

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2007 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 8
 Bill Version: CSHB 177(FIN)
 (H) Publish Date: 5/11/07

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Natural Resources
 Title Natural Gas Pipeline Project RDU Resource Development
 Component Alaska Gasline Inducements Act
 Sponsor Rules Committee
 Requester House Finance Component No. new

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	500,000.0*					
-----------------------------	-------------------	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2007) cost: 0.0

Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2008 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill authorizes the Alaska Gasline Inducement Act (AGIA) which would create a competitive public process for inviting applications for a license under this Act. The application process would include certain application requirements before an application can be considered as well as criteria by which the Commissioners of Natural Resources and Revenue will evaluate all qualifying applications.

The Act would also create inducements including: state matching contributions for pipeline construction in an amount not to exceed \$500 million and the benefit of a state gas pipeline coordinator.

(Continued on next page).

Prepared by: Kevin Banks, Acting Director
 Division: Oil and Gas
 Approved by: Tom Irwin, Commissioner
 Agency: Natural Resources

Phone 269-8800
 Date/Time 4/30/2007
 Date 4/30/2007

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

Under the AGIA, the licensee or its designated affiliate would be entitled to state matching contributions for qualified expenditures (post license costs incurred by the licensee that are directly and reasonably related to obtaining a certificate of public necessity and convenience or amending a certificate of public convenience from the FERC or RCA for development of the project).

On or before the close of the first binding season, the state will match up to 50 percent of the licensee's qualified expenditures pursuant to the amount specified in the application. After the close of the first binding open season, the state shall match the qualified expenditures at the amount specified but the amount may be no greater than 80 percent. Over a five year period, these contributions may not exceed \$500 million. The present value of the state's total \$500 million contribution would be roughly \$415 million, because state spending will be spread over several years.

AGIA will generate a number of project benefits that could more than offset its costs. The size of these benefits will depend on ultimate project scope and market prices, which AGIA leaves to the competitive process. Actual benefits will vary depending upon project terminus (Alberta, Chicago), size (1.2 Bcf/day, 4.5 Bcf/day), mode of transport (pipeline only, pipeline plus LNG facilities), among other things. Illustrative benefits shown here assume a 4.3 Bcf/day project to Alberta, Canada with a construction cost that is 50% greater than assumed in 2001. Results are presented in present value dollars, assuming a discount rate of 5%, to recognize that a dollar of state benefit received in the future will be worth less than a dollar spent today.

First, AGIA is likely to result in a project sooner than if no pipeline legislation is passed. By having the state agree to shoulder a large share of the up-front capital that is particularly risky, AGIA ensures that in exchange project proponents commit to move the project forward past clearly defined benchmarks. Because AGIA results in a project sooner, the current value of project revenues to the state is enhanced. Assuming a gas price of \$5.50, if AGIA accelerates project startup by one year, from 2017 to 2016, state benefits will exceed \$1.6 billion; a two-year acceleration in the project returns \$3.2 billion; a three-year acceleration generates \$4.9 billion.

Second, AGIA's requirement of a minimum 70 percent share of debt in the determination of tariffs ensures that the state will not pay unnecessarily high transportation costs. Without this protection, project tariffs could be calculated on the basis of 60 or even 50 percent debt and still pass regulatory scrutiny. The tariff benefits of a 70 percent debt structure, rather than 60 percent or 50 percent, are 26 cents and 55 cents per MMBtu, respectively. The savings to the state are \$1.25 billion and \$2.63 billion, respectively. Meanwhile, lower tariffs improve project economics for holders of both existing and yet to be discovered gas reserves, thereby increasing the likelihood that the project will commence sooner. The degree to which such savings are realized depends on how, absent AGIA's requirements, project tariffs would otherwise have been determined.

Third, AGIA's pipeline access provisions promise to increase competition for exploration and development of Alaska's gas resources, leading to earlier and more significant pipeline expansions. The value to the state of such expansions is scenario specific, and cannot be accurately predicted. That said, if AGIA's expansion provisions caused the pipeline to expand by 10% in year 3 of its operations, whereas without AGIA such an expansion would not occur, the increase in state royalty and taxes would be roughly \$3 billion in today's dollars. Even if the chances that such an expansion would otherwise not occur were only one in five the AGIA investment of \$500 million would more than pay for itself in this provision alone.

Finally, AGIA will directly ensure lower tariffs. The state's direct investment in up-front development costs would reduce the cost of moving gas to Alberta by roughly 4 cents. The present value royalty and tax benefits of this 4 cent tariff reduction come to \$183 million. Put differently, assuming \$5.50 gas prices, during pipeline operation the state will receive roughly 45% of the value of its contribution in increased royalty and production tax benefits. And at gas prices of \$7.50 or higher the state's up-front contribution actually generates more in royalty and tax benefits than it costs.

* \$300,000,000 was appropriated last year (SLA2006/Ch13/Sec14) from the general fund to Alaska Housing Finance Corporation for the purpose of funding capital projects including financing expenses and may be available to partially fund the matching grant.