

March 2, 2006

Senator Tom Wagoner, Chair  
Senate Resources Committee  
State Capitol, Room 427  
Juneau, AK 99801

Rep. Ralph Samuels, Co-Chair  
House Resources Committee  
State Capitol, Room 126  
Juneau, AK 99801

Rep. Jay Ramras, Co-Chair  
House Resources Committee  
State Capitol, Room 104  
Juneau, AK 99801

Re: Questions on PPT Legislation (SB 305, HB 488)

Dear Senator Wagoner and Representatives Samuels and Ramras,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to questions posed during (and following) recent committee hearings.

Received 2/28/06, 12:00 p.m.

1. Identify values/amounts for the “look-back” or transitional section; per year according to the actual, by type (exploration, development, production), by company.

The Department of Revenue model uses \$1 billion per year as capital costs, so for the transitional period, there would be about \$5 billion. This annual costs are based on compilations of historical data. The attached excel files outlines public data regarding investments.

2. How are mob, demob, and platform abandonment costs treated—as tax credits or deductions?

Mobilization costs are capitalized for federal tax purposes, as Intangible Drilling Costs. As such, they are a capitalized expenditure for PPT purposes, and therefore are deductible and creditable. We understand that demobilization and abandonment expenditures are both expensed as incurred. This would mean that these costs are deductible, but would not generate a credit.

3. Is there a “rating” for political stability – or one that reflects instability?

We do not have any information on a quantification of the risk of political stability.

4. What loss of revenue is incurred by moving the effective date from Jan 1, 2006 to July 1, 2006 on both 20/20 and on 25/20?

Using a combination of our spring forecast and YTD actuals, the average ANS price between January 1, 2006 and July 1, 2006 was \$58.62.

- The loss of revenue using the 20/20 system would be about \$480 mm in additional tax.
- The loss of revenue using the 25/20 system would be about \$770 mm in additional tax.

5. Section 9 – what amount is involved in this section?

A very small amount, probably no more than 1% of total state revenue from oil and gas. It is limited to three areas: [1] Alpine and its satellites; [2] the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska; and [3] Cook Inlet.

6. Was there consideration of phasing out the \$73 million deduction over a certain period of time?

No, it was not considered.

7. Of the current 14 producers in Alaska, which would pay a severance tax after employing the proposed \$73 million standard deduction?

With the merger of Chevron and Unocal, there are now 13 producers in Alaska. Of the 13 producers, BP, ConocoPhillips and ExxonMobil will pay severance tax at most price levels after employing the \$73 million standard deduction. At high oil and gas prices, and given our cost assumptions, Anadarko and ChevronUnocal will also pay severance tax after deducting the \$73 million dollar allowance, given the production volumes reported publicly by those companies.

8. Which other tax regimes – worldwide - have a progressivity structure?

TO BE PROVIDED

9. How many private royalty owners are there in Alaska – all areas, not just the North Slope (i.e., Nenana Basin, Kenai Peninsula, native corporation holdings, etc).

We do not have information on the number of private royalty owners in Alaska, which would include private oil and gas leases that are not in production. Homesteads staked under certain (but not all) federal homestead laws included oil and gas rights, and any of the owners of such parcels might enter into an oil and gas lease.

10. Provide a graph showing the status quo, the PPT, and the gas line contract terms.

This question appears to query the relationship between tax under the status quo, the PPT, and the gas line contract terms. At this time, gas line contract terms are not public information.

11. Provide information on the effect of previous incentives – the costs.

Claimed expenses under SB 185 (43.55.025) total \$104.8 million and claimed credits total \$33.6 million [see table below]. A claim was received by the Department of Revenue last week, thus the totals has been updated from the \$95.5 million and \$29.0 million figures previously provided.

12. What is the rationale for offering the same amount of credits for non-state lease lands where the state receives no royalty tax benefit – was there discussion of a reduction in the credit to offset this?

The rationale is that the incentives have the potential to result in higher severance taxes; taxes that are assessed on any oil or gas production within Alaska's sovereign territory. Given the overall economic benefit of increased production of oil and gas (and particularly gas in the Cook Inlet where significant private lands occur), an incentive for exploration and development even in the event that a field would pay no taxes after incentives makes sense.

13. Why should Point Thomson be incentivised?

We believe the development of Pt. Thomson may be critical for the development of the gasline. Accordingly, incentivizing Pt. Thomson may well incentivize the gasline

Pt Thomson is particularly problematic for two reasons. First, it is a high cost field since it is a high pressure gas condensate reservoir and second we do need the gas reserves to underpin the gas pipeline economics. By providing incentives, the goal would be two fold. First any incentive to encourage Pt. Thomson improves the economics of the gas pipeline. Second, incentives may encourage early production of the liquids which requires expensive infrastructure to handle the high pressure production.

14. Can you provide better definitions for “point of production” and “oil” and “gas” and has the State litigated these terms?

We’re not clear whether this question seeks more explanation of the definitions in the bill or is requesting that we consider modifying those definitions. Please clarify. Regarding past litigation, in general the point of production and the definitions of oil and gas have not been major subjects of litigation under the production tax statute. In contrast, there has been considerable litigation of related concepts, though not necessarily the phrase “point of production,” in the royalty context.

In the tax context, there was at least one dispute decided at the internal DOR appeal stage relating to point of production, but most of the controversy in this area played out in the development of regulations defining “gas processing plant,” rather than litigation. The use of the term “gas processing” in the bill is consistent with existing department regulations, but under current law gas processing generally is considered an activity occurring downstream of the point of production, while under the bill it is considered an activity occurring upstream of the point of production.

15. What steps must be taken to make the tax credits refundable rather than transferable?

This would require a language change to Section 12 at Sec. 43.55.024(d) and (e). We are available to work with drafters on the exact wording.

16. On Page 13, line 24 of the bill, what does “payment in lieu of” tie into for oil?

Section 21 (Sec. 43.55.160(d)(1)(B)) clarifies that payments in lieu of property taxes are deductible. Sec. 43.55.160(c) presents the general rule that lease expenditures are deductible. Lease expenditures would include property taxes. Sub-section (d) provides clarification for items that are not clear, such as “payments made in lieu of property taxes.”

17. Does the limit on transferable tax credits in section 12 (subsection (e)) limit the amount of tax credits that a single taxpayer can take against their own production tax in a single year?

Section 12 (Sec. 43.55.024(e)) limits the amount of tax that can be reduced through purchased credits. There is no limit on credits utilized by a taxpayer that were generated by that same taxpayer.

18. The State of Alaska has relied on the services and expertise of multiple outside law firms to handle disputes over oil and gas issues; have you conferred with such counsel in the drafting or review of this legislation? If so, have they assessed the impacts of the

legislation on the State's legal position in past agreements, current disputes, or future disputes?

Yes, such counsel(not all of them) have been consulted and such assessments have been discussed but have not generally been generated in formal written form.

19. Have you asked the Department of Law to review this legislation in light of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in Cuno v DaimlerChrysler that is now pending before the United States Supreme Court?

The Department of Law has examined this question. As a Sixth Circuit decision, it has no direct precedence for Alaska. It is currently before the U.S. Supreme Court and many analysts believe that it will not be sustained in its current form.

20. Please provide information regarding the expenditures that will qualify for the transition credits—including the depreciation method chosen under the federal and state income tax systems.

It appears that this question relates to the transition provision in Section 21 (Sec. 43.55.160(g)) which allows a deduction for capital expenditures made over the last five years, deductible over the next six years. The capital expenditures that qualify for transitional treatment are the same type of expenditures that qualify for ongoing credits. These are defined in Section 12 (Sec. 43.55.024(h)). These expenditures include exploration expenses and those expenditures that are capitalized for federal tax purposes. Exploration expenses include geological and geophysical exploration. Expenditures capitalized for federal tax purposes include intangible drilling costs. The capitalized expenditures are subject to a variety of useful lives under federal and state income rules. See Question 60 below.

21. Have any of the definitions in sections 30-33 been the subject of disputes with tax and/or royalty payers in the past? To the extent they have, please provide the definitions the state asserted in those disputes.

See question 18 above.

22. Please provide an identification of the point of production at each unit in the state under existing statutes, regulations, agreements, and court decisions. Provide the same under the definition as proposed.

TO BE PROVIDED

23. Please provide an identification of 'gas treatment' and 'gas processing' facilities in the state under the existing statutes, regulations, agreements, and court decisions. Provide the same under the definition as proposed.

TO BE PROVIDED

24. What standard will be used to determine whether oil or gas is of ‘pipeline quality’ under the definition of ‘gross value at the point of production’?

This term only appears in the definition of “oil.” It was not in the old definition, nor the new definition of “gas.” The standard for “pipeline quality” has not changed under the bill. The standard is based on a series of court cases.

25. Provide a historical analysis of the results of valuation methodologies adopted by the Department of Revenue, Department of Natural Resources (under all agreements), and the Department of the Interior.

TO BE PROVIDED

26. Will abandonment costs be eligible for deductions or credits under the legislation? If so, what estimates of the timing and costs of those activities does the Department project?

See Question 2 for deductibility of abandonment costs. With regard to costs, we are aware of no field having ever been abandoned in Alaska, and so we do not have any empirical data on costs.

27. How will AS 43.55.160(j) protect the State from a proliferation of corporate entities and/or companies claiming the tax free allowance?

TO BE PROVIDED

28. Provide the number of exploration and delineation wells estimated to be drilled over the first ten years of your economic models. Include the technical and economic success rates projected in the modeling.

Five [5] exploration wells per year are included in the model. The Department of Revenue assumes \$100 million is spent on exploration per year. With average costs of \$20 million dollars per well, this comes out to five [5] wells per year. Delineation wells are separate and included under development expenditures. The model assumes there are four [4] finds of large oil accumulations – reserves in place that would be on the order of 500 million barrels. There are four [4] relatively small fields that are characterized as being “heavy” oil. These fields would pay no production tax under the current system because their Economic Limit Factor [ELF] would be zero [0.0]. We did not include a “success rate” in our model.

29. Provide estimates for undiscovered resources in Alaska. Include the breakdown between technically recoverable and economically recoverable resources to the extent possible.

TO BE PROVIDED

30. Provide a historical analysis of the effective tax rate on each field in production on the North Slope over the past twenty years.

See Attachments A1 and A2. These tables contain effective tax rates since 1986 for all Alaskan fields on gross value at the point of production. The effective tax rate shown on these tables is the ELF x 12.25% for the first five years of production, and ELF x 15% thereafter. We note the effective rate varies between 15.0%, for Prudhoe Bay through 1987 (when the so-called “rounding rule” rounded the ELF up to 1), and 0.0% for a number of fields for a number of years.

31. How will Net Profit Share Leases be affected by this legislation? Will the gross costs of exploration and development go into the Development Account—or those costs net of the credits and deductions?

TO BE PROVIDED

Received 2/28/06, 2:30 p.m.

32. It’s been reported that the gas line contract will propose the state take its gas production tax share in the form of gas. How does that work in this bill?

In the gasline contract the state has indeed proposed taking deliveries of gas in place of a production tax; this is not reflected in the PPT bill which will stand on its own, gasline or no. Under the PPT, if the producers sell gas, those revenues would be part of the net profit calculation. Under the gasline, they would not. Instead the state would receive a percentage of the gas, which it would monetize through marketing. Note that the costs of developing (for example Pt Thomson) or running (for example Prudhoe Bay) a field that produces both oil and gas would go into calculating the oil profits for the PPT.

33. Of the pre-PPT credit provisions (or claw back), what is the cost to the state for legacy fields and what is the cost to the state for frontier regimes?

See question 20.

34. Of the pre-PPT credit provisions (the claw back), how many investment credits were sold under SB 185 and how do we ensure the person who holds the credit, not the original recipient, gets the credit?

Sale of credits under SB185 do not effect the ability of the seller to claim those credits as Transitional Investment Expenditures (that is to qualify for the claw back.)

35. If we have a gas pipeline in 2015, what will the ELF tax “take” be on North Slope gas and what will the “take” be under the PPT? What will the “take” be under PPT if we take gas in lieu of the production tax (the take would, I assume be the day-to-day value of the gas less the state’s cut in selling the gas on the marketplace)?

Without getting into price sensitive forecast, or the confidential draft gas contract, we can make the following observations about the comparison: The upstream costs are covered in the PPT, so the difference could be as simple as;

- (a) under the PPT, a taxpayer would pay 20% of the gross value at the point of production, that is sales revenues less the tariff charged by the Gas Treatment Plant and the tariff between the North Slope and the point of sale would be paid to the state. (without taking into account the effect of the \$73 million dollar allowance).
- (b) Under the gas contract, the state will receive some percentage of the gas, and then pay the tariff charged by the Gas Treatment Plant and the tariff between the North Slope and the point of sale. If the state owns part of the pipeline, then the state will also receive that portion of the tariff which is profit accruing to the owner.

36. Is current production tax deductible from corporate tax? If no, is this impact in the models presented by the Administration?

Yes, current production is deductible from corporate tax.

37. Referring to Section five, what oil and gas is exempt from taxation—just what is discussed in Section 10?

The oil and gas royalty amounts paid to the state and federal government are exempt. (AS 43.55.900 (13) “ownership or right to which is exempt from taxation” means any ownership interest of the federal government or the state.”)

Section 10 simplifies treatment of flared gas. Under current law there are three categories of gas – gas used in production operations which is exempt from tax, gas produced in excess of that needed for safety purposes which is taxable, and gas flared beyond the amount authorized for safety which is taxed and subject to a penalty. Currently there is no ‘free use of oil’ to produce more oil in statute. The bill

exempts from tax any oil or gas used in production operations, unless the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission determines that it was waste (instead of used to produce salable hydrocarbons), in which case it is taxed.

38. Referring to Section six, will there be any impact to current state taxes or municipality taxes from this change?

No, there should be no impact to current state or municipal taxes. This language change simply makes the description of Intangible Drilling Costs consistent with Internal Revenue Code language, which is how this item is interpreted currently.

39. Why was the payment for taxes and surcharges changed from the 20<sup>th</sup> day to the last day of the month? What is the economic impact of this change?

There is no economic impact and this just clears up current language. Under AS 43.55.020, payment for the tax is “due” on the 20th, however, the tax is not “delinquent” until the last day of the month. The significance of this is that according to AS 43.05.225 interest is assessed only when a tax “becomes delinquent.” Thus this bill makes the due date the end of the month and in section 7 establishes that “an unpaid amount of tax that is not paid when due in accordance with this subsection becomes delinquent.”

40. Do other nations with a net profit system have the 90 percent payment of taxes with the sure-up provision the following year? What is the economic impact of this change?

TO BE PROVIDED

41. What are the penalties for under-payment when sure-up is more than ten percent of the taxes owed?

If the taxpayer does not pay 90%, then interest will be due on the difference between the tax paid and the 90% amount.

42. Referring to Section 10, why does the AOGC [Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission] role change from focusing on excess needed for safety reasons to whatever they determine to be waste? Does this provision provide more power to the AOGC on what is included/excluded for taxation?

Under current law, as applied by DOR regulation, the categories of flared gas recognized by DOR are different from (although related to) the categories recognized by AOGCC. The bill will simplify the categorization and harmonize it completely with AOGCC's. This simply creates one standard administered by AOGCC, in place of two standards administered by two agencies.

43. Why does it seem the credits and incentive [sic] are on production along with exploration if our focus is to provide incentives for exploration?

(The bill is based on the expectation that investment, both exploration and in existing fields, will increase production.

44. Can the carry-forward amount be used for a credit for more than the first year after the loss?

Yes, the credit carry-forwards can be used indefinitely. There is no time limit on the credit carryforwards.

45. Is it the case that any allowable expenses for the exploration, development, or production of gas can be deducted from oil revenues in determining net value? If so, could the expenses of a gas line be included in these deductible expenses?

Expenses are allowable only if they are "upstream" costs. A gas line is "downstream" and so would not be a deductible expense.

46. Why not use GAP [sic] accounting rules versus set up or our [sic] system of defining revenues and expenses?

GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) are useful for determining whether an item of expenditure can be classified as an "expense." GAAP does not differentiate between expenses incurred specific to a lease and those expenses that are indirect to a lease. For example, GAAP does not distinguish between wages paid to a lease-based worker, and an employee in the home office.

47. Which credits can be applied to multiple years?

There is no time limit for credit carryforwards under the bill, nor for the optional credit codified in 43.55.025. However, any dollar of investment can only generate one credit, and that credit can only be used once.

48. Can a tax credit be sold in any year or just the year after it was accrued?

Once the credit has been turned into a Credit Certificate, it can be sold at any time. A person can apply for a Credit Certificate at any time, but the bill allows the Dept. of Revenue a period of time in which to issue the Credit Certificate. (See Section 12, Sec. 43.55.024(g))

49. What is the estimated economic impact to the state of the ability to sell tax credits?

TO BE PROVIDED

50. Referring to Section 16, what is current system and why do we need this change in confidentiality?

The bill codifies current practice embodied in regulations in our treatment of taxpayer information. The only change here is that the bill makes clear that any person receiving information released under current department practices, is subject to the same criminal penalties that apply to a state employee.

The current confidentiality law is very general in its exception language – information must be kept confidential “except in connection with official investigations or proceedings . . . .” The Department believes that current law does allow disclosure under the circumstances specified in the bill, but there has been some question about that, and it would be desirable to clarify the meaning of the law, as the bill does. In addition, there is the new provision on penalties, referred to above.

51. In what circumstances would oil and gas taxes go straight into the CBR.

Additions to the CBRF (Constitutional Budget Reserve Fund) are made for any oil and gas taxes collected in resolution of a dispute. That means that amounts collected because of an audit assessment, or subsequent settlement, are additions to the CBRF.

52. Referring to Section 18 and 19, why change from shall to is?

This change is made in accordance with the state style manual.

53. Why does the bill offer multiple methods to determine gross value? Who will choose a methodology?

The bill does not directly allow a taxpayer to elect alternative methods, it just allows the Department to authorize use of an alternative method. The election referred to would be an election between using an alternative method or just calculating gross value according to the usual rules – NOT an election among several different alternative methods. In implementing this provision, the Department will no doubt develop criteria for when a particular alternative method would be appropriate. I don't think we can predict now whether there might be circumstances under which more than one alternative method might be appropriate and under which the Department would authorize a taxpayer to elect among several alternative methods.

54. Section 21, page 1, line 8—why is this clause constrained y Dec. 1, 2005?

TO BE PROVIDED

55. Section 21, provision (h), which US CPI does the Administration plan on using?

This would be established by regulation. The Department has not evaluated the various CPI's at this time.

56. Are the current oil conservation surcharges deductible from any other taxation? If no, what is the policy reason to make them a credit in SB 305 and what is the economic impact?

Yes, current oil conservation surcharges are deductible from corporate income tax.

#### Other Questions

57. Do any other state taxes have a "standard deduction"?

a. Seafood Marketing Assessment (ASMI) tax is imposed only on processors/exporters that process or export fisheries resources with a value of \$50,000 or more in a calendar year. AS 16.51.120(g).

b. Mining License Tax is not imposed when net income is less than \$40,000 in a fiscal year. AS 43.65.010(c).

c. Gaming tax exempts gross receipts of less than \$20,000 from paying the additional fee under AS 05.15.020(b).

d. Alaska's Estate Tax follows federal rules, but the most recent exemption (Fy05) included estates valued at under \$1.5M.

58. How many NPSL's (Net Profit Share Leases) are in the state, and how much are they paying in royalties?

Out of 19 NPSL's, seven are paying royalties. These seven include five in the Milne Point Unit, and two in the Duck Island Unit, and they began paying in 2001. The total of NPSL payments received in calendar year 2005 was \$81M. Total receipts from NPSL's from 2001—2005 were \$254M.

Out of 19 NPSL's, seven are paying net profit share payments (*in addition to royalties and production taxes*). These seven include five in the Milne Point Unit, and two in the Duck Island Unit, and they began paying in 2001. The total of NPSL payments received in calendar year 2005 was \$81M. Total NPS receipts from NPSL's from 2001—2005 were \$254M. Net profit share payments are not deductible for PPT purposes nor for the current production tax. Royalties and production taxes are deductible for NPS purposes.

Royalties, however, are paid on net profit share leases according to each individual lease contract. For example, one NPS lease in Duck Island Unit has a twenty percent (20%) royalty rate. Other NPS leases may have the standard royalty rate of 12.5% or another, negotiated royalty rate. Royalties and production taxes are due from a net profit share lease as long as there is production, even when there is no net profit share payment from the property.

Attached is an Xcel table of producing and non-producing NPS leases showing the lease number, the net profit share rate and the royalty rate for each lease. (See Attachment B)

59. What are the depreciable lives for O & G equipment for federal and state income tax purposes?

	Federal	Alaska
Equipment for exploration and production including drilling, gathering pipelines, pumping equipment, separation equipment, certain platforms	7	11
Offshore drilling	5	6
Pipelines, excluding gathering and transmission lines	15	17.5
Vessels, barges, other water transportation equipment	10	14.5

60. Please provide the tax calculation under the bill, with the following assumptions:

--Gross value	\$60M
--Opex	15M
--Capex	10M

Gross value	\$60M
Less: Opex	(15)
Capex	<u>(10)</u>
Tentative net profit	
Before standard deduction	\$35M
Less: standard deduction*	<u>(35)</u>
Net Taxable income	<u>\$ 0</u>

Tax	\$ 0
Capital investment credit available for carryforward (20% of \$10M)	\$5M

\* this calculation assumes that taxpayer has not reached \$73M limit for the standard deduction.

61. Are net profit lease payments included as a direct cost under 43.55.160?

Net profit share payments under NPSL's (Net Profit Share Leases) would not be deductible lease expenditures because they are in the nature of lease acquisition costs. Lease acquisition costs are not deductible per Section 21 (Sec. 43.55.160(d)(2)(E)).

62. Are lease bonus payments eligible for capital credit under 43.55.024 and/or are they included as a direct cost under 43.55.160?

Lease bonus payments are neither deductible nor eligible for capital credits. Lease bonus payments are in the nature of lease acquisition costs which are specifically not deductible per Section 21 (Sec. 43.55.160(d)(2)(E)).

63. How are payments for "spec 3D" handled? Are they credit eligible under 43.55.024 or only allowed as deductions under 43.55.160?

We understand "spec 3D" to be certain seismic exploration costs. Exploration costs are allowed as deductions under Section 21 of the bill (Sec. 43.55.160(c)). Such costs are also eligible for credits under Section 12 (Sec. 43.55.024) by reference to definition of "qualified capital expenditure" at Sec. 43.55.024(h).

64. Please explain the taxation or exemption of royalties.

Public royalties (paid to federal or state jurisdictions) never enter into the base of gross value. This is so because AS 43.55.011(a) levies the tax on oil except oil the "ownership or right to which is exempt from taxation." This phrase is then defined in AS 43.55.900(13) as follows:

"any ownership interest of the federal government or the state."

These sections are not changed in the bill.

Because the bill changes the tax to a tax on net profits, it is necessary to specify deductions. Royalties are specifically disallowed as a deduction under Section 21

(Sec. 43.55.160(d)(2)(B)). Royalties paid to state and federal jurisdictions cannot be deducted because they are not included in the starting “gross value.” Private royalties cannot be deducted because the related production is subject to tax.

65. Under Section 21 (Sec. 43.55.160(d)), “direct costs... include...” Does the word “include” serve to restrict the list of allowable expenses to only those items included below in (A)—(C)?

No, Sec. 43.55.160(d) provides additional clarification for the general rule stated at sub-section (c). Sub-section (c) provides the general rule that lease costs are deductible. Sub-section (d) addresses only those items that may have been questionable under the general rule. Additionally, we note that under AS 01.10.040(b):

“When the words ‘includes’ or ‘including’ are used in a law, they shall be construed as though followed by the phrase ‘but not limited to.’”

Questions Received 3/1/06 12:00 p.m.

66. The discussion of oil field needs, i.e. not to deplete the gas pressure, did not recognize the CO<sub>2</sub> re-injection. How will that lengthen the field life(s) and at what volumes, i.e. how will it affect taxes?

TO BE PROVIDED

67. What happens if the “Big Three” sell off their assets to 20 smaller companies? Will the significant tax benefits ever be realized?

TO BE PROVIDED

68. How is it possible that any corporation gets triple the sale price for a commodity, having invested capital at the expected lower returns, and then maintains that they need a claw back provision? Why should we offer it?

TO BE PROVIDED

69. Please show us an international competitiveness rank and score for PPT under the following tax/credit scenarios, both overall and for new producers:

- a. 30/15
- b. 30/20
- c. 25/20
- d. 20/20

TO BE PROVIDED

70. Please present Mr. Marks' charts on pages 14-16 to show the difference between a PPT and status quo, annually under the following PPT plans at \$20, \$40, and \$60/bbl:
- a. 25/20
  - b. 30/20
  - c. 30/15

TO BE PROVIDED

71. Please show the corporate take chart on page 24 of Mr. Marks' presentation given the following tax/credit scenarios:
- a. 25/20
  - b. 30/20
  - c. 30/15

TO BE PROVIDED

72. Please show the price point where DOR estimates corporate profit margins hit 15% and 20%.

TO BE PROVIDED

**Attachment A1 (Question 30)**

**Effective Tax Rates, North Slope by Field, FY86 - FY05**

	Prudhoe Bay	Midnight Sun	Polaris	Orion	Aurora	Borealis	Kuparuk	West Sak	Tabasco	Tarn	Meltwater
FY86	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.07%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY87	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY88	12.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY89	12.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY90	14.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY91	14.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY92	14.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY93	14.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.34%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY94	14.81%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY95	14.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY96	14.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY97	14.59%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.72%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY98	14.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY99	14.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.87%	0.00%
FY00	13.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.97%	0.00%	0.00%	0.58%	0.00%
FY01	13.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%
FY02	13.44%	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.96%	5.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%	0.00%
FY03	13.05%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.40%	3.44%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22%	0.00%
FY04	12.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.03%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.84%	0.00%
FY05	12.65%	4.43%	4.43%	3.63%	3.62%	3.69%	0.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%

Note: The effective tax rate for Midnight Sun, Polaris, Orion, Aurora, Pt. McIntyre, and Borealis for FY 05 reflects 5 months' effect of the aggregation decision effective Feb. 1, 2005.

**Attachment A2 (Question 30)**

	Milne Point	Endicott	Eider	Lisburne	Point McIntyre	Niakuk	West Beach	NPBS	Alpine	Northstar
FY86	2.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY87	0.62%	0.00%	0.00%	4.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY88	0.00%	8.17%	0.00%	7.73%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY89	0.00%	12.25%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY90	0.00%	10.37%	0.00%	0.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY91	0.00%	9.44%	0.00%	0.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY92	0.00%	9.51%	0.00%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY93	0.00%	11.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY94	0.00%	11.53%	0.00%	0.00%	7.28%	1.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY95	0.00%	11.30%	0.00%	0.00%	11.30%	6.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY96	0.00%	10.39%	0.00%	0.00%	11.60%	1.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY97	0.29%	7.10%	0.00%	0.00%	11.63%	1.51%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY98	0.46%	4.54%	0.00%	0.00%	11.29%	0.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY99	0.64%	1.29%	0.00%	0.00%	11.75%	0.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY00	0.38%	0.73%	0.00%	0.00%	9.45%	1.32%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
FY01	0.16%	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%	6.47%	0.17%	0.00%	0.00%	4.24%	0.00%
FY02	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	3.10%	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	10.76%	5.14%
FY03	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	2.40%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	10.50%	10.59%
FY04	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.33%	10.37%
FY05	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.17%	10.18%

**Attachment B (Question 58)**

By: G. Rogers, March 1, 2006, source  
 DNR

**NPS LEASES, NPS RATES & ROYALTY RATES & STATUS**

Unit - lease number	Royalty Rate	NPS Rate	NPS Status
Duck Island			
1	312828	20%	79.5935% in payout
2	312834	20%	48.8703% in payout
Milne Point			
3	355016	12.5%	40.0000% in payout
4	355017	12.5%	40.0000% in payout
5	355018	12.5%	30.0000% in payout
6	355021	12.5%	30.0000% in payout
7	388235	12.5%	30.0000% in payout
Kuparuk River			
8	355023	12.5%	30.0000% not in payout
9	355024	12.5%	30.0000% not in payout
10	355030	12.5%	30.0000% not in payout
11	355032	12.5%	30.0000% not in payout
Colville River			
12	364470	12.5%	30.0% non producing
13	364471	12.5%	30.0% non producing
14	364472	12.5%	30.0% non producing
15	364477	12.5%	30.0% non producing
16	364478	12.5%	30.0% non producing
Point Thompson Unit			
17	312866	20%	52.352% non producing
18	343109	12.5%	40% non producing
19	343110	12.5%	40% non producing
20	343111	12.5%	40% non producing
21	343112	closed	closed non producing

Letter to Senator Wagoner and Representatives Samuels and Ramras  
March 2, 2006