1707 North 9th Street PO Box 5523 Bismarck, ND 58506-5523 Phone: (701) 328-2800 Fax: (701) 328-3650

www.land.nd.gov www.nd.gov



Gary D. Preszler, Commissioner

# TESTIMONY OF JEFF ENGLESON DIRECTOR, ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OFFICE North Dakota State Land Department

### TAXATION COMMITTEE October 2, 2008

Chairman Stenehjem and members of the Taxation Committee, my name is Jeff Engleson. I'm the Director of the Energy Development Impact Office (EDIO). I'm here today to give you a brief overview of the 2008 oil and gas impact grant round and to answer any questions you may have about this program.

As many of you already know, funds for the EDIO come from a portion of the 5% Oil & Gas Gross Production Tax. The North Dakota State Legislature has allocated 6.67% of the total tax, not to exceed \$6.0 million for a biennium, to the EDIO for grants to local subdivisions experiencing the negative impacts from oil activity. With both prices and production up this biennium, the \$6.0 million biennial funding cap was reached many months ago. Prior to the current biennium, the cap for this program was \$5.0 million per biennium.

During fiscal year 2008, the EDIO made 265 grants totaling \$3.0 million to 241 local political subdivisions in western North Dakota. A total of 376 requests were received from 278 political different subdivisions during 2008; the total amount of grants requested was \$29.1 million. Approximately \$3.0 million of additional grants will be made during the grant round to be held in the spring of 2009.

For much of the past decade, there has been relatively little new drilling activity in the oil patch in western North Dakota. In that environment, the oil and gas impact program evolved into one that focused on providing most political subdivisions with at least a little help in dealing with the everyday financial impacts of oil and gas production. However, with the explosion of activity and the limited funding this program receives, the focus this year was on providing grants to those entities that are most directly affected by the initial impacts of oil and gas development and those entities that are experiencing significant financial hardship as a result of the rapid rate of development.

Financial need was the main factor in determining which entities received grants this year. As such, many applicants that have received grants in the past were either denied grants or received reduced grants this year. Most counties, which receive the largest share of the gross production taxes that are distributed to political subdivisions by the state, received no grants at all this year. Production tax revenues for most counties were up substantially in 2008, more than making up for what they had received from the EDIO in prior years. Counties were not alone in receiving less funding. Many townships that have previously received grants received reduced grants or no grant at all this year if that township had a large cash balance on hand, a low mill levy, or large amounts of unused grants from previous years.

The attached tables break down grant awards and grant requests for both the current year and for the past few biennia by function, county and political subdivision.

Taxation Committee Jeff Engleson, EDIO Director October 2, 2008 – Page 2

The attachment entitled "Grant Awards by Function" clearly shows that transportation and fire protection needs have historically received the vast majority of the dollars granted under this program. During the 2008 grant round, over 75% of funds were allocated to transportation-related projects, while an additional 17.4% went to support fire protection related services.

The primary reason these types of projects receive the most funding is that these government services are directly impacted by the increased oil and gas activity in the state, but in most cases, receive little or no funding from the taxes generated by that activity. Weight restrictions on state and county roads often force oil trucks to drive on township roads that were never designed for such traffic. These trucks run 24 hours a day, rain or shine, whereas farmers and ranchers will usually not drive on the roads with heavy equipment when conditions are too wet or spring thaw is occurring. New development took an especially hard toll on township roads, and budgets, over the past year. Volunteer fire departments are responsible for protecting hundreds of workers and millions of dollars worth of property and equipment from fire, yet many of them are using equipment that is 20, 30 or even 40 years old. Townships and fire departments do not receive any gross production tax revenues.

The attachment entitled "Grant Requests/Awards by Political Subdivision and County" breaks down grants requested and awarded, by political subdivision type and by county. It shows how this program has evolved and adapted as oil and development in the state has changed over time. Eight years ago, when much of the new development in the state was in Bowman County, political subdivisions in that county received more than 20% of the grants made during the 1999-2001 biennium. Now that the Bakken play is taking off in Mountrail and Dunn Counties, political subdivisions in those two counties received over 40% of grants made in 2008. It also shows a clear shift in grant funding from counties during the early part of the decade to townships in more recent years. Part of the reason for this shift is less drilling in Bowman County; however, the primary reason is the fact that counties now receive more funding from the state, while townships continue to receive no share of oil and gas tax revenues.

A summary of the 2008 grant rounds, which shows the amount of grants requested by, and awarded to, each political subdivision in 2008 is available. In the interest of saving paper, I did not include a copy of this 18 page document with my testimony today. However, this summary document can be found on the State Land Department's web site at <a href="www.land.nd.gov">www.land.nd.gov</a> under "Energy Development Impact Office". If you wish to receive a printed copy of the summary document, please let me know and I'll make sure you get one.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

#### **ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OFFICE**

## Grant Awards By Function Fiscal Year 2002 Through Fiscal Year 2008

	2001-03 Biennium					2003-05 I	Bie	nnium		2005-07			
Function		FY 2002		FY 2003		FY 2004		FY 2005		FY 2006	FY 2007		FY 2008
Law Enforcement	\$	2,400	\$	21,000	\$	22,000	\$	15,000	\$	45,000	\$ 5,500	\$	10,000
Education		152,000		200,000		181,000		197,000	ļ .	110,000	105,000	Ť	83,500
Health		89,500		105,350		121,000		120,500		59,000	35,100		78,500
Transportation	70	1,694,100		1,936,250		1,601,000		1,669,600		1,869,000	1,949,400		2,274,000
Recreation		7,000		1,000		4,000						A-2504	-
Fire Protection		260,000		419,900		384,000		401,600		369,500	338,500		521,000
Housing							- The same		WANT DESCRIPTION		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		-
Planning				3,500					3		12,000		_
Potable Water		4,000		40,000		40,000		10,000		32.000	18,000		_
Sewage Treatment				10,000		26,000				,	.0,000		_
Water and Sewer		5,000		5,000		51,000		10,300		15,000	7,000		25,000
Local Administration		1,000		58,000		•		26,000		500	500		5,000
Other		60,000		· ·		20,000		,,,,,,					3,000
TOTAL	\$	2,275,000	\$	2,800,000	\$	2,450,000	\$	2,450,000	\$	2,500,000	\$ 2,471,000	\$	3,000,000
	7.70		\$	5,075,000		-	\$	4,900,000			\$ 4,971,000		

	2001-03 E	Biennium	2003-05	Biennium	2005-07 E	-	
Function	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Law Enforcement	0.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.8%	0.2%	0.3%
Education	6.7%	7.1%	7.4%	8.0%	4.4%	4.2%	2.8%
Health	3.9%	3.8%	4.9%	4.9%	2.4%	1.4%	2.6%
Transportation	74.5%	69.2%	65.3%	68.1%	74.8%	78.9%	75.8%
Recreation	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fire Protection	11.4%	15.0%	15.7%	16.4%	14.8%	13.7%	17.4%
Housing	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Planning	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
Potable Water	0.2%	1.4%	1.6%	0.4%	1.3%	0.7%	0.0%
Sewage Treatment	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Water and Sewer	0.2%	0.2%	2.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.8%
Local Administration	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Other	2.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

#### **ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OFFICE**

#### Grant Requests/Awards By Political Subdivision and County 1999-01 Biennium Through Fiscal Year 2008

(all dollar amounts shown are in millions)

#### **Breakdown By Political Subdivision Class**

		1999-0	01 Bienniu	m	2001-03 Biennium				2003-05 Biennium				2005-07 Biennium				Fiscal Year 2008			
Class	Reque	sted	Awarded	%	Requested	A	warded	%	Requested	A	warded	%	Re	equested	Awarded	%	Requested	Aw	arded	%
County	\$ 8	.412	\$ 2.063	42.1%	\$ 8.929	\$	1.978	39.0%	\$ 9.092	\$	1.388	28.3%	\$	44.353	\$ 1.191	24.0%	\$ 10.573	\$	0.540	18.0%
School	1	.317	0.248	5.1%	2.164	***************************************	0.352	6.9%	3.394		0.376	7.7%		3.499	0.255	5.1%	0.902		0.093	3.1%
City	7	.813	0.891	18.2%	7.942		0.868	17.1%	12.018		0.850	17.3%	l	12.508	0.674	13.6%			0.497	16.6%
Park District	0	.120	0.003	0.1%	0.077		-	0.0%	0.244		-	0.0%	l	0.351	_	0.0%			-	0.0%
Airport Auth.	0	.733	0.046	0.9%	0.249		0.029	0.6%	0.502		0.038	0.8%		0.337	0.042	0.8%			0.005	0.2%
Township	2	.577	1.217	24.8%	2.559		1.271	25.0%	3.652		1.503	30.7%		8,117	2,239	45.0%	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE		1,492	49.7%
Fire District	1	.777	0.432	8.8%	2.141		0.577	11.4%	2.804		0.745	15.2%	MILITANIA I	3.616	0.570	11.5%			0.373	12.4%
TOTAL	\$ 22	.749	\$ 4.900	100%	\$ 24.061	\$	5.075	100%	\$ 31.706	\$	4.900	100%	\$		\$ 4.971			\$	3.000	100%

#### **Breakdown By County**

	1999-	01 Bienniu	m	2001	-03 Biennium		2003-	05 Bienniu	<u> </u>	2005	07 Bienniu		Fiscal Year 2008			
County	1		Requested	Awarded		Requested								-		
Billings	\$ 1,404	\$ 0.030	0.6%		e Awarded	0.0%		\$ 0.005	0.1%	Requested \$ 0.073			Requested	Awarded	<u>%</u>	
Bottineau	0.891	0.399	8.1%	1 '	0.433	8.5%		+ +		l .	\$ 0.005	0.1%	1	\$ -	0.0%	
Bowman	5.759	1.000	20.4%	6.125		20.8%		0.491	10.0%	1.481	0.415	8.3%	Market and the second s	0.164	5.5%	
Burke					1.056	COURT IN COURT IN	7.004	0.610	12.4%	8.710	0.390	7.8%	5.012	0.133	4.4%	
	0.744	0.366	7.5%	0.837	0.396	7.8%	0.932	0.400	8.2%	1.683	0.493	9.9%	0.924	0.203	6.8%	
Divide	0.586	0.306	6.2%	0.507	0.250	4.9%	0.610	0.296	6.0%	1.630	0.505	10.1%	3.259	0.228	7.6%	
Dunn	1.066	0.192	3.9%	0.683	0.202	4.0%	0.753	0.234	4.8%	2.742	0.251	5.0%	5.044	0.440	14.7%	
G. Valley	0.814	0.304	6.2%	0.716	0.278	5.5%	1.221	0.366	7.5%	1.789	0.370	7.4%	0.872	0.156	5.2%	
Hettinger	-	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	0.005	-	0.0%	-	-	0.0%	_	_	0.0%	
McHenry	-	-	0.0%	0.067	0.035	0.7%	0.070	0.050	1.0%	0.070	0.040	0.8%	(i) to receive	2	0.0%	
McKenzie	0.647	0.112	2.3%	1.513	0.201	4.0%	1.545	0.215	4.4%	3.141	0.184	3.7%	0.734	0.118	3.9%	
McLean	0.024	0.015	0.3%	0.005	0.003	0.1%	0.010	0.007	0.1%	0.005	0.002	0.0%	0.003	0.001	0.0%	
Mercer	0.274	0.018	0.4%	0.012	-	0.0%	0.032	0.012	0.2%	0.035	0.002	0.2%	0.003	0.001		
Mountrail	0.756	0.370	7.5%	0.892	0.276	5.4%	1.143	0.295	6.0%	The second secon	0.641	12.9%	CONTRACTOR AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE P	A PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T	0.1%	
Renville	1,117	0.366	7.5%		0.398	7.8%	1.920	0.441	9.0%			THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN	4.390	0.796	26.5%	
Slope	0.754	0.171	3.5%	0.517	0.390	3.6%					0.402	8.1%	0.862	0.177	5.9%	
Stark	2.904						0.646	0.151	3.1%	0.826	0.154	3.1%	0.364	0.073	2.4%	
	1	0.389	7.9%		0.432	8.5%	3.270	0.385	7.9%	4.272	0.239	4.8%	1.501	0.090	3.0%	
Ward	0.107	0.046	0.9%	0.064	0.030	0.6%	0.185	0.048	1.0%	0.180	0.042	0.8%	0.092	0.025	0.8%	
Williams	4.904	0.818	16.7%	6.072	0.904	17.8%	10.914	0.896	18.3%	40.700	0.831	16.7%	5.189	0.394	13.1%	
TOTAL	\$ 22.749	\$ 4.900	100%	\$ 24.061	\$ 5.075	100%	\$ 31.706	\$ 4.900	100%	\$ 72.781	\$ 4.971	100%	\$ 29.139	\$ 3.000	100%	