on those highways and roads (-.17 and -.36 respectively).

**Table 33: Powder River County Tourism Summary and Comparison**

Item	Relative Importance Rank	Rated Condition Rank <sup>+</sup>	Tourism Influence Score <sup>#</sup>	No Influence
Personal health	1	--	--	--
Relations from family and friends	1	--	--	--
Safety from crime	1	3.2	-.26	--
Education system	2	3.1	.28	(44%)
Financial situation	3	2.6	.43	(45%)
Employment situation	4	2.8	.34	(50%)
Montana's natural environment	4	3.5	.02	--
Crowding and congestion	5	--	--	--
Housing	5	3.1	.02	(68%)
Leisure time and activity	6	2.5	-.11	(47%)
Access to government	6	2.5	--	--

**Condition and Influence Comparison:**

Overall personal happiness	--	3.3	.15	(50%)
Powder River County's emergency services	--	3.2	.24	--
Powder River County's museums & cultural centers	--	3.2	.80	--
Powder River County's overall community livability	--	3.0	.22	--
Montana's cultural & historical preservation	--	3.0	.41	--
Montana's parks and recreation	--	2.9	.23	--
Powder River County's parks and recreation	--	2.8	.38	--
Powder River County's cost of living	--	2.7	.07	--
Powder River County's infrastructure (water, sewer)	--	2.5	-.18	--
Montana's economy	--	2.0	.56	--
Montana's highways and roads	--	1.8	-.17	--
Powder River County's roads	--	1.7	-.36	--
Powder River County's job opportunities	--	1.7	.45	--

**Index Score Summaries:**

Tourism's influence on Montana <sup>#</sup>	.21
Tourism's influence on the community <sup>#</sup>	.19
Tourism's influence on the individual <sup>#</sup>	.12

<sup>+</sup> Scores represent conditions measured on a scale from 4 (Very Good) to 1 (Very Poor)

<sup>#</sup> Scores represent influences measured on a scale from 1 (Positive) to -1 (Negative)

*Summary of Powder River Comments*

Respondents were asked to give general comments. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording. (See Appendix B – Powder River Comments for a listing of all comments.)

Positive comments toward tourism development centered around how tourism can boost the local economy in terms of more jobs in the community. There were concerns that the population of the area is aging, and that there is currently little incentive for young people to remain in or return to Powder River County. Tourism may be a method to remedy that concern. (However, other respondents mentioned manufacturing and mining as better economic development tools.)

Ideas were presented regarding what specifically should be promoted in the area. Most ideas focused on three areas: “old west”/western heritage (e.g., more cattle drives and wagon trains), the history of the area

(e.g., the museum and the area’s battlefields), and hunting (however, some perceive that outfitters control most of the licenses and leave little money in the community). Some respondents were quite adamant that such promotion should not be a responsibility of the state (i.e., tax dollars) but rather should fall to the private sector.

There were concerns that the seasonal/temporary nature of tourism is not sufficient to sustain the economy and that economic diversity should be a goal. Powder River County is an agricultural county, and many respondents stated that tourism does little for agriculture. Some feared that tourism may eventually hurt agriculture as tourism may cause visitors to relocate to the area and drive land prices up.

There were other concerns as well. If visitors were to relocate to the area, the current way of life (i.e., small-town atmosphere) may be disrupted or destroyed. There was fear of overcrowding and increased crime. Some respondents stated that visitors often show disrespect for the land and the locals’ privacy.

Some respondents felt that tourism will not address local problems such as the horrendous shape of the roads and the bad appearance of the town. Many mentioned that visitors should “pay their way” for enjoying Montana by charging a sales tax.

## Laurel

Laurel respondents were asked whether Laurel’s local appearance should be improved if Laurel is to become a bigger player in the state’s tourism industry. A large majority (84%) stated that Laurel’s appearance should be improved. (See Table 34.)

**Table 34:** Laurel’s Appearance

Should Laurel's local appearance be improved?	Percent Mentioned
Yes	84%
No	16%

Respondents were asked to give examples of how Laurel’s appearance could be improved. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording.

Many respondents stated there needs to be a general clean-up of streets, residences, empty lots, parks, and entry points into the town. Several suggested better landscaping (i.e., flowers and tree) and more weed control.

Downtown also seemed to be an area of concern; downtown renewal/revitalization was mentioned frequently. Respondents stated that buildings need improvement. Suggestions included store-front upgrades, new signs, and awnings. Many people stated that old buildings should either be renovated or torn down.

Some respondents stated that roads are in a state of disrepair and need improvement.

Others were concerned Laurel’s appearance is marred by the refinery and by the railroad. “Who would want to visit such a place?” was the general consensus of these respondents. To that end, some people suggested more facilities for shopping and dining and more recreation facilities. (See Appendix C – Laurel Appearance Comments)

To determine respondents' perceptions regarding Laurel as a tourism destination, respondents were asked to name Laurel's greatest strength and its greatest weakness. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording. The suggestions were then assigned to general categories for comparison.

Location [i.e., proximity to I-90, Highway 212, Yellowstone National Park (YNP), and Cody, WY] was considered Laurel's greatest strength (41% of respondents). Twenty percent of respondents stated Laurel had no greatest strength as a tourism destination. In terms of Laurel's greatest weakness, 44% of respondents stated that Laurel has nothing to draw visitors to the area (i.e., there is nothing to do or to see). In addition, 16% said that lack of facilities (e.g., hotels, restaurants, and malls) was their community's greatest weakness. (See Table 35.)

**Table 35: Strengths and Weaknesses of Laurel as a Tourism Destination**

Laurel's Greatest Strength:	Percent Mentioned
Location (I-90, Highway 212, YNP, Cody)	41%
None	20%
Annual Events, community activities	14%
Don't know	10%
Relaxed environment, small town atmosphere	4%
Friendly People	4%
Bigger economy	2%
Chief Joseph	2%

  

Laurel's Biggest Weakness:	Percent Mentioned
No strengths, nothing to draw them here, nothing to do/see	44%
Lack of facilities (hotels, restaurants, malls)	16%
Location (Too close to Billings)	8%
Don't know	6%
Community cooperation	3%
Appearance of town (dirty, rundown)	2%
Air pollution	2%
Crime, gangs, not enough police to control crime	2%
Refinery	2%
Bottleneck of entering/exiting; traffic	2%

Table 36 is a summary of many of the tables throughout this report for Laurel. The first section of the table compares respondents' rankings of the relative importance of various items with each item's current condition and with respondents' perceptions of tourism's influence on that item. The second section of the table compares each item's current condition and respondents' perceptions of tourism's influence on that item. For example, if a condition is rated as high/very good and respondents' perceptions of tourism's influence is high, this is a good match. On the other hand, if the condition is rated as low and tourism has a negative influence, this could be considered a problem area.

The column titled "Rated Condition Rank" contains respondents' ratings of current conditions in their community and in Montana. The data are on a scale of one to four. A rating of 1 means the current condition of the item is rated as very poor. A rating of 4 means the current condition of the item is very good.

The column titled “Tourism Influence Score” contains respondents’ ratings of how tourism will influence current conditions in their community and in Montana. The data are on a scale of –1.0 to +1.0. A rating of –1.0 means that respondents perceive tourism to have a negative impact on that condition. A rating of +1.0 means that respondents perceive tourism to have a positive impact on that condition.

To summarize the first section of the table, it appears that safety from crime was very important to respondents, and its current condition (2.5) was rated as neutral (i.e., neither good nor poor). However, respondents perceived tourism to negatively affect safety from crime (-.21). The education system was also important to respondents, and its current condition (2.8) was rated as good. However, in contrast, respondents perceived that tourism will positively affect its condition (.17).

With respect to the second section of the table, the current condition of Laurel’s emergency services was rated as good (3.3), and respondents felt tourism will have a slight positive effect on these services (.12). Laurel’s respondents perceived current conditions of Montana’s highways and roads (2.2) and of Laurel’s roads (2.0) to be poor. They also perceived tourism will have a negative impact on those highways and roads (-.20 and -.36 respectively). Laurel’s infrastructure was also a concern. Rated poor (2.2), respondents perceived tourism to negatively impact infrastructure (-.27).

**Table 36:** Laurel Condition/Influence Comparison

Item	Relative Importance Rank	Rated Condition Rank <sup>+</sup>	Tourism Influence Score <sup>#</sup>	No Influence
Personal health	1	--	--	--
Safety from crime	1	2.5	-.21	--
Relations with family and friends	2	--	--	--
Education system	3	2.8	.17	--
Financial situation	4	2.8	.04	(51%)
Employment situation	5	2.9	.21	(55%)
Montana's natural environment	5	3.3	.04	--
Crowding and congestion	5	--	--	--
Housing	5	3.2	.03	(64%)
Leisure time and activity	6	2.7	-.14	(40%)
Access to government	7	2.6	--	--
<b>Condition and Influence Comparison:</b>				
Laurel's emergency services	--	3.3	.12	--
Overall personal happiness	--	3.2	.07	(49%)
Laurel's overall community livability	--	2.9	.14	--
Montana's parks and recreation	--	2.8	.14	--
Montana's cultural & historical preservation	--	2.7	.21	--
Laurel's cost of living	--	2.5	-.04	--
Laurel's parks and recreation	--	2.5	.20	--
Montana's economy	--	2.3	.53	--
Laurel's infrastructure (water, sewer)	--	2.2	-.27	--
Montana's highways and roads	--	2.2	-.20	--
Laurel's roads	--	2.0	-.36	--
Laurel's job opportunities	--	1.8	.24	--
Laurel's museums & cultural centers	--	1.7	.15	--
<b>Index Score Summaries:</b>				
Tourism's influence on Montana <sup>#</sup>		.15		
Tourism's influence on the community <sup>#</sup>		.00		
Tourism's influence on the individual <sup>#</sup>		.00		

<sup>+</sup> Scores represent conditions measured on a scale from 4 (Very Good) to 1 (Very Poor)

<sup>#</sup> Scores represent influences measured on a scale from 1 (Positive) to -1 (Negative)

### *Summary of Laurel General Comments*

Respondents were asked to give general comments. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording. (See Appendix D – Laurel General Comments for the complete version.)

Several respondents voiced concern that Laurel is not a tourism destination. Generally, the sentiment was that there is nothing to do or to offer visitors. Feeling that Laurel is a bedroom community for Billings, several people felt the need for better facilities for tourists and for locals, such as shopping (e.g., an outlet mall or specialty shops), restaurants, campgrounds, and recreation facilities. Some respondents felt the lack of culture in the town is difficult and suggested a museum highlighting Laurel's railroad history or its Native American heritage. Respondents also felt there are too many casinos/bars and alcohol-related

activities.

Most concerns voiced about tourism involved the possibilities of out-of-state people moving in and buying up land, increased crime, loss of small-town character, and increased traffic and congestion.

## Hill County

Respondents from Hill County ranked the best opportunities for future economic development in their community and what role tourism should play in their community. Industries were ranked one through six with one being the best opportunity. Agriculture was ranked as the best economic opportunity in the community followed by manufacturing.

- 1 Agriculture – 1.8 mean score
- 2 Manufacturing – 2.9 mean score
- 3 Retail sales – 3.0 mean score
- 4 Tourism/recreation – 3.1 mean score
- 5 Wood products – 4.8 mean score
- 6 Mining – 5.3 mean score

When asked what role tourism should have in their local economy compared to other industries, the majority said tourism should have an equal role with other industries (55%). However, a significant number (31%) indicated tourism should have a minor role. Only a small number of respondents (14%) indicated tourism should take a dominant role.

Hill County respondents were presented with a list of local attractions. For each attraction, respondents indicated whether they had visited the attraction and whether they would recommend the attraction to their visiting family and friends. According to Table 37, every respondent (100%) had visited the Beaver Creek/Bear Paw Mountains. A large majority had visited the Badlands (85%) as well as Havre Beneath the Streets (74%). With respect to whether the attraction would be recommended to visiting family and friends, 98% of respondents stated they would recommend Havre Beneath the Streets, 95% would recommend the Beaver Creek/Bear Paw Mountains, and 94% would recommend Fort Assinniboine Historical Site. A large majority of respondents stated they would recommend each attraction to family and friends.

**Table 37:** Local Attractions Visited by Hill County Respondents

	% Visited	% Who Would Recommend
Beaver Creek/Bear Paw Mountains	100%	95%
Badlands	85%	81%
Havre Beneath the Streets	74%	98%
H. Earl Clack Memorial Museum/Heritage Center	67%	89%
Fort Assinniboine Historical Site	64%	94%
Wahkpa Chu'gn Bison Kill	51%	91%
Hagener Collections/Nat. History-MSU-Northern	45%	82%
Rocky Boy Pow Wow	37%	82%
Rudyard Depot Museum	14%	80%

Table 38 is a summary of many of the tables throughout this report for Hill County. The first section of the table compares respondents' rankings of the relative importance of various items with each item's current condition and with respondents' perceptions of tourism's influence on that item. The second section of the table compares each item's current condition and respondents' perceptions of tourism's influence on that item. For example, if a condition is rated as high/very good and respondents' perceptions of tourism's influence is high, this is a good match. On the other hand, if the condition is rated as low and tourism has a negative influence, this could be considered a problem area.

The column titled "Rated Condition Rank" contains respondents' ratings of current conditions in their community and in Montana. The data are on a scale of one to four. A rating of 1 means the current condition of the item is rated as very poor. A rating of 4 means the current condition of the item is very good.

The column titled "Tourism Influence Score" contains respondents' ratings of how tourism will influence current conditions in their community and in Montana. The data are on a scale of -1.0 to +1.0. A rating of -1.0 means that respondents perceive tourism to have a negative impact on that condition. A rating of +1.0 means that respondents perceive tourism to have a positive impact on that condition.

To summarize the first section of the table, it appears that safety from crime was important to respondents, and its current condition (2.9) was rated as good. However, respondents perceived that tourism will negatively affect safety from crime (-.15). The education system was also important to respondents, and its current condition (3.0) was rated as good. Forty-five percent of Hill County respondents did not perceive tourism to have any influence on the education system. However, of those 55% of respondents who did perceive an influence from tourism, they perceived a positive effect (.26).

With respect to the second section of the table, the current condition of Hill County's museums and cultural centers was rated as nearly neutral (i.e., neither good nor bad). Respondents felt tourism will have a positive effect on these attractions (.66). Those perceptions were the same with Hill County's parks and recreation and Montana's cultural and historic preservation. The current condition of Hill County's parks and recreation (2.9) was good, and respondents perceived tourism to positively affect them (.39). The current condition of Montana's cultural and historic preservation (2.8) was good, and respondents perceived tourism to positively impact it (.43). Hill County respondents perceived that the current conditions of Hill County's highways and roads (2.1) and Montana's highways and roads (2.3) are poor. They perceived tourism to have a negative impact on those highways and roads (-.30 and -.18 respectively). Hill County's infrastructure was also a concern. Currently rated poor (2.4), respondents perceived tourism to negatively impact infrastructure (-.18).

**Table 38: Hill County Condition /Influence Comparison**

Item	Relative Importance Rank	Rated Condition Rank <sup>+</sup>	Tourism Influence Score <sup>#</sup>	No Influence
Personal health	1	--	--	--
Relations from family and friends	1	--	--	--
Safety from crime	2	2.9	-.15	--
Education system	3	3.0	.26	(45%)
Financial situation	4	2.7	.16	(57%)
Employment situation	5	3.0	.33	(65%)
Montana's natural environment	5	3.4	.04	--
Leisure time and activity	6	2.8	-.04	(46%)
Housing	6	3.1	.08	(72%)
Crowding and congestion	7	--	--	--
Access to government	8	2.8	--	--

**Condition and Influence Comparison:**

Overall personal happiness	--	3.2	.14	(56%)
Hill County's emergency services	--	3.2	.15	--
Hill County's overall livability	--	3.0	.25	--
Hill County's parks and recreation	--	2.9	.43	--
Montana's parks and recreation	--	2.9	.19	--
Montana's cultural & historical preservation	--	2.8	.39	--
Hill County's museums & cultural centers	--	2.7	.66	--
Hill County's cost of living	--	2.5	-.04	--
Hill County's infrastructure (water, sewer)	--	2.4	-.18	--
Montana's highways and roads	--	2.3	-.18	--
Montana's economy	--	2.2	.15	--
Hill County's roads	--	2.1	-.3	--
Hill County's job opportunities	--	1.9	.26	--

**Index Score Summaries:**

Tourism's influence on Montana <sup>#</sup>	.19
Tourism's influence on the community <sup>#</sup>	.15
Tourism's influence on the individual <sup>#</sup>	.13

<sup>+</sup> Scores represent conditions measured on a scale from 4 (Very Good) to 1 (Very Poor)

<sup>#</sup> Scores represent influences measured on a scale from 1 (Positive) to -1 (Negative)

*Summary of Hill County Comments*

Respondents were asked to give general comments. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording. (See Appendix E – Hill County General Comments for the complete version.)

The comments of several respondents indicated opportunities for more tourism promotion of the area such as Beaver Creek Park, the natural environment, festivals, cultural centers, recreational activities in the area, historical places and events, and fair activities. Many respondents discussed the need for

improvements in the area such as downtown renovation of Havre, beautification (e.g., more landscaping), and a general clean-up of the area. Still others mentioned the need for more recreation facilities such as a hockey arena and another golf course.

However, respondents voiced concerns about tourism. The possibility of increased competition for recreation (e.g., hunting, fishing, camping) among locals and visitors was a concern. Road upkeep and increased traffic and congestion worried respondents. Some respondents felt the seasonal nature of tourism makes the industry less attractive. Instead, it was suggested that efforts should be made to entice diverse, stable industries with a more solid economic base into the community.

### *Summary of Statewide Comments*

Respondents were asked to give general comments. This was an open-ended question with respondents providing their own thoughts and wording. (See Appendix F – Statewide General Comments for the complete version.)

The purpose of soliciting comments from the statewide sample was to gain an understanding of the feelings of Montana residents with respect to tourism on a statewide level. However, the comments were very diverse, and many comments pertained to the respondent's specific community. Because many comments did not address tourism on a statewide level, further analysis may have misrepresented the data. Therefore, it is recommended that the reader review the comments with that in mind.

## **Comments**

The following section consists of the verbatim comments that were received from statewide survey respondents. On the back of the questionnaire, respondents were given the opportunity to offer support, suggestions, concerns, and other comments about tourism. These comments are very important to the Community Tourism Assessment process in many ways. Comments represent feelings of the respondents that are difficult to assess using the quantitative methods. Therefore the comments provide additional insight. Fortunately, many of the respondents offered usable comments, providing a good representation of the variety of feelings held by the communities' residents. Comments from individual communities are not included here, but were provided to the community assessment committees and can be requested as a supplement from ITRR.

The comments should be studied carefully by the assessment committees and other decision makers. These comments provide a good read on the true pulse of the residents and offer many constructive suggestions for appropriate improvements to their communities. The comments are arranged in four categories represented by the symbols +, +/-, -, and 0. The categories are defined loosely as follows:

+ Comments generally favoring tourism development or offering suggestions for improving tourism in the community. The suggestions were interpreted as the respondent's idea of a positive contribution to improvement, though some may contradict. For example, one respondent may have felt that more wilderness would be beneficial to tourism while another suggested that less wilderness would offer more opportunities. In other cases the comments may sound negative, as in 'downtown is dirty', but were interpreted as 'cleaning up downtown would improve tourism', and thus were supportive of tourism.

+/- These comments usually raised concerns as well as offering suggestions or support. Often respondents offered opinions about appropriate and inappropriate types of tourism. Other respondents acknowledged the benefits of tourism but were worried about growth or inappropriate development. Some respondents identified current problems associated with tourism and offered solutions. In some ways this category of comments are the most insightful because they represent acknowledgment of the benefits and the costs; they represent middle of the road and compromise; or they present problems and solutions.

- Comments in this category were not supportive of tourism or presented concerns without offering solutions. Some were just negative in general.

0 These were the 'other' comments that could not be classified as supporting or not supporting tourism. Some presented views on current conditions, but did not credit or blame tourism. Some objected to specific activities like gambling but did not offer comments on tourism in general. Other comments as well as some in the ' - ' category seemed unrelated to tourism. Commenting on current conditions, some were less than constructive. They were included here not because they provided helpful suggestions to decision makers, but because they offered insight to feelings and frustrations found among some people in the communities.

It is important to examine the substance of the comments rather than the relative number of each type. In the previous section it was shown that the amount of support for, and perceived benefits from tourism varied by community and in some cases by the types of respondents in the communities. Some of these variations appeared to be related to the type and amount of tourism the respondent had experienced and the relation they had to the tourism economy. While the *amount* of support and perceived *level* of benefit and cost varied by community, the *types* of concerns that were expressed in the open-ended comments tended to be very similar regardless of which sample they came from. In general concerns about tourism were expressed in the following areas:

- Tourism only offers low paying seasonal jobs that do not provide enough opportunity.
- Tourism only benefits a minority of businesses and people in the community.
- Tourists move here.
- Tourism causes commercial strip development, traffic, crowds, and litter.
- Tourism businesses do not contribute to the overall community livability.
- A tourism economy is not diverse or stable.
- Tourists do not pay their share of the burden.
- Tourism contributes to higher prices and taxes.

Fortunately, many of the comments provided good suggestions for appropriate solutions to those concerns. These considerations and suggestions should be an integral part of the tourism planning effort.



**Appendix A: Statewide Resident Opinion Survey Instrument**











## **Appendix B: Powder River General Comments**

## Powder River County Comments

- + Cattle drives and ranch tours are extremely good.
- + Anything will beat nothing which is what we have now besides the county payroll. Our roads are not the best but they are all we can afford and I have yet to hear tourists complain. They had to slow down so they enjoyed the scenery more. Our museum is second to none and getting better every year. Our wild game observations are unmatched any place in the state. Our national friendly disposition is unmatched any place. Our wagon trains attract many guests world wide.
- + We should capitalize on Sturgis rally crowd - a bike day. Tourists passing through to Black Hills or Custer Battlefield. Campground along the river with walking trails. Stay away from "bar scene" activities.
- + At this point I think we need to explore all options and opportunities. I think we need to expand all areas and still try to maintain our small town life style (if that's possible). I think there is a lot of events and places to visit here but there needs to be complete community involvement and support of these events and there hasn't been a lot of that in the past.
- + I am a recent store owner, so of course I am interested in tourists. I have noticed in my six weeks since opening that I can not depend on the community to keep me open. My only hope is hunting season, tourists and visitors. Our community does not shop at home. I am sorry to say. My husband and I also run a few cows. Of course no family can survive on one income anymore, my husband also has a full-time job in town. I have been very disappointed in our town because they buy most everything somewhere else, another town. Miles City gets a lot of our business. Tourists can only help us.
- + We need to take any steps necessary to improve the economy in Broadus and Powder River County.
- + I think tourism is important to bring in dollars but I think offering jobs in the form of small manufacturing companies is also important. In our little community, I see an aging population. Jobs would encourage the young to return to Powder River County and new residents to stay.
- + Powder River County needs a lake for outside recreation. This could help make Broadus a destination instead of a place to fill up with gas and soda on the way through. It would possibly help agriculture (irrigation) and give local people a place for R and R and make a summer attraction. Fall hunting is really the only tourism here. Highway 212 between Lame Deer and Alzada is narrow, broken up and dangerous.
- + Powder River County is a ranching county. I came here 37 years ago and Broadus was pulling off ranching. We had a crack at oil and it is now gone but they built so dang much junk in Broadus that we can't support or maintain it. Now they want to tax us more for tourists they hope to draw. They will get the profits and the taxes will keep up the attractions. It is a move to keep the town from dying. They built these counties because of horses and it took days to go to the county seats and back. OK. Now it takes two hours. We need about three county seats in eastern Montana and then they would cost too much.
- + Reynold's Battlefield could be made into as good a historic spot as Big Hole Battlefield is in western Montana. Besides agriculture, which obviously won't support much, tourism, and to some degree, coal mining, is all there is around Broadus to do much with. The beauty of the Powder River and a scenic drive from Broadus to Moorehead up one side of the river and down the other could also be used which would include the Battlefield site.
- + Anything to improve the economy.
- +/- After visiting Red Lodge recently, it appears most of the businesses there cater to tourists. We need to do what we can to attract visitors, but at the same time keep our existing businesses that provide services and goods to

our local residents. Perhaps we could develop something around the Powder River, our history like Reynold's Battlefield.

- +/- There are not enough rest stops or wide places along the road where people can pull off the road and enjoy the plants and growth in this area. Many people are interested in the native plants and would stop to check them if it was safe to do that.
- +/- Most tourists like our area and have mostly favorable comments. The most mentioned unfavorable comment is the high price of rooms for what they are.
- +/- Some people in our county I'm sure have attractions on their ranches and don't want to have people tromping through to see. That should be their choice. Appropriate development: improve park and more western events such as rodeos.
- +/- I feel too much emphasis is put on tourism state and local wide. The extra money is needed for local economy. However, we are attracting too many out-of-state people to move to Montana. They bring all their metropolitan crime and attitudes with them and will eventually destroy the very things we (natives) hold dear and attracts them to begin with. So we will end up destroying our way of life. Look at western Montana.
- +/- As I have indicated with my responses, almost all changes will have positive and negative effects. In most cases, there will be more than one effect. The question is "Will there be more positive or more negative effects?"
- +/- I think tourism promotions should feature local existing business establishments and not try to attract new ones because of the temporary nature of the tourism industry. There is not a large enough trade area (number of people) to support a business that would rely on tourism for its major source of income. I enjoy living here because of the small town atmosphere and would not be in fear of anything that would change that. Thank you for the opportunity to respond.
- +/- Broadus will never be a primary tourist attraction. Tourism won't support (alone) any businesses in Broadus. Tourism will help by working with the local economy. I am a tourism promotion all of my life and a director of Custer Country since it was organized in 1981. I was named the "Tourism Person of the Year" in 1993.
- +/- Tourism is ok for Powder River County as long as they don't stay. Californian's etc. are trying to take over and we don't need that here in Powder River County, but there is really no opportunities for tourists passing through to make them want to stay, and we should keep it that way.
- +/- Tourism should be confined to more urban areas except those of wagon trains, etc. - where they are controlled because when they become too familiar there is a tendency to trespass on private property. Tourism can be encouraged but our county shouldn't go to a lot of debt to promote it (debt which is passed on to its citizens). Private enterprise can promote and encourage.
- +/- I think tourism is an important part of the diversity necessary for small towns to survive. However, I think tourists put a lot of stress on local services and roads and should contribute to local tax base through a sales tax structured to reduce resident's property/real estate taxes. Having moved here from the Black Hills, I have witnessed the effect that tourists can have on traditional land uses (ranching, mining, logging). They don't want to witness the destruction of land. They don't understand regrowth, reclamation, or the processes that provide all their needs. I don't think that is as much of a problem in Powder River County as it is in western Montana. I don't think tourism will relocate to Powder River County in enough numbers to affect traditional uses because of the relative remoteness. Tourism information, however, should stress the presence of resource extraction activities for a century and the resulting beauty of productivity.
- +/- Powder River County tourism was affected negatively by Montana FWP when they stopped selling over the counter mule deer tags. Many non-resident hunters used to drive to Broadus just to hunt does, now they can't and they do not come here. Also, whenever they limit non-resident hunting licenses, that hurts the tourism

dollars that come into Powder River County. Good luck getting any new development into Powder River County as the people that are and have businesses don't want anything to change. They do want any free money, grants, etc. though.

- +/- I know that western Montana is growing with tourists moving in. I want tourism in eastern Montana without the high prices and overcrowding. Western Montana has turned into where the rich can have summer houses there and the middle class can't afford to live there. Is there or can there be good solid tourism and affordability at the same time?
- +/- Broadus is presently trying to put in an information center south of Broadus(out of town). We have a very good museum that is manned during summer months. If an info center is put out of town people will not stop in downtown Broadus, but out of town. This info center will take away from business. Our roads are in dire need of repair at this end of the state. As a former owner of an RV park just west of Broadus- many tourists said they would never travel here again because of the roads.
- To begin with, tourism is a service industry. Jobs in service industry tend to be low paying, with little or no potential for advancement. I refer to these as "hamburger flipping" jobs. True new wealth must come from a resource, whether natural such as grass, timber, oil, ore, or water or a recyclable resource such as paper, steel, aluminum, etc. New wealth and therefore growth and posterity, have never been realized in an economy based rather than production. Eastern Montana's 2-lane highways are in such a state of disrepair that even truckers are taking longer routes to avoid them. Tourists will do the same. The high points of Powder River County are already well promoted in my opinion. Any development in Powder River County must be production oriented. Examples: sawmills, small backgrounds feed lots, mining, drilling, etc. Some services such as outfitting, have done well.
- Until the tax situation in Montana is revised, there will be very little development of the resources in our state. Tourism will never pay the bills in running the state.
- We spend too much time worrying about tourists. We should worry more about residents of Powder River County, more oil, mining, and logging.
- There has been too many tax dollars spent on advertising for the tourist trade. It attracts too much negativity, increased crime and taxes. Too many out-of-state people are moving to Montana bringing their crimes, greed, and disrespect for the land with them. Our government has been blinded by money. They are selling our state to the highest bidder and making it very difficult for the farmers and ranchers to provide for their families. Give Montana back to Montanans.
- If you were a tourist and drove into a town that had empty buildings and run down buildings, would you want to spend time and money there? Broadus looks dirty and run down. If you try to rent or buy any of these buildings, you need to have Ted Turner's money. You can't expect people to enjoy a town that looks like hell on earth and our streets are something else. Not good. As far as the rest of Powder River County goes, how can you send tourists to see anything when roads and streets are not marked.
- This community is supported by livestock and agriculture. Tourism would have little impact on the ranchers. It may help the few stores we have here. I feel that strangers coming here is something we don't need even in the most people can be trusted. With our present rate of crime one cannot be sure that all can be trusted. In my opinion, we don't need outsiders. I am satisfied with my life as it is.
- Tourism as I can see creates more of a hinder than helping the state and county, due to the part that a fraction of them want to reside. Therefore, that makes for more and higher taxes that we do not need. It creates more crime. Also tourism will have less respect for private lands. Because they want to roam all over the public. Also personal property tax will soar or increase due to tourism. The people cannot afford living in the state as it is.

- I feel that this survey is a prime example of unwise tax spending. Powder River County lacks tourism potential.
  - The tourists that decided to stay in Powder River County have, quite often, had a negative effect on the county. Many have had nothing, brought in drugs, etc. and have abused the welfare system here. Are the economical advantages worth the long term negative advantages of exposing our kids to this?
  - This is an ag town. More people cause more problems in crime and more congestion on medical services. You would end up with more people wanting to move here. You would end up with more people on welfare. More people is not always good. Agriculture is getting pushed out in a lot of areas of Montana by more people. I have seen it happen and it happened to us. When people start complaining about you moving your cows down the road because they are getting cow ---- all over their car. You don't want those people!
  - Powder River County is made up of people in the cattle and sheep business, which all help support the local businesses. Tourism would be of little benefit to the cattle man and sheep man. We don't need people to come here that have money to buy land and therefore drive the price up so we ranchers can no longer afford to buy, we also don't need people with driving records, child molesters, and the like of that. As far as I am concerned, we can do very well without tourism.
  - I don't want any tourists or any more people in Powder River County. I want plenty of open space and to be left alone and especially by US government.
  - In Powder River County, tourism would be up and down, not dependable source because of our remote area, no big attractions. Powder River County has a mix of tourism now private sectors are testing what works and what may not. Why can't Powder River County make what they have now, better, quit wishing for some cosmetic dream - like a cure all.
- 0 Strictly cattle ranch far enough from Broadus to be affected by tourism.
  - 0 Development should be carefully thought out. This is a very good place to live and ranch. Over development has a tendency to spoil the value of rural areas.
  - 0 No tax money should go into the effort. Business interests can and should develop what will make a return on effort. Montana is the highest tax per capita in the 50. We need less government directives. If any ideas will make money then an individual will be doing it.
  - 0 Fix up town. It needs new highways and new streets with curbs so people can fix up boulevards so its cleaner. Junk on the edge of town by people's houses needs cleaned up so people coming into town will want to stop. Have more western things, that's why people come to Montana.
  - 0 Powder River County needs to get off their butts and build the new airport. We should be aggressive in taking advantage of the 90 percent funding by the FFA. If we feel we're going to survive without a good airport, we're dreaming. Economic development will not take place without airport access. Our leadership and many in our great community fail to understand this fact. The locals cannot fund this county (as is) by ourselves. We need outside investment.
  - 0 Industry, we need a better one for our little community.
  - 0 I would like to have some positive people in our community government, as the people we now have are negative and against new development and progress. They don't want change.
  - 0 This area has a small population base, core group is static. Some increase due to the logging industry, but these increase the population decrease over a five year period. Continue to lose 1 - 2 businesses every year. Powder River County has some of the best coal deposits anywhere, yet will not be developed due to high costs and

controversy from state, so called environmental groups and locals. Reynold's Battlefield and the first battle between US Calvary and Indians both could be promoted. Had a chance for and airport improvement project, but commissions and locals feel would benefit Broadus only, plus think grant funds are derived from income taxes.

- 0 Outfitters have tied up most of the local hunting so that now out-of-state hunters don't use the restaurants or motels like they used to ten years ago. They have limited access for out-of-state hunters to licenses and areas to hunt. They have ruined what little tourism Powder River County did have. The main attraction of this area is the deer antelope hunting and unless the laws are changed, outfitters will continue to keep 90 percent of Powder River County's tourism dollars.
- 0 I don't feel this will do bit of good. Questionnaires never have. It will be done as the community wants it. The results here should be published so we could see how we rated.
- 0 Bingo in town once a week for something to do. More shopping. Places for 4 x 4 RVs to go play. Miniature golf. Rink skating for the kids. Factory jobs.
- 0 Great questionnaire, was impressed!
- 0 First thing that needs to be done to attract tourism is have a neat, clean attractive town not just the entrance but the entire town. Most comments I've heard from people going through are "Why would anyone want to stop in this dusty, yucky place. It's not kept up." The sides of the streets are awful looking as the streets are. Weeds growing everywhere, junk piled everywhere. They called it a God forsaken place, couldn't wait to get out. Our highways are horrible compared to everywhere else. This county has a great mining, coal potential that state laws and taxes forbid it to happen. It's there for us to use and we're not. We need to have a sales tax to release the burden on locals.
- 0 Powder River County is a 100 percent agricultural county. Most tourism here involves wagon trains and ranch tours. Fishing is poor. Lots of good areas to hike or backpack. Hunting is good, except most areas are leased up by outfitters so access for most hunters is impossible. Most services are provided by the outfitters so their hunters leave with little money in the community. I feel Montana is in a very bad need of a sales tax so the tourists could help pay for some of the recreation we provide them.
- 0 Reynold's Battlefield, prison or correctional institution??
- 0 I have no comments about tourism but I would like to see the county roads improved.
- 0 Coal mine, railroad, correction facility.
- 0 Powder River County needs someone to come in a build a theme park such as Opryland, Six Flags, etc. Broadus sits on a main east/west route as well as a main north/south route. It would draw many people if there was just someone who believed in it enough to invest in and then promote such a venture.
- 0 Broadus might promote a replica of an 1880's saloon to attract customers. Kids should be allowed inside. Maybe a \$100 prize for the best flower garden might help beautify the town. A central place for hunters to get information on available hunting spots would help.
- 0 Promote: wagon trains, campgrounds, Reynold's Battlefield, ropings, horse sales, archery, lakes, sporting events, education system, museum and arts, swimming pool and parks, all weather track, more jobs. Eliminate: wrecked vehicles, teenage drinking, drug usage that's illegal, poor city streets.
- 0 I really don't believe tourism effects my family or business.
- 0 Would like to see more Bed and Breakfasts, a hiking and biking trail from the Manor to the river and up to the bridge. Also a trail over B Hill. Clean up some of the buildings and land coming in from the west. More points

of interest in town like Pipestone, Minnesota. Lots of brass plaque saying what this building was through the years. Possible a large covered wagon in the park with slides coming out of it. More western equipment around for people to see. More dude ranches.

- 0 Reynold's Battlefield as well as other sites where the calvary tangled with the Indians. Also promote the Powder River wagon trains and cattle drives.
- 0 Another motel not owned by present owners. A chain motel run by manager, giving another person a job, helping this town and economy. Tourists and truckers do not like present situation on motel management. A cafe that would stay open until 2:00 am Friday and Saturday nights. Need more law enforcement pertaining to drugs and alcohol. Need less management from state, give control back to the counties! Need more recognition from state government on Eastern Montana. Not always everything based on Western Montana and population. We pay our share of tax and do not expect us to support Western Montana.
- 0 Develop and encourage tourism at the county fair. Would like to see more "family vacation" businesses in addition to the wagon trains or ranch vacations to attract a more varied tourist clientele. More art events or places where local art can be seen. Choke Cherry Festival was great! More speciality agricultural products for sale from local agricultural producers.
- 0 No casinos or gambling!
- 0 I am opposed to the state of Montana building a tourist information center at the new weigh station three miles south of Broadus. Our current information center is located in our local museum right downtown. I think many tourists will not stay in our town if they can get the information at the weigh station, use their stores, get a cold drink, etc.
- 0 Guests coming to experience our ranch life and history, such as the wagon trains, cattle drives, ranch tours, hunting. Our roads need a lot of work. It has been a positive advantage for our young people to work with guests on the wagon trains and ranch tours. They have learned to work with all the races and many of them have been invited to the guests' homes all over the US and in foreign countries.
- 0 Location of Broadus as southeastern gateway to Montana presents both opportunities and challenges. First impression of Broadus makes or breaks tourists' conception of the west as it had been and is now. Wagon trains have had positive impact recently and local museum that was started ten years ago draws more visitors yearly. Events tied in with museum to advertised our heritage should be encouraged, as history is becoming more on visitors' minds. Development promoted by some "outsiders" should be received with skepticism!
- 0 I do not feel Montana will go far economically until we have a sales tax to release the tax on property and businesses. The cost of doing business in Montana is much more than in our neighboring states. In agriculture we can not even hire people to work and take up residency because the taxes and cost of living are so high (car licenses, gasoline tax, etc.). A sales tax could relieve the tax burden for our residence. Why not let our tourism help pay for running our state - we help pay for running every state we visit during the year. Since tourism is our second largest industry, lets capitalize in it.
- 0 Maybe if our roads were driveable, we would have more tourists. I would not put a car on that road if I didn't live here, and now I wonder why.
- 0 The republicans keep closing roads and selling the ???? crusher with 1,000 miles of gravel roads, there won't be any place for the tourists to go out of town.
- 0 Wildlife habitat and hunting are real opportunities for tourism in Powder River County. As long as FWP dept. is in charge of this aspect, little hope for the local economy exists. Wagon trains, working ranch bed and breakfasts, etc. that emphasize western heritage are opportunities for recreation and tourism.
- 0 Subdividing would not be appropriate in this ag community. You have not mentioned outfitting and the revenue

it brings into the county.

- 0 We need more access to water recreation and closer places to fish and boat. Everybody has to leave the county to go boating.
- 0 Our tourism consists of unsolicited, organized Powder River wagon trains and cattle drives of one or two weeks producing grass of 50 to 120 thousand. Would like to see it expanded to several more weeks each peak year. Also consisted of ranch tours and hunting. And unorganized: highway passer-through, visitors to our excellent museum, relatives and friends of residents visiting, visitors to reunions, rodeos, school events, etc. As historian for PRWT and CD above, I feel Powder River County has a lot of historical potential yet undeveloped: Cole expedition, prelude to Little Bighorn Battle, etc. Types of tourism weren't specified. I am totally opposed to gambling.
- 0 I believe tourism will help the economy however Powder River County will need to maintain the streets better and improve the looks of Broadus. More information needs to be available about the local attractions. The community should come up with a theme for all of the merchants to go by during tourism for example, historical. Also the whole community needs to be involved in the decision making process.
- 0 Unfortunately, tourism is pretty important. Local restaurants, hotels, and gas stations do seem to benefit but out on the ranch it doesn't effect us much. I don't mind growth (population) as long as those moving here don't try to turn it into the place they left. I would like to see "old-west" types of events promoted. Events that would relate our codes of ethics, way of life and how similar it is now compared to how it was 100 years ago. We like our culture here so tourists and implants need to leave theirs where they came from.

## **Appendix C: Laurel Appearance Comments**

Streets cleaner & kept up, new parks, better equipment, buildings in better shape, new signs & awnings on buildings.

More trees and flowers downtown.

Revitalize main street, zoning regulations to produce a uniform appearance in heavily traveled areas, keep streets clean, renovate old buildings, trash off main streets on strip, paint and repair underpass.

Entrance into town could look more inviting. Physically more attractive, especially Laurel's main street.

More facilities - such as recreation areas

Laurel has an industrial look- Nothing can improve it except those industries closing

Less casinos on 1st avenue, more museums, more educational sites, better use of unused buildings.

Clean up entry way into the city. Improve Canyon Creek Battlefield to bring people to Laurel

The old Laurel hardware building should be torn down. Sidewalks should be repaired. A movie house should be built for young people.

I think some of the businesses could improve their appearances.

Run down buildings, closed buildings need to be torn down. Maybe the city could give a break to people willing to build a new business.

Better marked places like library, post office, schools, churches (some have directions, but not all.)

It would be difficult since the railroad & the refinery are our 2 main industries and neither is very attractive.

Buildings cleaner, kept up better  
Have taxes decreased and help more senior citizens.

Get rid of or improve old buildings downtown and update those you have.

Either use existing building for new businesses or tear down the ones that have been empty for decades.

Downtown urban renewal.

Better road repair, community clean up.

Make people start cleaning up their residences. Enforce the ordinances so Laurel doesn't become a slum town. Too many people don't take enough pride in their homes.

Better streets. New swimming pool and tennis courts. Cut trees at street intersections.

More tasteful construction towards I-90 to lure the traveler. Also more trees and plants and less pavement to the street type of landscaping.

Put a fence up along the railroad. Get rid of the bums begging at off ramps.

Improve highways.

Remove existing businesses and start from scratch. Won't happen. It shouldn't happen.

Get tenants for empty businesses. Improve streets. Storm sewers.

Street sweeping, controlling weeds, more flowers planted.

Removing any old unused buildings that definitely are not of any value for use in any way in the future.

Entry into Laurel from the south. Landscape along 1st Avenue. Remove much of the asphalt and replace with landscaping. Clean up all of the buildings along west Main. City council should enforce clean up more quickly than they have.

Grooming side streets, cars, weeds etc. Entrance beautification interstate grooming. Sidewalks and street repairs.

Left turn signal when coming through the underpass from the south.

Modernized, more opportunities.

Downtown needs cleaned and updated.

Downtown business buildings need improved. Need signs on interstate to invite people to stop here. Need "fun spots" built so people will stop and stay.

Shopping mall. Factory outlet mall. Unique shopping and dining. Family park with kid activities.

The state highway south of town is a disgrace. Weeds and underpass is full of dirt, feathers, and trash!

By building bigger parks and places to shop locally for tourists and locals.

More businesses. Better stores.

Bums on highway intersection eliminated. More downtown development.

Maybe some of the empty lots could be cleaned up.

Improvements on older buildings on main street.

Fix the roads.

Don't know.

General clean up.

West and east exits are unattractive. Really don't have recommendations. West Main street, south side of 100, 400 block needs improvement.

Entrance to city

New growth in business district by state or local incentives.

Cleaner streets, better appearing approach from interstate, do something with the railroad interstate.

Clean, neat approach renewal of facilities.

Parks. Parking. Hotel. Restaurants.

Downtown area needs to be more cozy. Park is a mess, needs TLC with trash pick up. Four-way stop by Ricci's is scary.

People should take more interest and action in keeping their property and the town clean.

Better traffic control. Repair roads. Need a shopping mall or amusement park.

Improve streets and store fronts on main street.

Get rid of some of the junk yards and have people fix up their houses. One on third and seventh is a mess.

Enforce the weed control problem. Better restaurants.

More eating places of German influence. Emphasize German heritage.

We need more businesses and let Ricci's move their store to the north school lot so we have better and bigger store to serve the tourism.

Better streets, some of our streets are not paved all the way to the curbs. Keeping the downtown area cleaned up, weeds cut down.

Remove or remodel empty buildings on main. Burn all casinos.

Store front upgrades, streets and sidewalks in very poor shape, decent well-kept parks, few street lights, railroad tracks, run down grain elevators.

Fix roads, need better traffic control device for underpass and for south Main street. We need to promote more business at laurel interchange.

More industry or business that does not rely on tourism to build a better infrastructure and thus a better town. Also, less politics and the good ole boy system.

More attractive and well kept entrances into Laurel. Improve buildings on Main street. Tear down old empty buildings and clean up a business with old washers, stoves, etc sitting outside.

Should be cleaner. Flowers planted on median south of laurel. West end of town is trashy looking. Clean up!!

Remove or replace crumbling and deserted buildings. Need a tourist information center inside city.

Old building fronts repaired and repainted. Roadways cleaned of debris and weeds, repaired as needed.

Cleaner roadways coming into town.

Clean up older homes, backyards etc.

Empty lots on main should be built up. ??? Hardware building should be spruced up. West end of Main spruced up.

Entrances and exits into town cleaned up - enter the 90's. Cut down weeds in all lots, vacant or not.

Remove all transients & undesirables. Make people assigned to community service pick up litter. Create jobs for local teens to keep them out of trouble. Some businesses and residential owners need to improve the looks of their property.

Repair burned and destroyed buildings.

There is nothing to draw people to laurel except the fourth of July fireworks and the Herbfest. I am an elderly woman and have no idea how to improve Laurel for tourism.

Clean up

Don't know.

Trees along frontage road to block view of tracks and muffle sound to local establishments.

Heated indoor pool for family and school use in park. Lower gas prices at pump.

There should be more things for the young people to do. There should be another theatre built by someone. There isn't enough for people who don't drink to do.

Derelicts and beggars out of our parks.

Improving the park with keeping it cleaner.

Laurel is an industrial area. How do you beautify a railroad or refinery?

Improved streets. Everything needs to be cleaned up. Shabby bathroom facilities for visitors.

Need better roads.

Just a general sprucing up.

Woo major attractions (six flags, etc.). Have more businesses look German architecturally. Leavenworth, WA is a prime example of what Laurel can be. Solvang, CA is another good example. Christmas time would be a prime time to use our German theme.

Don't know.

Keep transients off the streets. Fix up and occupy deserted buildings.

Fix streets for driving. Clean up homes and yards. Have 7-11 or similar store on east side of laurel. The east side is the worst eye sore of Laurel.

Neater appearances of building, stores, and land adjacent to highways into laurel.

Turning lanes especially under railroad bridge on left and Main.

Improve roads and downtown.

Movie house, something for people to do.

More creative landscaping.

Roads and main street. RV parks.

Cut trees down on Yellowstone -- are too many. Street too narrow

The refinery and railroad hidden by trees.

Cleaning up entrance to city - garbage, maintenance, plant flowers in medians, plant trees and shrubs.

Clean the gutter and streets, more street lights.

Traffic, put trees around refinery. Build newer buildings with better landscaping for businesses.

Remove the refinery.

Laurel is not very neat and clean. Litter, weeds, left over sand from winter all mar the appearance of the streets and parks. The streets need to be cleaned more.

Business owners and residents display their pride in Laurel and their business or homes in keeping streets clean of clutter and well maintained. Beautification needed.

Keep streets in better shape.

Road improvement, traffic control.

I think the quaint German structures are great and the old brick structures. Laurel needs to be more aware of its potential as a boutique center - not mass market of retail goods.

Too many old, unused, run down buildings on main street. Shabby looking hotels. No clothing store. Too many casinos.

Pollution from railroad and refinery is bad. Amount of transients around and about. For such a small town the amount of alcohol and drugs among our youth. The loss of our youth in such a small town through death.

Downtown redone. Something like Powell, WY. New life needed. Too much old style.

More businesses improve the exterior of their place. Have a new business move into vacant spot where theatre used to be.

Add boulevards and more trees. More sidewalk benches, better street lights, better streets.

Nothing specific comes to mind except maybe the need to generally update and keep streets in better repair.

Renovation of buildings.

## **Appendix D: Laurel General Comments**

## Laurel Comments

- + Tourism would be a big help to Laurel as we need to get going. Time for some positive changes- our youth need it.
- + I would like to see an outlet store development close to town. Would bring lots of tourists and also Billings residents.
- + Outlet Mall. Need to develop a teen center. Need to cut back on any more casinos &/or bars. Build things to draw families. We should have had the "Cracker Barrel".
- + Bringing people into Laurel at any time for anything would help the city of Laurel and the rest of Montana, our schools and shopping which we need more of. Hope this helps.
  
- +/- Laurel has one tourist attraction and that is the 4th of July. The Herbfest is dying and there are no landmarks, buildings, or attractions to bring anyone here. We need businesses that attract tourists - water slides, fun parks, etc. I love this town and the people in it. They have been very good to me and my family. I run my own business outside of my job and would like to continue to be able to build it here but need people. Luckily for Laurel and myself, Billings is growing.
- +/- Instead of dwelling on what tourism can do for Laurel, ask what Laurel can do to promote and benefit from tourism and increased tourism. Laurel is so stuck on it's self. It is such a "cliche" town that it will never be a tourist attraction so long as this attitude is allowed to go unchecked. We see dramatic results from Fourth of July activities and the Christmas lighting, albeit most is somewhat local. The Herbfest generates some interest but is too ethnic. Those three items account for about one week of the year and beyond that Laurel could dissolve and few tourists would miss it. An attitude example is that damn rusty Indian in the downtown park with ZERO recognition for the railroad which mostly created and maintained Laurel. Where is Laurel's locomotive in that park which would inspire some real tourist interest?
- +/- Laurel needs more restaurants, stores, etc. There is nothing here. Why would tourists come here? They can't shop, there are no "attractions". All we have is the 4th of July celebration and Herbfest. We need something big ( a supermall, big hands-on museum, etc.) or something with a railroad theme. It would be great for Laurel to be more self-supporting and encourage tourism and businesses.
- +/- Tourism in Montana presently is not the benefit that it could be because we don't have a sales tax. Until we do, we will see little benefit.
- +/- Laurel is a major railroad hub, I think a train museum just might be a good thing, also a history (local) museum. Our local chamber of commerce does a good job for the people of this city. Local city government needs to be more receptive to the people's wants and needs. They also need to work very hard for the betterment of this city as a whole, stop the petty politics and get on with running the city in a way all of us can be proud of. Tourism could be a good thing for this city and area only if we look at tourists as people wanting to see and know more about our city and its area and its past and not just as money spenders.
- +/- My main concern is that if there is too much tourism, it will bring in rich out-of-staters that will buy up everything or force prices too high that we as locals and natives of the state won't be able to afford to live here in our own land.
- I moved to Laurel from a "one industry town" because Laurel's economic geography dictated it to be a natural 5 industry town. It still has that promise, although some of its natural attributes are being jimmied by "regulation". There is no way that Laurel will become a "tourist destination"!! Silk purse of a sow's ear! Laurel should

emphasize added value for what it naturally has! Sure, a few bucks dropped by tourists helps. But Laurel City Government should remember that Laurel was built on “the right to go broke”! The guiding hand of Laurel government hasn’t contributed much to progress.

- We don’t need those strangers around here. They will cause more crime. We need more stores. We need less casinos and bars. We need department stores like Wolds used to be. We need a big shopping mall so you don’t have to go to Billings for so many things. Our businesses are like they are doing you a favor by waiting on you. I think their prices are unnecessarily high.
- Laurel is a good quiet community for living for those who have gainful employment or as a bedroom town for those who work in Billings but don’t want to live in the city. Unfortunately, that aspect is darkened by the huge amount of drug use and dealing, and alcoholism. Also too many people the law can’t touch. But there may be problems everywhere. Unfortunately, I expected better. As for tourism, I’d feel it is a pleasant place for an overnight stay - relaxed meals and not as much traffic chaos as Billings. But the area offers absolutely no natural attractions, culture is zero and being in the shadows of Billings and Red Lodge I fail to see where there is anything in Laurel to encourage tourism - and perhaps it is better that way. Sorry I haven’t got any more positives to offer - I call Livingston, MT home, but regrettably will never live there again. We might look at Livingston as a town that was saved by people who “discovered” it moving in but has lost much of its western, rural character in the process. At least it saved the economy.
- “Shotgun Willies” NOT promoted! Casinos NOT promoted! One of Laurel’s attractions is the low traffic volume and quietness. If it becomes a big tourist town, we might as well move to Billings or somewhere else.
- Tourism brings out of state people who decide to live here. They have brought big money into the state and caused land values to skyrocket to a point where someone living and working in Montana can no longer afford to own property. Check property values in Boulder, Stillwater, etc. Compare with twenty-six years ago.
- I’d just as soon keep a fence around Montana and let very few people in. I realize this is a pipe dream, so I have resigned myself to the fact that this state will become ruined by a wealthy few who come as tourists and then return to buy land at inflated prices; and us “homegrown” Montanan’s are forced into the role of servants to the rich with no hope to obtain land for ourselves.
- Not much here for tourism, except the 4th of July and that is overcrowded already.
- Why should Montanans clutter up their state with more people and cause the crime rate to go sky high?
- As an outdoors type person, I have seen land and forests closed down to the locals and everyone else for that matter because of the landowners. Feelings of those “damned out-of-staters” and I can’t blame the landowners. I can see that in the future all land will be “free to trespass or hunt” because of tourism and the impact it has on the land. Tourism does provide a living, although it is a seasonal living at best. Tourism is exploitation of Montana resources, no different than mining or logging or oil, why not then limit tourism, like the government does our other resources, and make the same rules apply. Tourism is making someone wealthy, but I doubt it’s the common man, the man that makes Montana what it is, the last best place.
- I don’t understand all this tourism. Laurel has no theater, and no museum. Nothing much to offer tourists. I’m sure most people would not like their children in these casinos. I think the downtown area needs cleaning up, some paint on buildings and businesses on Main Street and 1st Street. Most of all we need a clothing store. To me, Laurel isn’t as nice and prosperous as it was in the 30’s. Laurel is about as shady as Bridger, Fromberg, or Columbus. Since I have poor eyesight and have to use a tile sensor, it looks kind of messy. I guess you can tell. I think all this tourism is ruining the state. We need building in Laurel so more businesses can locate here and some businesses working out of their homes would have a downtown location and not all on the south side of the tracks. It is difficult for older citizens to shop over there.

City of Laurel and/or state has put too much time and effort in the tourist trade! You would benefit a whole lot more if you put your efforts into bringing more real jobs into this state and city. These are far and away, just

too many small businesses in this city and whole state. Bring real strong financial based jobs here and to the whole state. You certainly would see the cities, counties, and state prosper more. Just look at Idaho!

The virtues of Montana have been over-advertised worldwide and tourism has encouraged too many people to come here. Along with natural disasters pushing people out of other states advertising for tourism has not been beneficial. Montana's population is growing too fast and among other things the result is inflationary. Montana is not the kind of state to sustain a heavy population and it was doing alright before

- 0 Laurel is a bedroom for Billings - like it or not. Laurel people are "anti-Billings". They should support more of the actions of Billings and Yellowstone County.
- 0 Ricci's proposal should not be approved. Keep North School Lot as a park or vacant for activities. Chief Joseph monuments should be redone. Develop Yellowstone River frontage near or at Riverside Park more vigorously. Tear down either or both elevators near underpass. Establish family or group sponsored flower gardens in vacant areas i.e. next to Sonny O Day, next to railroad tracks and in middle of parking lot near second hand stores on Main Street. Remove junk from around Fred's TV shop on 5th and Main. Install street lights in newer parts of town to improve visibility.
- 0 Perhaps a KOA-type facility for families that travel with their RV's.
- 0 We need better traffic control when we have large events like the fireworks. More parking spaces would be nice. Getting on and off the Interstate is getting to be quite trying at times. Need more places for the local teens. Our biggest advantage, I think, is our location, the turn off point to Red Lodge and Yellowstone. We need to encourage more people to stop here instead of Billings, but improve traffic control first. I guess I like the feel of a small town and wouldn't mind an occasional event being promoted, but we are already growing, so we need to do the improvements.
- 0 Local events have little outside marketing efforts to draw in tourists, i.e. The Herbfest, which mainly relies upon word of mouth. The Fourth of July celebration is not advertised as a day long event. It is viewed as fireworks only. Industry businesses such as the Cenex refinery and the asphalt plant need to clean up emissions to provide cleaner air. Additional businesses such as these should be discouraged. Additionally, Laurel should focus on a few events throughout the year to capitalize on tourism. Don't attempt to become a primary destination in Montana. The attempt would more than likely fail.
- 0 Herbfest and the 4th of July fireworks are the two main events every year which involve a lot of people from outside the community. It is very evident during these events that Laurel needs to improve on traffic control.
- 0 Events for tourists: Herbfest. Plans for development means plans for control, i.e. - government expanding control of zoning, more police, etc. Control is already excessive. NO! to planned development. Police department is a travesty. Court system is a corrupt joke. School system is poor. Planning dept. is self-serving. Influx of tourists would make this worse than it already is.
- 0 Bringing movie making to Montana in my opinion was a mistake! All it's done is bring in those rich movie stars who buy up the land so no one else can afford to pass their land on to the next generation and drive up the taxes. They post the land so no one can hunt or fish. It's becoming the rich man's playground and the everyday Jane and Joe are cut off. Montana no longer belongs to Montanans. It belongs to the very rich!
- 0 I think the Aviation Week is a very educational perspective not only to the young but also the old. It shouldn't be pointed at the service level, but also in the history of the older planes. Also Laurel was built because of the railroad. The town as a whole should have some kind of museum in memory of all the railroad workers who have come to live in this town and also the history of how this town was built upon this. I would be excited to help in this project if it were to get off the ground..

- 0 At my age, I have no definite opinions.
- 0 Although I haven't seen the results of the years Herbfest's profits, many people in Laurel feel that the new location on the edge of Laurel has many people thinking that the City of Laurel will not gain from it. They need to be reminded that we need this cultural event and the new location is a good one, and Laurel does gain from it. How to get the word out? Laurel is a bedroom community to Billings, but we have a lot to offer from that very thing. We would gain more from tourists if we had a sales tax.
- 0 Large scale conventions or gatherings would not be appropriate - lack of infrastructure, adequate facilities.
- 0 No more Casinos!!!!!!
- 0 Everything is fine!
- 0 Need better stop lights.
- 0 Would like to have a better change in Laurel government, replace older individuals with younger persons, would have to wind up with one term office, get home town people decisions. Too slow in road repairs.
- 0 I think Laurel has plenty of people here, that work in Billings. Laurel doesn't need any more recreation attractions, although fixing up the south pond would be nice. Toilets and picnic tables, trees and barbecue pits.
- 0 Laurel has plenty of bars but they need something for minors to do.
- 0 This entire survey is slanted to be pro-tourism. I believe the results will be biased not only because of the questions but the respondents will tend to be more from the pro-tourist businesses. A representative sampling will be difficult at best.
- 0 Don't promote Shotgun Willies. Theme parks are nice. Would have been nice to have had Wal-Mart located here because of the many highways that junction here.
- 0 We need to encourage business growth in our town.
- 0 The traffic on 1st Avenue is terrible now with more cars the chance of getting out of business is even a lot worse. The corner of 1st Avenue and 1st street is very dangerous. Parking is too close so you can't see clearly at the corners and people don't use the four-way right. Increase traffic lights are a must now as population and tourist increase , it's ugly on some streets. People traveling north and south do not do right-of-ways. Traffic around and on 1st Avenue is very dangerous for students going to and from school. The underpass is always dirty and the birds are thick. Thank you.
- 0 We need more motels, a fun park, a community center with a swimming pool, but more than anything we need publicity about our town.
- 0 We are badly in need of a civic center or large building to house indoor events. Also an indoor swimming pool for the youngsters.
- 0 We need a council that is willing to extend city services beyond the city limits to encourage growth rather than discourage it. We need more highway motels and restaurants to attract passer-by. We need more downtown parking (free) to encourage visitors to shop our stores, hardware, pharmacy, art gallery, florists, etc. Promote and create walking trails from interstate motels and stores to downtown. It's only a block or two. Create a "Last Chance Gulch" like Helena has and then advertise it!
- 0 The streets in Laurel have to be about the worst in this area. Even the recent resurfacing in west Laurel streets area is a joke!! The infrastructure in the city is awful. Recent water hikes by the city further proves this. For a town on the outskirts of Montana's largest city you would think we could improve these items and not after the

growing pains start.

- 0 Any type of development that would attract criminal activities.
- 0 I think that there are too many bars and other things that promote drinking and there are a lot of people who don't drink, but there is nothing for them to do since the movie theatre burned down. I think that someone should build another one. Have something for the young people to do.
- 0 Laurel has become stagnant and our present government is doing more harm to this city all the time. It's time for a change before Laurel is by-passed or our town is ruined by good people quitting and resigning. Why??
- 0 I personally would like to see more cultural and historic tourist attractions rather than amusement attractions.
- 0 An interesting place for kids especially teens to hang out and do fun things, be it swimming, games, foods, etc. under one roof. A sort of Sea World with fish, mammals, etc. with a tea room. A kiddy place for the very young, carousel horses, kiddie train to ride, etc. Or a mini golf course for parents and children to play together.
- 0 I don't feel I can answer this properly. I am 80 years old. I'm feeling things aren't as good here as should be. There is too much crime and destruction of property. I feel we should do more to take care of what we have. We already benefit from the overflow of tourism in Billings. Our streets are a disgrace and laws not followed about care of property here. We are a suburb and have to shop in Billings.
- 0 Transportation for seniors, buses to Billings etc. at least once a month. Never liked Laurel but I guess it's safer than Billings. Not able to leave anyway. I prefer Washington even it rains a lot.
- 0 The huge increase in water rates will discourage many things, not to mention people trying to move elsewhere. There is nothing here to attract tourism. No shopping and a city council that does what it wants.
- 0 The town doesn't need any more events where alcohol is a major event (Herbfest, 4th of July). Although a good rodeo would do well. I'm Native American. This community as a whole is not prejudice but are somewhat ignorant to Indian customs and culture. Laurel and tourism and people of all nationalities would greatly benefit if Laurel had a major museum of Native American Culture and Customs of the different tribes of Montana or the upper Missouri Area. Laurel would be a great place to showcase a Native American/early settlers, railroad museum because of the interstate and access of a smaller town next to a bigger town. P.S. I hope you understand what I'm saying, if not feel free to contact me and I'll explain.
- 0 Promote: Chief Joseph sight - history - railroad history - some museum or other method to display this all current activities in area i.e. rodeo, fishing. Instruct store clerks to have more pride in area and events. Indian celebrations. Festivals (4th of July, Herbfest, activities at horse barn). Take an interest in and support attraction on Thiel Road - frontier town or whatever it is going to be called - also the air boat river rides.
- 0 I doubt that our city council wants anything to change in Laurel. It seems any time someone tries to start something here, council drags their feet or shuts it down and Billings gets it. We have a skating rink and a swimming pool that is so cold when they swim. There is really very little here for young people to do here.
- 0 We have the Herbfest and the 4th of July fireworks. Land use regulation has to be supported on an individual basis. I am opposed to overgrazing but cattlemen are still your best land use. Look at Ted Turner's back to the buffalo terrible soil erosion and the release of the wolves are already proving to be a disaster. We lived through the summer of 88's disaster fire in Yellowstone - natural burning wasn't it called? We couldn't breathe all summer. I love this state and I hate to see out-of-state and country interests come in and buy up as going broke cattle people, but what do you do? And people want to recreate where the deer and antelope play. Some really tough questions. And in Idaho, they're teaching children how to live with grizzlies. I don't think so! Good Luck!
- 0 Keep the Herbfest in the city of Laurel. Have the library where its accessible. No railway access in the area. -

have to go all the way to Malta or Wolf Point.

- 0 If you have no alternative but to vacation in Laurel, in my opinion, you are in a world of hurt. Laurel is kept alive by the volunteer fire dept., backed up by the police dept.. There are drinking bars galore, two grocery stores. Main shopping clothing and otherwise in Ben Franklin. No cultural shops or events. Town is basically a refuge residential area for Billings's families. In the 50s, Laurel was a thriving town since then it has only gone down hill. Without Billings, there would be no Laurel.
- 0 A shopping area to promote Montana product. A more western theme. More family type eating place. I do not see a lot for Laurel as a place for tourists. Only a stop once as they go to other places.
- 0 I would not like to see more good agricultural land gobbled up for more hotels and houses.
- 0 Laurel is a good town with good friendly people, a good place for kids to grow up. The problem being is that if the kids want something to do they have to go to Billings. Tourists always have kids tagging along, on the most part. What is there for kids to do in Laurel? Too bad we didn't get the amusement center but it's hard to compete with Billings - leave them there and come back to Laurel for some rest and quiet. What's a vacation for?
- 0 Improve South Pond- add some trees and a boardwalk to the middle of the lake.

**Appendix E: Hill County General Comments**

## Hill County Comments

- + Increased tourism means more money being spent in our town, which in turn, means economic growth for our community.
- + Havre needs to clean up its downtown area. Trees and green stuff are desperately needed, not only for appearances, but to help modify the climate. Tourists zip through town all summer, for gas, a quick meal, or a nights sleep. Hill County needs to entice them to stay longer. Downtown beautification is a necessary first step.
- + Havre has a limited population from which to draw customers. Therefore, in order for businesses to grow and new businesses to develop that population with purchasing power needs to be enlarged - and increased tourism is a means to do that.
- + We have great historical places and events in Hill County which are being promoted. Keep up the good work. It can only help our economy by drawing tourists here. We are not overcrowded in Havre. I am willing to help in its promotion.
- + Since this was sent to our household, we filled it out as a couple. We think the best approach is to emphasize what we currently have and encourage tourism at an added bonus. Beaver Creek Park is as nice as Glacier in many ways, so we should push its use. Our natural environment is our best asset.
- + I think just about any family event we can have that will bring people in is needed. We need to capitalize on our tourist trade.
- + Havre needs another golf course, hockey arena, and better entertainment at the fair. This would bring more people and money, employment and prosperity to Hill County. Hill County cannot solely rely on the railroad and agriculture for any growth. Also Hill County has to take some risks when promoting recreation, etc.
- + I've long thought the development of a "Northern Tier Historical Trail" could be developed to entice tourists to travel Highway 2, starting with Fort Union on the North Dakota-Montana border and moving westward to Fort Belknap; the Airman's Memorial at Harlem; Chief Joseph Battlefield and museum south of Chinook; and then there's many attractions (overnight here) and then on to Glacier, still on Highway 2. There is information available singly of some attractions, on Highway 2, but more coordinated and concentrated effort would pay dividends, I believe.
- + We should capitalize on the history and cultural aspects of our area. Havre and Hill County have an amazing history if we can show it to the tourist. The arts and culture of our native population are another natural opportunity that we continue to ignore. Let's get behind a Native American Art cooperative with genuine art. Great opportunity to help create jobs and foster better relations.
- + It all boils down to employment. Tourism is important only to the extent that it provides jobs. Havre needs more employment to keep its youth here and to build the economy. We need more businesses (such as a dime store and a music store) but there is not presently enough trade to support them.
  
- +/- Havre area attractions are good. We do not need to try to become bigger than we are. Billings, Missoula, Great Falls, and Kalispell are nice places to visit, but I would not want to live in any again. Too much big city attitude in an area where it should be rural and open under the Big Sky.
  
- +/- Tourism is good for Hill County. The only drawbacks I see are the increasing competition with natives for

things we have had all our lives, i.e. fishing, hunting, camping, traffic, etc. Most tourists are desirable people and leave important dollars in Hill County.

+/- Tourism is great for any area. It brings in money, opinions, and suggestions from people who have a different outlook. However, if it's all negative, it won't be good at all. Havre would tend to be negative because, number 1, location. Great Falls is two hours away would seem a better place to visit. First it's our mall - no shopping variety. The Canadians used to stop here in droves. What happened? Woolworths left. What do people like to do on vacation? They shop, eat, gamble in nice places with restaurants attached, see sites, see entertainment different like rodeos, Virginia City Players, zoos, museums, etc.. Havre's main street could be improved by trees, benches, flowers. Havre needs to be cleaned up - the main part should look like Pepin Park or the housing area downtown. Make it an oasis on the long drive from Canada or east or west.

+/- I think we need more industry. Tourism is great as a sideline but would hate to depend too heavily on it for economic health of Hill County as so many unforeseen factors may affect it - weather, gas prices, etc.

+/- Tourists should not drive so fast and learn the rules of the road concerning passing where yellow lines are. Concerning business development, we would like the Straw Board plant to be on the Hi-Line

+/- Promote local festivities better. Make them bigger and better. A better fairgrounds for Havre, more improvements and funds for what's here and in the county. A new golf course is not needed and will not promote tourism, but will be a big financial burden to the city and county (Hill). Let's use our resources to keep the people home. Jobs!!! Tourism? After all, we can't force a person to come and see us. Tourism is OK, unfortunately 90% of the money goes back into advertising and is not spread out to help towns that do get a lot of tourists. The sell-off of Montana stinks!! Bless the buffalo and any other animal out there! Tourism? A question \$\$\$\$\$. No, I don't belong to any group. Just like the good old days.

- I do not believe tourism is the route to push. It provides mainly for low paying without benefits employment possibilities leading to more 'working poor'.

- Do not recommend Indian Pow Wows on either reservation until drugs and crime problems are under control.

- Tourism will never play a big role in Havre and will employ very few and do little for our tax base. Spend your time and money on a good manufacturing business where the people have been checked out financially.

- Let's face it, Northwesterly Montana is not the "Golden Crescent" - Glacier National Park down through Missoula over to Bozeman and on to Billings. Tourism is not the answer to economic development for this area. Develop natural resources.

- Promote Havre Festival Days and county fair. We need to draw in businesses such as manufacturing or the likes instead of depending on seasonal types. The people of Hill County deserve good solid employment, not seasonal. The future of this area depends on solid jobs.

- Overall conditions (Q3) are substantially better in rural Hill County. Conditions in Havre lowered responses to Q3. With such a high percentage of rural Hill County tax dollars going to residents within Havre area, it is difficult to support tourism if it will increase our taxes further, with no benefit to the small communities.

- If stores or services are brought in exclusively for tourism, there will be times of economic depression as tourism fluctuates. This will be more prominent as middle class has less and less to spend on leisure.

- I think using tourism as an industry is insane. Would you like uncaring strangers tramping your backyard? Could you continue to put up with their rudeness, garbage, and pollution in your backyard? This is my (our) backyard and I won't exploit it for a couple of bucks. Thank you for my say.

- I don't think increased tourism would be positive for Hill County. It probably would cost more for road upkeep

and government services etc. than the income they would create.

I have seen what tourism has done to other towns. It builds up to higher cost. The only people who really benefit are property (multiple) owners and businesses. The common person has to scrape even harder to get by. My brother currently rents a one room kitchenette 12' x12' for \$335, has a minimum wage job, and must support his daughter. I don't want to see this happening here. It's hard enough to find a decent place to rent and landlords up the rent because of college. Families are being pushed into nonliveable conditions.

- I feel that too much time and money is being spent on promoting our state. It does not benefit all people equally.
- Only other thing I have is Hill County has a lot of railroad people. Nothing Mentioned. It has a devastating impact on Havre and Hill County. Other than that maybe ??? five I think isn't right.
- It's too bad that our county officials discouraged the straw board plant. Now Fort Benton or Rudyard will get it.
- Don't know if any of the roads get repaired. They're done wrong and fall apart too quickly. Crime. Tourists move here for more welfare. I don't see where any of the money goes. I'm still taxed way too much.

0 Promote Rocky Boy Pow Wow.

0 Better promotion of what we have. Create as much in the next five to ten years as the last five to ten years. Better visual impact when entering, going through, and leaving Havre.

0 Residents of Hill County should be given preference over anyone else when it comes to development projects of any sort. Money should be used on improvements rather than expert advice from people who are residents of Bozeman or some other city or state. Any non-resident should be carefully scrutinized and viewed with suspicion. For that matter, residents' opinions should count. Then perhaps a nice grassy hill wouldn't be torn up and turned into a dust bowl giant weed patch.

0 Do not favor Havre called a "Honky Tonk Town". Promotion of clean-up so town looks better. A couple of roadside parks with tables and restroom facilities. Use of prison helps to keep a well maintained system. Tourist information center operated on a volunteer basis but kept covered by scheduling. Promote new businesses. Good Luck!

0 My daughter saw a bumper sticker that says "Montana sucks, go home and tell all your friends". Montana is great just the way it is.

0 More recreation, hopefully the new golf course will be built. More cultural events, concerts, etc. Need some major retail stores to fill our shopping malls. Quality retirement housing?

0 Sporting events both high-school and college - a bigger gym could bring many people to the Havre area.

0 You ask what about our road conditions, I say good to rocky. I wonder who pays the taxes. Then compare ours to the southern part of the state. To build tourist businesses, upgrade US 2.

0 I sure hope that the county and the city have not paid a lot for this survey. If they did it is a shame that MSU Northern didn't benefit.

0 Local government is unsatisfactory. We need professional people, not popular ones. Montana works to the disincentive of commercial business through tax structure and bureaucracy. Business and government need to be ????

0 I'd like to see an auto/truck sports racing complex, we have flats for a good drag strip and easily enough space for

an oval truck and tractor pull. If Great Falls and Billings can host truck/tractor pulls in the sports arenas, why not Hill County at the fair grounds? Entrants spend money, spectators spend money. That's the bottom line, isn't it?

- 0 Do a better job of cleaning up Beaver Creek Park. The so-called largest county park in US is a pigpen. Could possibly be a great tourist attraction, but who's going to pay \$20 to camp and picnic out there. 180 miles west you can spend the same \$20 and have clean campgrounds.
- 0 Promote Heritage Center. Promote 18 hole golf course. Promote convention center. Promote hockey center.
- 0 Need good paying jobs for younger people.
- 0 What about Fresno as a local attraction that could be promoted to others? The government never does anything efficiently. What is this costing? Maybe money could be used to improve the roads "natives" drive every day.
- 0 Tourism has little to no effect on this household. I, myself live on US Highway 2. I spend several minutes at peak times just trying to get on the road. Additional traffic would be about the only effect (bad!) that we would experience.
- 0 The border of Montana should be a place where tourists can buy \$120 Montana dollars for \$100 US dollars so you can see where the dollars go. (This really would not work because most people pay with credit cards.) Something along this line might be implemented.
- 0 I feel that tourism plays a minor part in the economics in Hill County.
- 0 Do not want to promote or develop anything that would have an adverse effect on the environment - air, water, etc.
- 0 I think the Clack Museum should have stayed up at the fairgrounds with a campground. That is where the tourists will see it. Museum downtown will not support itself. Tax burden to the public.
- 0 At my age, it doesn't matter but for the future business would benefit.
- 0 We need a civic center for concerts, and the kids need a place to go. We need more events and things to do - this town offers little for entertainment. The economy "sucks" and is so far behind because it has been stagnant for years! No wonder the kids leave - What's to keep them here?
- 0 For Hill County: I think we need more things to do for kids such as a roller-skating rink would be nice! Maybe a water slide this would not only be good for Hill County but would draw people from other close counties, the nearest water slide in Montana would be Columbia Falls, Big Timber, or Billings. For Montana: I think Montana is a beautiful place and we took a '97 vacation around our state and enjoyed the splendors of the outdoors and parks. But I think our great state is missing some kind of amusement park like Six Flags or Disneyland. Of course not on that scale, but something the people of Montana and their children will go see and spend their money here in Montana. We've seen the zoo in Billings. It's a great beginning, but it's going to take a few years before it's complete. The carousel in Missoula is nice.
- 0 I know that there has been many improvements done at Fresno, but more could still be done particularly at the main beach i.e. better parking and walkways, better fire pits and picnic tables. Maybe the caretaker should do more, like picking up trash and bottles on the beach. Also in Beaver Creek, the toilets need major improvements. That is a big reason we wouldn't promote the area more.
- 0 Tourism does put a strain on available outdoor activities. That means these areas need to be upgraded to meet increased demand. The paving of the Fresno road was good, but unless additional access areas are created or improved, problems will increase. The same is true for Beaver Creek Park. Many of the lesser areas also need to be developed to create better access and relieve pressure on the main spots. Some of this conflict is connected with the mix of private and public lands. While Havre doesn't have a real traffic problem, 1st street and 5th Ave

do present problems at times. Some sort of traffic plan should be developed to give better traffic flow. In 1968 the population of Havre was 10,00 to 12,000. In 1997 it is still about the same. There are, however, fewer young people 18 and under. Northern has seemed to grow and maybe that offsets the decline. The spread between wealthy/comfortable and poor seems to be growing. As that difference increases, more population arise, especially in crime.

- 0 Better places for kids to visit and play. There really isn't anything for them. There's nothing even in the mall and it gets old going to McDonalds all the time. How about something like Discovery Zone, Chuck E. Cheese, etc.
- 0 Beaver Creek Park is becoming overused on many occasions. Park board is doing an excellent job of management but we have severe problems with littering, vandalism, and destruction of property. Need better cooperation from court system to get some convictions and reimbursement for destroyed property. A severe lack of respect for public and private property throughout the area. Poor morals.
- 0 Beaver Creek Park is the best camping area in the state, it should be supported and maintained to best it possible can and patrolled to stop people destroying campsites. Festival days promoted more. Build the downtown area up, and not spend so much energy on out of town mall.
- 0 I would like to see the castle developed, perhaps into a tourist attraction. Our historic homes could also be developed into an interesting attraction with a motorized tour which could be narrated.
- 0 Havre and Hill County has a very negative outlook on new changes there will be very little change in this area.
- 0 Removing trees from the Bear Paw Mountain. Mining.
- 0 I suggest having all sidewalks where our tourists along with our residents walk build on a straight level. A number of walks are now changed into cement run for vehicles to drive over the walk, it's hard for us walking to be comfortable.
- 0 I am a fisherman and I believe there should be better access areas to Beaver Creek Reservoir and Fresno Reservoir. I believe there should be more access to Fresno's shoreline. There are a lot of tourists using the area.
- 0 I think most tourists drive too fast here for our highways. Hate to see it, but we'll probably have to impose speed limit.
- 0 Would like to see the downtown area developed with parks, walk-ways, redevelop old buildings and restore to original. A parking ramp could be put in for all downtown businesses and customers. Make use of our abundant wheat crops for flour mill, brewery, or other related businesses to put people in Havre to work. We need more industry of some kind.
- 0 Hill County and Havre need to attract manufacturing. Advertise communication and transportation. RECRUIT!!! Hill County and Havre need to promote MSU-Northern and the programs. I wonder if Hill County and Havre leadership are aware of what is offered at MSU-N and how those programs can promote the town and county.
- 0 I feel the promotion of golf courses and the short-stay-type things are important. I feel Beaver Creek Park is too small to promote and might become overused and create problems for the Hill County residents.
- 0 I would like to see a cooperative effort between Havre, Hill County, and Rocky Boy Indian Reservation to improve and develop recreation opportunities in the Bear Paw's for example . The ???? camp, Bear Paw Ski Bowl, Rocky Boy Recreation area, could all be improved with a cooperative effort. There isn't a community in the state that has the recreation opportunity that we have. We need to develop it for the benefit of all residents.
- 0 Believe encouraging trailer groups, Good Sam Club and Air Stream Club, will be positive to have events planned here.

## **Appendix F: Statewide General Comments**

## Statewide Sample

- + I am very much in favor of taking advantage of our natural resources through tourism. Growth is a positive thing if we are prepared for it. I would favor a greater diversity of artistic (music) events such as high quality jazz, classical, and operatic events.
- + It is a fairly clean industry.
- + I think tourism is vitally important to Montana. We have a beautiful place and tourism money will help maintain the beauty and the animals, so industries/mining that destroy the environment do not have to be the priority. Tourism development does need to be planned and tourists pay in some way for roads and planning.
- + Tourism should be more thoroughly promoted the year around.
- + Improvement of Highway 93 is needed. I would like to see efforts within the community and the chamber of commerce to get people to stop and spend time and dollars in my area.
- + In general, I believe that a robust tourism component to our overall economy provides increased leisure time opportunities for Montanans. We need to invest more in our state parks (like Oregon) to get tourists to slow down and stay a night or two - particularly Yellowstone to Glacier corridor.
- + Tourism can only be a benefit to Montana. It not only provides jobs, it provides money for improvements that benefits all of us.
- + This survey, in the questions asked, seem too slanted towards the assumption that tourism is causing problems that outweigh benefits. Compare tourism in Montana to major tourist areas and it is a drop in the bucket. This state is so empty that tourism and for that matter, the population could double with little impact except in a few congested areas. Get out of the pulp smelling Missoula sometimes and smell the roses. Montana has one of the highest qualities of life in America. Just go to Seattle, San Francisco, LA or any major metro area to appreciate what we have and don't have.
- + Tourism should be encouraged. Secondary roads should be improved. Montana's hotel bed tax should be raised. It's very low compared to many other states.
- + Community casinos I would not like to see promoted. I like the tourism level to stay the same or increase. Montana could use more good jobs.
- + I support continued promotion of tourism in the state. However, it would be good to get a few more tourist dollars that would give some relief to the very high property taxes in the state.
- + I greatly prefer tourism to any business that destroys the environment - I think tourism is preferable to the rapid population growth, but feel the population growth is inevitable, so wish we had better control of the direction of development. I wish our community had public bus service to cut down on the congestion and smog caused by traffic so I wish the tourist had buses to ride and everyone would be willing to use them.
- + Tourism overall is a positive influence on the state.
- +/- I am ambivalent about tourism. I recognize the economic impact and jobs that are created. At the same time, I see over-use of parks and recreational lands (which are underfunded and deteriorating), increased congestion on roads and infrastructure. Also, as Montana gets more attention, we get destination areas (Big Sky, Whitefish, etc.) which become enclaves of wealthy non-Montanans who have impact locally (and usually get their own way) while locals experience increased taxes, strain on infrastructure, etc. Our way of life is changing - the influx of people and money has some good consequences, but I regret the loss of a simpler,

more rural, more communal, more sustainable way of life. I think native Montanans are losing control of our own destiny - which more and more will be determined by wealthy outsiders and cooperations exploiting on the environment - just as our natural resources were exploited in the past.

- +/- Encourage tourists to come spend their money and leave the place like they found it.
- +/- The community needs a much broader economic base than tourism oriented. Timber needs to be revitalized as well as mining and manufacturing. Tourists need to be encouraged to bring those things to Montana.
- +/- While I realize tourism is a plus and want to see others enjoy our area, I don't like to see us becoming more "discovered". I don't want to see lots of people moving into the area.
- +/- It is true that tourism brings needed money and jobs to our state, but I have noticed that the rate of decline of our timber and mining industries seem to be directly tied to the increase in tourism. Now these are jobs that pay a liveable wage - not the minimum wage most tourist related jobs are paid. Granted mistakes have been made by both mining and timber industries, but they are learning now to be more friendly to our environment. I really feel that all the motels, campgrounds, roads, and other tourist attractions have a detrimental impact on our environment. Montana made a big mistake when it changed its motto from the "Treasure State" to "The Big Sky State".
- +/- Focus on tourism detracts somewhat from development of services on recreation specified or developed for local citizens. Think the state should assist to develop local recreation opportunities, which could also enhance opportunities for tourists also. We need to develop things for our children not just more casinos. Where is the incentive for carousels, amusement parks, fairgrounds, etc.? These things can be accessed by locals and tourists. HELP!
- +/- Our area does not attract a tremendous tourist trade - we have no major attractions. I believe tourism causes increases in our cost of living and in that way is a negative. Positive aspect is the increased income in a community and local business in a small community need that desperately. I do not think our area could afford much development to attract tourists since there are no major tourist attractions here. I firmly believe Montana is being extremely foolish, financially, by not having a sales tax. We Montanans pay sales tax when we go to the other states so why not have tourists pay a sales tax here to help finance road improvements and other services that suffer from increased usage by tourists? I wonder how many dollars of income Montana really misses out on for not having a sales tax.
- +/- We would like to see more good restaurants and more activities for 18 - 40 ages. I've always thought we should stress more tourism but by doing that the environment may suffer as will prices for local residents. Difficult to have one without the other.
- +/- Tourism is a mixed blessing in our community. It is often taken for granted because of our proximity to Little Bighorn Battlefield and Big Horn Canyon, but those visitor numbers have decreased in recent years and no strategic planning process has emerged to combat this trend or to plan for the future. Tourism grew and exploded in our community after 1990 when Custer's Last Stand re-enactment was reinstated. Then franchises sprang up in proximity to I-90 and its corridor of tourists, seeking to capture those traveling between Sheridan, WY and Billings, MT. There are too many franchises in Hardin now, and many mom and pop stores have gone out of business as a result. While the economy looks good for four to five months of the year, some long-term planning needs to take place to decide how to "market" this community during the fall and winter months.
- +/- I think of tourism as a necessary nuisance we have to put up with. Montana needs the tourist dollar, but we also have to put up with the disrespect tourists have for Montana's people and environment. I especially dislike the attitude of the tourists in regard to the basic rule on highways.
- +/- I enjoy tourists. They are interesting and fun. I don't want polluting industries or any industry which will encourage population growth.

- +/- When we moved to this community, we were willing to make do with less (lower income, lower housing standard) to live in this beautiful area and historical town. Our children thrived here with good schools, low drug and crime rates. Since then, I've seen the community change. The town is now filled with art galleries, boutiques, craft stores, etc. on its way to becoming another "Jackson Hole". Cost of real estate has increased, local shopping is gone, many of our students have no pride in their community or themselves. I attribute a great deal of this change to out-of-state people moving here (who probably visited and thought this would be a great place to live, but unfortunately brought different values with them). I have nothing against tourists - I am one, once in a while. I do feel promoted tourism has much farther reaching effects than the immediate dollars it brings in to a community. It's good for some, bad for others.
  
- +/- We moved to this area from a major tourist area in Colorado. I've lived with the good and bad aspects of tourism. I feel the overall impact of tourism is good in that it promotes a healthy economy if properly managed, however it is not without obligations to the community. I feel that Montana should promote growth, however that promotion should be targeted to families and not to the pick-up truck full of hunters and beer who return nothing to the area they are visiting. Vacationing families will spend money and stimulate the local economy. In return, the communities need to provide safe roads to drive on and nice restaurants and lodging to bring them back. I find Montanans in general very resistant to the change necessary to stimulate growth and have little faith in the leaders ability and desire to direct a change. Montana will eventually grow - how that is handled will determine whether Montana will remain "the last best place".
  
- +/- Tourism must maintain a delicate balance. Too much everything deteriorates and is costly to keep up. More tourism is not better. People come to Montana because we promote it. I'm not too excited about more promotion. We are well known enough. The dollar is the motivating factor that brings out-of-staters here to provide services to tourists. I believe we are now over the line with promoting tourism. I hope ITRR has Montana's best interest in mind and not just self promotion.
  
- +/- The history and wonders of Montana are very evident to those of us who live here. We should showcase and pride ourselves on what we have. If we would develop and feature these assets in a way that would indicate our appreciation and awareness of what we have, large numbers of transitory viewers are also be appreciative of those same wonders and carry that message back with them. We have a wonderland for people to see and enjoy but sheer logistics will prevent most people from coming back to live in this sparsely settled and distant land. We can have the best of both worlds if we view the tourism aspect in its proper order and logically plan for it.
  
- +/- I have mixed feelings about tourism. It's great for the economy and it helps our business somewhat. I think our area and other communities are capable of handling increased tourism and I welcome it. But, I'm very worried about increased tourism in our parks, recreation, and wilderness areas. These areas are overcrowded now with Montana's treasures that we all want to see and enjoy, but we may be loving them to death. If tourism increases in Yellowstone and Glacier, how can they handle the road use, water, sewer, etc.? Most of what it is doing to the environment. How can we keep Montana pristine and beautiful? I want everyone to love Montana as much as I do, but I also want it to be as beautiful and special for my children as it is for me. I think we need to promote our museum and cultural centers at least as much as the fishing and recreation; they are outstanding.
  
- +/- Tourism income is a two edged sword here. On the positive side the retailers love it and service stations collect lots of revenue. On the downside it means a proliferation of service-industry jobs when what this community desperately needs are jobs with annual incomes that a family can not only survive on, but thrive on. Tourism is good in the sense that America needs to see what a natural jewel Montana is - history runs in the air here, but for an overall benefit to the community I think the retailers are the only ones reaping the bennies.
  
- +/- I think tourism can be a clean "industry" and can benefit the state provided there are rules (not pollute air in West Yellowstone or Yellowstone Park). There has to be some spacing so you don't have large groups of people/horses/cars/ tourist place to pieces and destroy what people came to enjoy (sic). That means planning, protection of environment. For example - I am sure we will have to regulate entrance into the Glacier and Yellowstone Parks soon, if we want people to enjoy the experience. We have to keep certain areas wild - no roads - no oil/gas exploration and preserve our natural assets which in the long run will be invaluable for a

viable tourist industry.

- +/- I think it's hard to answer some questions as yes or no or maybe. The influx of people into Montana are a lot of undesirables (criminals). I've noticed an awful lot of out-of-staters who will not follow rules or speed limits. They are bad about litter and in general a lot of them are rude and demanding. There are too many pros and cons.
- +/- More understanding of what tourism means to and can do for an area. Need to properly manage tourism - too much can be detrimental, but I can't see that in very many areas.
- Highway construction has severely limited tourists coming through Libby this summer and previously when the Troy-Libby road was done (2 years).
- Have you ever seen a hamster on its treadmill? It runs and runs but gets nowhere. I live outside of Whitefish. Whitefish is the hamster and tourism is the treadmill. Tourism does not bring economic prosperity or stability to a town's people or the community as a whole. A few people profit greatly. Most grow poor at low paying service jobs, using taxes, increased cost of living, declining community services, and decreased quality of environment. Construction jobs are temporary, they are part of the treadmill. Increased "tourist centered" businesses fuel the need for more tourists. More tourists cost more in roads, police, etc. Computer models show that the only growth that truly profits the local people and government is slow growth with clean, light industry.
- I feel that tourism brings high traffic to area. Also prices at the local businesses are too high for the blue collar worker. Some businesses jack up the prices to meet with off-season lows. That in turn makes it impossible for lower income people to enjoy some of our local attractions.
- The main "industry" of this area appears to be retirement homes. There are few other industries other than log homes. We have a two-lane road with four-lane traffic from commuters. Tourists cause congestion to add to the confusion. This is a big concern but more importantly the tourists who decide to stay are changing the rural area to a large suburban area.
- Tourism that results in part-time residents (summer snow birds) drive housing and cost of living costs up. Services and goods needed for this seasonal influx creates a boom/bust seasonal cycle. Rather than attracting tourists, why not look at what it takes to attract clean, quality businesses to our state. Let's raise the quality of working here instead of the cost of living here. You may use my name.
- The government spending our tax money to attract tourists seems ridiculous. Use tax dollars to repair roads and rest areas and with a decent tax rate the residents won't be leaving the state in droves. Montana is beautiful, backward, boring, and expensive place to live.
- I believe this questionnaire is a waste of time and money. Tourism is being promoted enough. We need the extra money to promote jobs to help people here and I mean year round jobs.
- I spend a lot of time traveling in my business and observe a disproportionate number of out-of-state vehicles driving at high rates of speed, but even more of a concern are the passing on solid lines and hills and generally bad driving. Tourism impacts me personally very negatively because of the increased fuel prices and motel room rates during the tourist season. My business overhead is dramatically increased by tourism and I personally receive no benefits.
- People don't give a damn, they are just looking to destroy our state!! (I think)
- It is questionable whether tourism is a benefit to the state. Do the costs incurred exceed the income in tax revenue? Do revenues really make up for the decrease in quality of life? I think not. Even if revenue exceeds costs, I doubt that it is enough to justify the deterioration of the environment. We don't need more people, we

need more, better jobs.

- It truly is a trade off - more people, more services needed, more jobs, more money for communities, but then communities need more road improvements, etc. So do we really benefit? As a rancher more pressure from fishermen/tourists is a definite negative. As an outfitter certainly we need fishermen, hunters, tourists - given the choice less tourists to maintain own lifestyle with the ranch would be worth it. We would rather ranch and not have lots of tourists. More people, more pressure on fragile resources.
- Tourism doesn't create wealth, it only redistributes it. Manufacturing creates wealth. The state should spend more money towards developing a diversified manufacturing base. Tourism is great when it's there, but people are fickle, tourism isn't something that you can count on year after year.
- I hate to see Montana as a place where rich people buy up the land and try to stop economic development. I don't want the state to be a two tiered society with the rich catered to by self-employed servants and their minimum wage employees. Montana has one of the lowest per-capita incomes in the nation. Tourism, like gambling, produces nothing and supports mostly low wage jobs. The solution lies in changing our national economic policies away from speculation, and free trade and toward infrastructure development and scientific and technological progress.
- I am an unemployed mining geologist. Tourism does not promote mining. Tourism can increase restrictions on types of land use, this reduction in freedom is negative.
- Too many rich tourists coming and buying up all the property for high prices, that normal Montanans can't afford. Taxes are going too high.
- I know several people that moved up here after they toured Montana but Montana doesn't have the economy to support rich retirees and keep their own people up to par.
- I am of the opinion that tourism is way over rated. The so-called jobs that it brings in are only minimum wage jobs and for the luckier ones, seasonal employment. You can't plan to work in Montana and try to purchase a house, the wages do not allow that. The cities cannot afford to put on enough law enforcement to help patrol or just protect the people from the influx of tourists. I would just soon see all the efforts be put towards an industry i.e. timber, mining, agriculture, that could support families. Too much money is spent on promoting an industry (tourism) that only really benefits a small minority of businesses. It makes it hard to even stay in the state of Montana and to live comfortably.
- Too many, too fast. They are driving up housing costs and farmlands.
- We feel tourism ultimately causes unwanted and uncontrollable changes in all facets of local lifestyles. It results in unwanted changes, introducing undesirable lifestyles and individuals to communities not prepared for those changes. Tourism accelerates the changes that may occur at a much slower pace and perhaps tolerated at the slower rate of change. Montana has invested a great deal in tourism promotion, which has resulted in a dramatic change in the way Montanans live. In my opinion, and the opinions of people I know, those changes have caused a negative change in the lifestyles of our people. Crime is up, traffic and aggressive drivers has increased dramatically. The cost of everything is skyrocketing, land ownership is increasingly going to out-of-state owners as vacation or second home sites, etc. It's a sad day for the state and we all know it.
- This is a nice quiet community, no tourist attractions and we don't want our quality of life to change. Our state is filling up with people wanting our lifestyle and the minute they get here they want to change it. The subdivisions are ruining the last frontier. This used to be a very pretty state, now it's just a lot of houses. Most of the tourism in Montana only benefits people who live in other states. No benefit to the natives.

0 An old style gold mine. Skip the cyanide leach. We need to stomp on our law and order infrastructure. It's

getting awfully piggy out. Abolish capital punishment. Legalize homegrown. Dance naked around a tree. Push birth control.

- 0 Promote Shakespeare in the park. Development of set system (buses similar to Yosemite or other transportation) for those visiting Yellowstone. It should be every so often, and do the major loops (which it is ideally set up to do). For those camping or with other gear, a system to transport to campsite. A trailhead could be useful.
- 0 It seems incredible to a comparative new comer that a state with Montana's resources - which has produced people like Jeanette Rankin, Lee Metcalf, and Mike Mansfield - should allow itself to fall into the hands of a rabble of bucolic demagogues who, feeding at the Federal trough, shout "poverty" and try to dismantle higher education, raid the public patrimony, and neglect the infrastructure and essential services, all in the name of "lower taxes". Some sweeping reforms appear to be in order.
- 0 You can't do anything about it because you really don't have a voice in Federal policy making. But if we stopped spending money to try and keep world peace (a futile effort) we wouldn't have poverty at home.
- 0 The most significant issue in Montana is the cost of living increases associated with rises in housing costs. Montanan's salaries have not kept pace with the housing costs or cost of living. The influx of out-of-state home buyers appears to have effected these two aspects of Montana living. I'm not sure how tourism influences someone's decision to move to Montana.
- 0 Not appropriate: State prison, expanded gambling.
- 0 No rock concerts. Love Montana - born and raised here - Like the country to remain free and original. Be able to fish and have some space. Need a speed law I believe.
- 0 More cafes, clothing store, any kind of business, motel or a nice hotel to go with our golf courses.
- 0 As a native Montanan that has had the pleasure of working statewide for varying amounts of time, I've seen a lot of change in some parts of the state. Thank God I still know some secret spots where no one goes. Unfortunately there seems to be nothing that can be done about the humans' innate ability to glom onto another and live life around the almighty dollar. Until the human mind can grasp the concept of self control, we're screwed.
- 0 Would like to see a sales tax in Montana so that tourists would also be paying for the infrastructure and services they use in this state.
- 0 Will you people stop wasting my tax dollars on this nonsense! Who the hell pays for all this trash and what a stupid questionnaire anyways! Get a real job!
- 0 Affordable housing is needed in our community.
- 0 Need a theme or water park which will benefit both the community and tourism. It will help keep our teens busy and out of trouble.
- 0 The bed tax is not needed. Tourists will come without such heavy promotion and "overselling". Policy focus should be on high quality, low impact, high priced tourism (high priced to the tourists). There are too many motorhomes and RVs on the roads, also vehicles hauling trailers and spare cars, for road safety. Tourist attractions encouraging this kind of travel should be discouraged. Facilities and amenities for monster vehicles and trailers should be very high priced to cut down such types of visits. Aggressive recruitment of out-of-state students by our universities and colleges is poor policy. Higher levels of state funding for these schools would help alleviate the need for getting more tuition money from such students. Residency rules need toughening too.
- 0 State and community should employ sales tax so all could gain benefits from tourism - not just business.

- 0 Cost of living is very expensive here. Also real estate property - taxes.
- 0 The COL is high here compared to average income. Sales tax in other states gets the tourist to pay part of the benefit of using our states and relieves the tax burden of the residents. The cost of maintaining our state's attractions and highways is obviously too much for the few people in our state so we need to rethink our tax system.
- 0 Please no more casinos or gambling joints. I am surprised that you don't include categories for eco-tourism, historical tourism, etc. Need to break down tourism into what types. This is a good beginning.
- 0 This is the mayor's town. He does what he wants, we pay. Senior retirement homes (like Conrad). Our house, bought in 1959 for \$10,000 is now valued at \$55,000 for tax purposes. \$825 a year when you can least afford it. We have been retired since 1981-1982. I was fired when the telephone office moved to Billings at 58 before age discrimination came in as an issue. 17 years - Husband worked 30 years for B.N. Tourism has not played a very big part in our lives. We had to pay taxes, etc. to put in a motel - water, sewer, power, etc. - if they wanted it to be built here - Why? It just made other motels have less business. There isn't any industry here that helps employment - Pamida moved in and Ben Franklin and Pennys went out. Is this progress? The money doesn't stay here. Tourists don't have to come downtown at all. The big motel is about the first thing you see after Pamida.
- 0 Develop the Ulm/Pishkan.
- 0 The people who come and build summer homes drive prices up, it makes it difficult for the people who live and work in the surrounding areas.
- 0 I think we should have an amusement park, not just for tourists, but kids need something to do. We also would have more tourists if we built a better mall in Billings. Personally, I think Billings is really boring and I can't wait to get out of Montana. It's beautiful and everything, but there's nothing for young people to do that doesn't cost a lot of money. The Montana zoo needs a little bit of work, too. I apologize for filling this out instead of my mom, but teenagers' opinions count too. After all, in a few years, we'll be the ones in charge. I hope I haven't offended anyone and I'm sorry if I have.
- 0 I feel strongly that the cultural and historic resources are not getting the support they deserve from all the bed tax money collected. If we are going to have all those people pressuring our resources, then these resources should be receiving as much; much larger portion of the tax dollars than the mere pittance available. Why not have the museum associations, a professional organization, oversee the granting of the little bricks and mortar dollars you have available for grants? As it is, there is little professional input.
- 0 A lot of tourists are superior acting and extremely rude. Montanans are trusting, helpful, and congenial. We should be treated the same - not as low class, ignorant peasants. I'm not sure why we are seen this way. Most of us are close to Montana for the very things that others see as suspicious.
- 0 Sales tax and other taxes to help state maintain roads, parks, etc.
- 0 My town will be receiving a sewer system soon. Hopefully this will attract some new industries to help support the way of life we now enjoy.
- 0 The cost of parks and other recreational facilities should be more affordable to all tax payers, not just the upper class.
- 0 Promote more on state parks, city parks, campgrounds, lakes, museums, and cultural facilities. More development needs to be done with state and city parks.
- 0 I'm from Butte whose summer economy is largely dependent on tourism, but some of those things promoted are ecological disasters. This I would like to see changed. Instead, the focus should be on the rich cultural past, less

on mine waste.

- 0 Let us not as a community emphasize only “one thing”, tourism, retail, etc. Personally, I think there is too much emphasis on retail instead of manufacturing - downline. By this I mean the following: papermill, box plant, art graphics, Target, Kmart, arts and crafts, plastic manufacturing, art graphics, Ben Franklin, auto parts manufacturing, alternator air pollution parts, mining, electronics, computer chips, computer manufacturing for computer parts, TVs, art graphics. In summation, tie manufacturing to sales and retail and tourism. People coming to see Montana sights as well as business seminars. Everything is tied together, not separately!
- 0 It is not the development but rather how it’s handled. Too many people with personal interest in fattening their own pocket books are the ones that seem to have the major say so in what developments are to be let in. This makes for a serious conflict in interest for what is not good for the state of Montana. Though I have lived in Montana for only two years, I have seen and done more in understanding about Montana’s growth than many that have been here much longer.
- 0 Small businesses, ??? free businesses.
- 0 I’m not in position to answer the above. I am now 90, seldom go any place, am living on social security and pension, and only know what I hear from papers and conversations with friends. I feel new-comers should be refrained from populating phoney attractions to induce tourist trade - such as that ridiculous artificial water fall in Columbia Falls. There is so much natural beauty here. More time and effort should be spent in supporting schools and more appreciation shown to the valiant and inspired teachers who carry on in spite of public distrust and prejudiced condemnation. As far as I can see, tourism pays ??? and fast ??? places very well. I’m glad I grew up in the Flathead. I’m glad I attended the university in Missoula (class of 29) and I’m glad I could come home again to Montana in 1971 and to Columbia Falls in 1980. When I was teaching in Portland, if any question was raised in the teacher’s lunch room, somebody was sure to look at me and say “Oh - we know, it’s better in Montana”.
- 0 Survey question #2B Conditions of roads is a joke. Some of the best roads in the state are in rural areas such as I live in. These roads are all gated off for wildlife. What a joke. The animals were doing fine for hundreds of years with these roads. Now suddenly the roads are hampering their welfare. I don’t think so. In fact, anymore there seems to be more animals in and around small towns than ever. If these roads were so bad for the animals, why are there more in the urban areas where there are a lot of roads?
- 0 Too many out-of-state hunters. Too many people move in then try to shut down industry i.e. mining and logging.
- 0 Keep doing an excellent job.
- 0 Mr. Kitzenburg is working very hard at getting an interpretive center at Fort Peck, which I am all for. However, I do not want to see eastern Montana become a haven for rich movie stars, or other wealthy individuals such as has happened in the western part of our state. We need growth to survive but we need to go about it carefully so that people that have lived and worked here all their lives are not forced out by exorbitant land prices and taxes.
- 0 I don’t believe there is enough tourism in eastern Montana to amount to too much.
- 0 We need a museum.
- 0 Visit Jackson Hole, WY sometime. No quality, everything false, expensive, shallow...
- 0 Cleanup of our beautiful Clark Fork River valley and water.
- 0 When tourists come then decide to move here, I think we should have better zoning. I also do not think that developers should put the burden of improved infrastructure on the local citizens. Developers should pay those costs because they’re the ones who benefit.

- 0 Housing and summer homes that make the tax structure increase while folks in agriculture can't handle the increase because of agricultural prices not competing effectively.
- 0 Need a sales tax so tourists help pay their way instead of all costs on only property owners.
- 0 Tell them meatheads advertising our state they can close their doors, if they have not noticed, WE'VE BEEN DISCOVERED!!!
- 0 Would like to see events brought in that it is good for Montana children and parents that doesn't cost so much. I think as a tourist they should pay to vacation in lew keep in check (sic). But for all residents of Montana, I don't think it is right. This is our state. We pay in taxes but we're not allowed to fish or go anywhere in Montana without paying to park or camp. Should the residents of Great Falls pay to go to Grant Springs? Thank you.
- 0 Life does not exist east of Billings. Eastern Montana has lots to offer. We need jobs and shopping out here. Glendive is a great place to raise a family. School facilities are good. But the town is dying. Businesses can't make a go of it. The crime is low. There aren't very many job opportunities. The utilities and oil companies are moving out of Glendive and out of state.
- 0 I don't appreciate outsiders trying to influence how we handle our problems by threatening boycotts.
- 0 Local fishing areas. RV access
- 0 The single most important thing that could be done in my community (Billings) to improve the quality of my life is plow the roads. I don't know anywhere else in the country where they could get away with this. It couldn't possible hurt tourism either.
- 0 When we try to promote our state too much we get people to come visit then decide to stay and I hate to see so many outsiders move into our state. The people that have always been here can't afford to stay after awhile.
- 0 Let everyone know that we have no sales tax and put back the speed limit to about 75. The rest I don't care about.
- 0 Some questions are very difficult to answer. We need to eliminate gambling totally in Montana - Gambling will in the next 10 years be the costliest mistake Montana ever made, second only to tobacco. Legislators have to listen to all the voters, not the lobbyists and special interest groups. Tobacco use should be outlawed in all public places.
- 0 Educate Montanans of the problems and give them solutions.
- 0 Closer and more access to public lands - improved roads.
- 0 I do not like eastern states telling Montana to have wolves, bears, coyotes to make it impossible to be law abiding - put wolves in new ?????, they would help keep the streets cleaner. We worked hard to save the land on the farm. Our biggest problem was the Government telling us and making us do it their way which didn't work in our short rain fall. I have a real problem with your gun control. When you live on a county line and have a rabid skunk in your yard, you have no choice but take of your own problems. As the sheriff is 58 miles away in one county and 46 miles in the other county and the skunk doesn't care which county he lives in (the sheriff does). I am in favor of killing our own skunks and burying them which we have done several times.
- 0 Park personnel only want to control the land that can be seen from the park. They no longer respect private ownership. The whole government is trying to control us from cradle to grave. The problem with tourists is they see beautiful Montana and our good schools and government to the exact thing they just ran away from. They do not want to take on the personal responsibility that comes with a free society.
- 0 Do not build a prison or halfway houses here. Do allow support for walleye fishing in Canyon Ferry. This would really benefit the economy and draw tourists in a positive way. Do build better motorboat ramps, docks,

restrooms.

- 0 Would like to see tourism be promoted exclusively by the private sector.
- 0 Go Bobcats!! Pooooor Grizzlies!!
- 0 If the 3 percent bed tax does not all go to the general fund, it should.
- 0 Substantial bias in questions, particularly the first ones.
- 0 We need the self-discipline of a good community and state planning by a broad based group not dominated by one interest group.
- 0 Since we are off the main roads, we don't see too many tourists. Since this is a good hunting place, we see quite a few out-of-state hunters every fall. The lack of job opportunities limits the number of people that might want to move here. Thank you for giving us a chance to reply to your survey.
- 0 I wish people would stop moving to the country from the city. They move here but live like the city. Paved roads, more high priced homes. Hunters galore, UGH it's the pits!! They are raising our taxes. They want the cement plant to close the mines for clean purposes. I am sick of it. People are wanting to buy a piece of the country, there won't be any left pretty soon. Good survey, thanks.