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Alaska is Not the Only Government Changing Taxes!

Regimes routinely ranked most stable by International Oil Companies (IOCs) appear multiple times below

Figure 1: Government Action Reflecting Commodity Prices

The period of 2012 to 2016 is populated with many more changes similar to the above

From Dr. Ruggiero presentation to House Resources Committee – 2/20/17
Government Reaction to Market Changes
Lookback to the Future?

Government Action v. Oil Price

Source: IHS

© 2016 IHS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

From Dr. Atul Arya, IHS Energy Presentation
to AK Oil & Gas Competitive Review Board, May 2016
**HB 111 – Version 30-LS0450\O**
**Raises Oil Taxes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 111 by Section</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Credit “Reform”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 1 - Increase Interest</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 2 - Raise Min. Tax from 4% to 5%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 3 - Harden the Floor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Migrating&quot; Credits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 4 - Technical to conform Sec. 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 5 - Change NOL from 35% to 15%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6 - No cash payments for NOL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 7 - Changes Per-barrel &quot;credit&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 8 - Only Middle Earth credits get cash</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 9 - Limits cash payment to $35M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits threshold to 15K/bpd</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 10 - Changes GVPP Determination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 11 - Repeals cash payment structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 12 - 16: Effective dates/conforming</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increasing Interest is not a tax increase, but will be added cost to industry.*
Section 1: Increases Interest Rate

- AOGA supports current interest structure & rates – especially considering the lengthy statute of limitations.

- Companies have repeatedly testified that resolution of open tax years should be accelerated, not delayed.

- It is in no one’s best interest to delay resolution solely to avoid interest on an amount in dispute.

- Six years of compound interest will not be an incentive for state to finish audits.

Section 1 increases costs, and has nothing to do with tax credits.
Section 2: Raises Minimum Tax from 4% to 5%

- Represents a 25% increase for each taxpayer subject to the minimum tax.

- “Infinite increase” for smaller companies/newcomers who do not yet pay the 4% tax, they go from 0% to 5%.

- Will mean more money in taxes, and less money spent in development and/or exploration.

- Industry has testified that this increase alone would likely lead to the reduction of one drilling rig for at least 6 months.

Section 2 is a tax increase and has nothing to do with tax credits.
Section 3, Part one: “Harden the Floor”

- For companies, large & small, that may have credits from prior year investments, not allowing the credits to be applied to the minimum tax floor delays and possibly denies economic recovery.

- For some companies, using tax credits against the minimum tax is the only way they can continue to invest – especially in low price environments.

- Coupled with raising the minimum tax, will represent a significant increase.

- This change is analogous to the federal and state government not allowing corporate losses to be applied against corporate income tax.

Section 3 is a tax increase and changes a key provision of the purpose of credits.
Section 3, Part two: “Migrating” Credits

• Represents a tax increase.

• This provision would require a producer to file perfect monthly installments/estimates or run the risk of losing valuable tax credits.

• Makes the system more complex by moving the tax into more of a monthly tax versus what it currently is – an annual tax.

• This creates uncertainty for companies in estimating their tax burden.

• If credits are not allowed to be carried forward or transferred, they would be lost.

Section 3 is a tax increase and changes a key provision of the tax system.
Section 5: Changes the NOL from 35% to 15%

- Immediate tax increase.
- Eliminates approximately 60% of the value of the NOL.
- The NOL was established as an integral part of Alaska’s net based tax system, from the beginning in PPT.
- The NOL has generally matched the tax rate.
- Penalizes companies for investing in Alaska while they are losing money.

Section 5 is a tax increase and changes a key provision of the tax system.
Section 6: NOL credit no longer eligible for cash payment from the state

- All cashable North Slope credits are eliminated in this section; only the NOLs would remain.

- For companies exploring or with limited production, the NOL has served as the playing field leveler, attracting companies to invest in high cost projects.

- This proposed change is a “double whammy” when combined with the reduction of the NOL as it severely impacts smaller companies and explorers, especially those who have made significant discoveries.

*Section 6 is a tax increase and changes the playing field for new/small companies.*
Section 7: Changes the per-barrel credit

• Immediate tax increase on the core fields that underpin where just over 90% of North Slope production comes from.

• Per-barrel was designed to add a progressive element to the tax system, so it is structural, not really a “credit”.

• Legislative consultants, *analytica*, described per barrel credit as a “misnomer” – “The credit against the production tax is not really a credit; it has an explicit tax-rate-setting goal.” – 6/17/15

Section 7 is a tax increase and fundamentally changes the structure of SB 21.
Quotes from Tax Division Director Alper on per-barrel tax credits

“Some of them (credits) are integral parts of the tax regime; the 20% capital credit in ACES, the per-barrel credit in SB 21, those are very much offsets to what would otherwise be a very high tax rate.” – Senate/House Joint Resources – 6/17/15

“With SB 21 the credit is an offset to the tax and is designed to create a progressive element, a little bit lower tax rate at lower prices, a higher tax rate at higher prices, so it’s hard to really consider them a credit in the context of an inducement to doing work. It’s really what we are calling an integral part of the system.” – Senate/House Joint Resources – 6/17/15

Section 7 is a tax increase and fundamentally changes the structure of SB 21.
Section 9: Further restricts eligibility of cash payments

• It is unclear to industry how this would be applied and to which companies.

• Companies would be restricted to $35 million per year.

• Only those companies with fewer than 15,000 barrels per day of production would qualify.

Section 9 is a tax increase and changes a key provision of the purpose of credits.
Section 10: Gross value at the point of production cannot go below zero

- This impacts those fields with excess marine transportation or pipeline tariffs, such as those farther from TAPS.
- Would change the structure of the production tax.
- Disguised tax increase.
- Creates uncertainty as to how a producer is to evaluate potential investment opportunities or calculate its production tax.

Section 10 is a tax increase and has nothing to do with tax credits.
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*Increasing Interest is not a tax increase, but will be added cost to industry.*
Would you invest in Alaska if tax policy changed 7 times in 12 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Tax Policy Change</th>
<th>Increase / Decrease?</th>
<th>AOGA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2005- March 2006</td>
<td>Aggregated ELF – Administrative decision altering gross production tax</td>
<td>Tax Increase</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006- July 2007</td>
<td>Petroleum Production Tax (PPT)</td>
<td>Tax Increase</td>
<td>Opposed Final Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007- 2013</td>
<td>Alaska’s Clear and Equitable Share (ACES) *</td>
<td>Tax Increase</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Cook Inlet Recovery Act</td>
<td>Incentives for Industry</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>SB 21</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Supported, with concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>HB 247 – Gov. Walker’s oil tax reform</td>
<td>Tax Increase</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Proposed HB 111 – House Resources</td>
<td>Tax Increase</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some provisions of ACES made retroactive to enactment of PPT, others to 1/1/2007

Few other regions consider oil/gas changes more than Alaska.
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What is “Fair” Share?

Source: Department of Revenue, Fall 2016.