

Fiscal Note

State of Alaska
2026 Legislative Session

Bill Version: SB 280
Fiscal Note Number: _____
() Publish Date: _____

Identifier: SB280CS(RES)-DOR-TAX-5-14-26
Title: OIL & GAS PROPERTY TAX; MUNI TAX
Sponsor: RLS BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR
Requester: (S) Resources

Department: Department of Revenue
Appropriation: Taxation and Treasury
Allocation: Tax Division
OMB Component Number: 2476

Expenditures/Revenues

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below. (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY2027	Included in	Out-Year Cost Estimates					
	Appropriation Requested	Governor's FY2027 Request	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2027	FY 2027						
Personal Services	739.5		739.5	739.5	739.5	739.5	739.5	739.5
Travel	40.0		40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0
Services	55.6		55.6	55.6	55.6	55.6	55.6	55.6
Commodities	17.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	21.0	1.0
Capital Outlay								
Grants & Benefits								
Miscellaneous								
Total Operating	852.1	0.0	836.1	836.1	836.1	836.1	856.1	836.1

Fund Source (Operating Only)

1004 Gen Fund (UGF)	852.1		836.1	836.1	836.1	856.1	836.1
Total	852.1	0.0	836.1	836.1	836.1	856.1	836.1

Positions

Full-time	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Part-time							
Temporary							

Change in Revenues

None	***		***	***	***	***	***
Total	***	0.0	***	***	***	***	***

Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2026) cost: 0.0 *(separate supplemental appropriation required)*

Estimated CAPITAL (FY2027) cost: 1,250.0 *(separate capital appropriation required)*

Does the bill create or modify a new fund or account? Yes
(Supplemental/Capital/New Fund - discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? Yes
If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed? 01/01/27

Why this fiscal note differs from previous version/comments:

Updated to reflect Senate Resources Committee Substitute version L. The main changes from version H to version L affecting the Tax Division include: changes to alternative volumetric tax rates, 10-year sunset for alternative volumetric tax, removal of community impact fee, addition of increased minimum tax floor for the oil and gas production tax, and removal of some disclosure language.

Prepared By:	Dan Stickel, Chief Economist	Phone:	(907)465-3279
Division:	Tax Division	Date:	05/14/2026
Approved By:	Janelle Earls, Commissioner	Date:	05/14/26
Agency:	Department of Revenue		

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2026 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSSB 280 (RES)

Analysis

Background Information

This bill makes numerous changes to state laws that related directly or indirectly to the proposed Alaska Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) project. Broadly speaking, the changes fall into three categories: (1) increased oversight and disclosure requirements for the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC); (2) firmer language to ensure the state receives fair value for oil and gas for royalty and tax purposes; and (3) changes to taxes related to gas and LNG, including new taxes and increases/decreases to existing taxes. Following are the major provisions specifically relating to the Department of Revenue (DOR):

1. Exempts AKLNG project from state and municipal property taxes. Alaska levies a property tax on qualifying oil and gas property in the state in the amount of 20 mills (2 percent). Municipal property taxes are allowed as a credit against the state tax, so that the total tax paid by the taxpayer does not exceed 20 mills. The state manages the appraisal process for all oil and gas property in the state.

Under current law, certain aspects of the project are eligible for tax benefits. Some of the project property would be exempt from state and local property tax prior to commercial sales if the AGDC is part of the project ownership. However, under current law, the property may become taxable before the full project is operational if in-state gas sales start first. Under current law, the LNG export facility component of the project is exempt from state property tax, but would be subject to local property tax.

This exemption would be subject to conditional effective-date and repeal provisions tied to receipt of a one-time payment intended to offset construction effects, commencement of pipeline construction prior to January 1, 2028, and completion of at least one major component of the Alaska LNG project prior to January 1, 2032. This exemption would sunset 10 years after startup of export operations.

2. Creates a new Alternative Volumetric Tax (AVT), which would apply to the project. The provisions would apply to the major components of the Alaska LNG project, but would specifically not apply to a spur line. Along with the property tax exemption, the AVT would be subject to conditional effective-date and repeal provisions. The AVT would take effect after the state receives a one-time payment of at least \$50 million intended to offset the effects of construction of a gas pipeline from an entity that has partnered with AGDC. The AVT would repeal and revert to current law if pipeline construction does not commence prior to January 1, 2028, or if at least one major component of the Alaska LNG project is not completed prior to January 1, 2032. The AVT would also repeal and revert to current law 10 years after startup of export operations.

The AVT would apply beginning the day after commencement of commercial operations. The tax would apply at rates of \$0.06/mcf for gas treatment plant or carbon capture facility throughput before throughput exceeds 250 million cubic feet per day, increasing to \$0.10/mcf after that threshold is reached. The tax would apply at rates of \$0.06/mcf for pipeline throughput before throughput exceeds 250 million cubic feet per day, increasing to \$0.15/mcf after that threshold is reached. The tax would apply at a rate of \$0.15/mcf for LNG plant throughput beginning at commencement of commercial operations. Rates would be adjusted annually for inflation based on CPI for urban Alaska, with the first adjustment timing varying by component and rate.

The AVT would be levied by the state and separately accounted for by component. Fifty percent of gas treatment plant or carbon capture facility AVT would be available for appropriation to the North Slope Borough. Fifty percent of pipeline AVT would be available for appropriation to municipalities and affected areas based on the proportion of pipeline located in each area, with the state retaining the portion associated with the unorganized borough. The remaining Fifty percent of pipeline AVT would be shared per capita with municipalities, reserves, and communities in the unorganized borough under community revenue sharing. Fifty percent of LNG plant AVT would be available for appropriation to the Kenai Peninsula Borough.

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2026 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSSB 280 (RES)

Analysis

3. Creates a new pass-through entity tax for oil and gas companies. Under current law, only C-Corporations doing business in the state are subject to corporate income tax under AS 43.20. This bill proposes taxing pass-through entities involved in producing, treating, supplying, transporting, or processing oil or gas, including LNG processing, marine transportation of LNG produced in the state, and carbon capture or carbon storage activities. The tax would include brackets starting at 5 percent of taxable income between \$1 and \$2 million and ranging to 9.4 percent of taxable income over \$5 million. Pass-through entities not involved in oil and gas activities would continue to be exempt. It is likely that only a handful of companies would be impacted by the new tax. This provision would apply retroactive to January 1, 2026.

4. Creates a new Infrastructure Maintenance Surcharge. This bill would implement a new production tax surcharge on each taxable barrel of oil produced, modeled after the existing hazardous release surcharge. The fee would be \$0.30 per taxable barrel of oil produced, with proceeds directed to a Dalton Highway pipeline corridor maintenance fund. No tax credits, deductions, or other allowances could offset this fee. This provision would apply beginning July 1, 2026.

5. Increases the minimum tax floor for production tax on oil. This bill would increase the minimum tax floor for production tax on North Slope oil from 4 percent to 6 percent of the gross value at the point of production when the average price per barrel for Alaska North Slope crude oil for sale on the United States West Coast is more than \$25. This provision would apply to oil produced on and after January 1, 2027.

6. Updates oil and gas valuation requirements for DOR. This provision would require that oil or gas sold at no cost or under circumstances where the sales price does not represent prevailing value be subject to tax based on the value of the oil or gas. The value would be based on oil or gas of the same kind, quality, and character prevailing for that field, unit, or area during the calendar month of production or sale.

7. Creates DOR requirement for assisting with state investment decisions on AKLNG. As part of the AGDC provisions, AGDC is required to negotiate state purchase options for the gas project. DOR is required to cooperate with and assist the legislature in determining whether to acquire said interest, including analyzing funding sources and providing fiscal analysis of the investment opportunities. This provision would have an immediate effective date.

In addition to these provisions directly impacting DOR, the bill would create an Alaska gasline community impact fund administered by the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development. The fund would include a gasline construction impact account and a statewide gasline impact account, and money appropriated to the accounts would be distributed to communities through grants and per capita distributions. The legislature may appropriate up to \$50 million from a one-time payment intended to offset construction effects to the gasline construction impact account and up to \$30 million each year over five years from qualifying revenue or receipts to the statewide gasline impact account. Revenues and implementation costs related to this program are not included in this fiscal note since DOR would not be directly involved with this program.

Revenue Impact

The revenue impact of this bill is indeterminate. This is a complex bill with many different pieces and is difficult to analyze with certainty, and estimates represent a preliminary interpretation of bill provisions. The revenue impact could be positive or negative and could impact state finances by hundreds of millions of dollars, or more, per year. Key uncertainties include the impact of this bill on whether the Alaska LNG project moves forward, and detailed final project cost and timing.

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2026 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSSB 280 (RES)

Analysis

Following is specific discussion of the potential revenue impacts of the major tax changes and related revenue provisions. A range is provided for each provision reflecting the impacts if the project does or does not proceed with or without this bill. Estimates are based on the Spring 2026 version of the AKLNG model which assumes a \$46.2 billion construction cost in 2026 dollars (\$46.4 billion with spur line added), a \$1.50 per thousand cubic feet gas purchase price, first in-state gas in 2029, first export gas in 2031, and full 3.5 billion cubic feet per day throughput in 2033, among numerous other assumptions.

1. Exempting AKLNG project from state and municipal property taxes. The AKLNG project is not included in the official Spring 2026 revenue forecast. For informational purposes, if the project proceeds without tax modifications, current law state property tax revenue is estimated at \$25 million initially following start of in-state commercial operations in 2029, ramping up to \$244 million upon full capacity export operations in 2033.

2. Creating a new Alternative Volumetric Tax (AVT). This provision would only have impacts if the project proceeds. If the project proceeds, there would be no revenue impact prior to commercial operations, and an increase to total state revenue estimated at \$4 million initially following the start of in-state commercial operations in 2029, ramping up to \$478 million upon full capacity export operations in 2033. The AVT would be levied by the state and separately accounted for by component. The state would share fifty percent of the AVT revenue for the gas treatment plant and LNG plant with municipalities. Based on the modeled allocation, the state would share approximately 81 percent of the AVT revenue for the pipeline component with municipalities, affected areas, reserves, and communities in the unorganized borough, shown as designated general fund revenue. Unrestricted general fund revenue to the state would be \$1 million initially increasing to \$181 million per year upon full capacity export operations. Revenues would increase with inflation adjustments thereafter.

3. Creating a new pass-through entity tax for oil and gas companies. This provision would have material impacts regardless of if the project proceeds, impacting both tax liability and project economics for new exploration and development. DOR has estimated a range of \$0-100 million per year for a tax of this type applied to oil and gas companies holding all else equal per the Spring 2026 forecast - currently about two-thirds of oil and gas companies pay corporate income tax and this tax could apply to many of the remaining companies. With AKLNG, this tax would potentially apply to incremental upstream income from qualifying oil and gas producers as well as to the midstream operator which is assumed not to be subject to corporate income tax in DOR's Spring 2026 AKLNG model. Incremental AKLNG project revenue from this provision would be deferred until after the fiscal note time horizon due to expected net operating losses during construction and depreciation. Revenue could exceed \$60 million annually in the late 2030's, increasing substantially in the 2040s once all net operating loss balances are used up and capital expenditures are fully depreciated. Revenue from this tax would be unrestricted general fund. It is expected that, should the project and this bill proceed, qualifying upstream producers would require a higher gas price to commit gas to the project as a result of this provision.

4. Creating a new Infrastructure Maintenance Surcharge. Over time, revenue collected from this surcharge is expected to change proportionally to forecasted taxable barrels of oil produced in the state. Under the Spring 2026 forecast, revenue is expected to range from \$48-62 million per year during the forecast period. Additional liquid production associated with the AKLNG project would increase these amounts by about \$4 million per year. Proceeds of this surcharge would be deposited in the newly created Dalton Highway pipeline corridor maintenance fund and are considered designated general fund revenue in this fiscal note.

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2026 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSSB 280 (RES)

Analysis

5. Increasing the minimum tax floor for production tax on oil. This provision would have impacts regardless of if the project proceeds. Under the Spring 2026 forecast, increasing the minimum tax floor for production tax on North Slope oil from 4 percent to 6 percent when the average price per barrel for Alaska North Slope crude oil for sale on the United States West Coast is more than \$25 would increase revenue by \$71 million in FY2027 and on average \$137 million per year thereafter during the fiscal note time horizon. Additional liquid production related to AKLNG would increase the revenue from this provision by an additional \$59 million on average from FY2029 through FY2032. Revenue from this provision would be unrestricted general fund.

Note, revenue estimates and impacts are based on the Spring 2026 forecast and related baseline AKLNG modeling. As mentioned, the fiscal impacts are uncertain even under the baseline assumptions. A further layer of uncertainty is introduced in that it is not possible to say how this bill would impact the overall economics, commercial environment, and Final Investment Decision for the AKLNG project.

In addition to the revenue discussed in this fiscal note, the AKLNG project would also impact production tax, corporate income tax, and royalty revenue both from the Alaska LNG project and associated new development. Municipalities would be impacted through property tax exclusion, shared AVT revenue, appropriations and distributions from the Alaska gasoline community impact fund, and increased property tax revenue from associated new developments. Further, there would be economic benefits and impacts for the state and municipalities far beyond the direct impacts of oil and gas revenue.

Implementation Cost

The Tax Division would need to add four positions to fully implement the provisions of this bill:

-A Corporate Income Tax Auditor 3 in the Corporate Income Tax group, to administer the new tax on passthrough entities. Even though the expected taxpayer base is small, this change would create additional workload which could not be absorbed.

-A Tax Auditor 3 in the Excise Tax group, to administer the new AVT. Even though the expected taxpayer base is small, this new tax type would create additional workload which could not be absorbed.

-An Oil & Gas Revenue Auditor 4 in the Oil & Gas Production Tax group, to administer and implement increased valuation requirements and general increased audit requirements associated with major gas sales.

-A Commercial Analyst in the Economic Research group, to comply with required commercial analysis of gas project ownership decisions, and general increased analytical requirements associated with major gas sales.

Services costs are primarily internal core services paid to other state agencies for the additional employees, and there would also be ongoing costs for travel and training. There are also one-time costs for issuing equipment and business supplies to the new positions.

Additionally, this legislation would require the Department to make significant changes to its Tax Revenue Management System. \$1 million of the capital cost reflects an estimate for the Division's contract with FAST Enterprises to make the necessary changes in a short amount of time. The contractor would need to provide changes for the associated databases, forms, communications, and integration with the Division's existing imaging, accounting, and collections modules. There would also need to be changes to Revenue Online, the online program that allows taxpayers to file, pay, and request refunds electronically.

The remaining \$250,000 of the capital cost reflects an estimate for outside expertise to assist with the fiscal analysis of state purchase options for gas projects.