## MINUTES

## MONTANA SENATE <br> 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION <br> COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Call to Order: By Senator Mike Halligan, Chairman, on March 18, 1991, at 8:00 a.m.

## ROLL CALL

Members Present:
Mike Halligan, Chairman (D)
Dorothy Eck, Vice Chairman (D)
Robert Brown (R)
Steve Doherty (D)
Delwyn Gage (R)
Francis Koehnke (D)
Gene Thayer (R)
Thomas Towe (D)
Fred Van Valkenburg (D)
Bill Yellowtail (D)
Members Excused:
John Harp (R)
Staff Present: Jeff Martin (Legislative Council).
Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Announcements/Discussion: None

## HEARING ON SENATE BILL 450

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Halligan, District 29 , said this bill creates equity in taxation for married persons filing jointly. Currently in Montana, couples who file jointly at the federal level and do not file jointly at the state level pay a great deal more in taxes. The bill establishes a separate set of rates and creates some equity between the two filing methods.

## Proponents' Testimony:

Walt Kero, Montana Certified Public Accountants, said the bill was jointly drafted by the Department of Revenue and the CPA organization. It is an attempt to adjust the rates between filing jointly and separately to reach revenue neutrality and simplify filing in Montana. Using single taxpayers as a base of one, people who file married joint pay $60 \%$ of single rates, people who file married separate pay 1.2 times the single rate, and head of household pays approximately $80 \%$ of the single rate. Those percentages were applied to Montana rates and the results were revised by both Mr . Kero and DOR. The final rate structure is incorporated in SB 450.

The driving force behind the bill is simplification. With the adoption of the rates, the number of married separate returns would be reduced by 80,000 . It also aligns Montana law with federal law. In Montana passive loss and capital loss rules are complicated and lack guidelines under married filing jointly rules.. There are special incentives in federal law for filing married joint which do not apply in Montana. The overall effect is intended to be revenue neutral, although some taxpayers will pay more and some less. The winners will be those who file married joint and head of household.

Tom Harrison, Montana Society of CPA's, said the Society is interested in three things, economic development, simplification, and quality. Senate Bill 450 represents simplification and should be passed.

## Opponents' Testimony:

There were no opponents.

## Questions from Committee Members:

Senator Towe asked if this bill represents income splitting. On the federal return under the income splitting provision, the family that files a joint return will get a maximum tax break no matter how they split their income and file separately.

Mr. Kero said this bill would do the same thing. There is a built in penalty for filing separately and an incentive for filing jointly.

Senator Towe asked if that doesn't indicate the bill is different from the federal where the penalty is exactly the same.

Mr. Kero said, at the bottom line, the tax will probably be the same. But the treatment between the top line and the bottom line is vastly different.

Senator Towe asked if the whole purpose of the bill is to discourage couples from filing married separately.

Mr. Kero said that is a "by-product" of the bill. The primary purpose is to simplify filing for taxpayers, CPA's and the Department.

Senator Towe said a similar problem arose in 1975. There are lot of people paying on divided incomes - spouses filing separately with separate incomes - who will have to pay more in order to make the bill revenue neutral. The couples who file separately will have to pay more because they are paying for the benefit received by those couples in which one spouse is not working, but yet they file jointly and get the maximum benefit .

Mr. Kero replied that is true, but it does follow the federal rules by creating incentives for people to file jointly.

Senator Towe said that is exactly what will kill the bill.
Bob Turner said indexing was addressed incorrectly originally, therefore, the amendment was added so that the same rates are in place for two years. The rates are left at $\$ 800$ on the base of 1980 and indexing proceeds forward each year from that time.

## Closing by Sponsor:

Senator Halligan closed saying the bill will provide a revenue neutral change in the rates. He said the simplification will be even more attractive when we see the results of action on the tax reform package.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 373

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Gage, District 5, sponsor, said the bill addresses conservation of oil and gas production, encourages more investment by Montana residents in oil and gas drilling and production, and offers incentives to non-resident investors to invest in drilling ail and gas wells in Montana.

Senator Gage reviewed the provisions of the bill section by section. Section $l$ addresses secondary recovery units formed after the passage of this bill which would be taxed $4 \%$ of value. They are taxed at a higher rate because secondary units are more expensive to operate and produce from than primary production units. New oil horizontal wells will also be production taxed at 4\%. All tertiary oil production will be taxed at 3\%. All stripper oil over 5 barrels would be taxed at $3 \%$. All new wells
in the secondary or tertiary units would be taxed at the same level as the rest of the unit after the two year exemption for all new oil or gas. It exempts royalties for individual Indians whose property is held in trust by the federal government and tribal royalties under the Indian Mineral Leasing Act of 1938 from tax. It defines gross taxable value for calculation of state severance tax and local government severance tax.

Section 2 provides for credits and payments for under or over payment of the tax.

Section 3 is clarifying language regarding failure to file a return.

Section 4 clarifies the issuance of warrant for distraint.
Section 5 provides for prior year mills in distribution of the local government severance tax. Senator Gage said a coordinating clause should be written for this section as there other bills addressing this same provision.

Sections 6 and 7 deal with clarification of deficiency assessments and overpayment.

Section 8 establishes the 24 month exemption from state severance tax if oil is less than $\$ 33$ a barrel to be determined on a lease by lease, quarter by quarter basis.

Section 9 deletes the interim production definition.
Section 10 is a clarification and Section 11 addresses the rates on various production that assessors are to use in assessing the local government severance tax and net proceeds tax (net proceeds being the tax on new production).

Section 12 clarifies the 12 month exemption for net proceeds on new oil .

Sections 13-16 eliminate the term "interim" production.
Section 17 is the applicability to tax years after 12/31/90.
Section 18 makes the bill effective on passage and approval.

## Proponents' Testimony:

William W. Ballard, President, Balcron Oil Company, Billings, presented his testimony in support of the bill (Exhibits \#1 and \#la).

William H. Tulloch, Tax Manager, Meridian Oil, Fort Worth, Texas, presented his testimony in support of the bill (Exhibit \#2).

Jerry Croft, President, Croft Petroleum, Cutbank, presented his testimony in support of the bill (Exhibit \#3).

Bill Vaughey, Jr., Havre, presented his testimony in support of the bill (Exhibit \#4).

Patrick Montalbin, President, MSR Subsidiary Companies, Cutbank, said his company operates 300 stripper wells in the state. He said he agrees with the previous testimony. His operates a small independent company with an average production of 2.7 to 3 barrels a day per well. This is strictly a numbers game and $100 \%$ ownership is necessary if any money is to be made on stripper production. He said the LGST was good for his company. The tax break incentive worked well until the fourth quarter last year when the price rose and they had to pay an increase of $\$ 77,000$. The price dropped again very quickly and the companies need the incentive replaced. He noted MSR has moved to Texas because of the inconsistency of the tax base in Montana and will not be doing any new drilling until the situation improves. He said the bill will generate income for local governments and schools and place the state in a much better competitive position for new drilling and production.

Ken Williams, Entech Oil Division, said his company has spent $\$ 30$ million over the past four years in exploration of oil and gas projects in the region. Only $\$ 1.5$ million was spent in Montana. He said SB 373 sends a strong message to investors and produces. He offered enthusiastic support for the bill.

Mike Stephen, Montana Oil, Gas, and Coal Counties, expressed support for the bill. He said they are interested in horizontal drilling, accelerated payments of LGST, and would be interested in other amendments that may be presented later in the testimony.

Dennis Burr, Montana Taxpayers Association, expressed his agreement with the previous testimony and asked the committee to support the bill.

Forrest Boles, President, Montana Chamber of Commerce, said they are concerned about the economy and the employment climate of the state. He expressed support for the bill.

Doug Abelin, Northern Montana Oil and Gas Association, said this is a good bill and offered his support for it.

Denis Adams, Director, Department of Revenue, said DOR supports the reinstatement of the incentives. He expressed support for the bill.

Janelle Fallon, Montana Petroleum Association, said production has declined $10 \%$ per year since 1986. If the decline continues there will be less and less money for schools, few jobs, and worsening economic conditions in eastern Montana. She said the bill is very important to the petroleum industry and the whole state of Montana.

Senator Tveit, District ll, said production is half of what it was when he first came to the legislature. He said the bill reestablishes the incentives and allows Montana to again be competitive in the production and exploration market. This is an important and vigorous industry in the state and should not be taxed away to other states. He noted the horizontal drilling is a most important tool to the industry. When a well is through pumping, $70 \%$ of the oil is still in the ground. Approximately $40 \%$ can retrieved by secondary and tertiary flushing and pumping. The oil and gas is there, he said. We need to offer the companies the incentive to come back and get it.

## Opponents' Testimony:

There were no opponents.

## Questions From Committee Members:

Senator Eck asked Mr. Tulloch how much Meridian was affected by the tax holiday.

Mr. Tulloch said since 1989, when the incentives were established, to last fall when they were lost, Meridian had drilled 50 wells in the state and 2 horizontal wells in the Bakken formation. There has been no drilling or exploratory activity since the tax holiday ended and all the plans Meridian has for the state are on hold due to the current tax structure.

Senator Towe expressed concern about defining secondary and tertiary production and the possibility of broadening secondary into regular production. He also questioned the procedures for overseeing horizontal drilling.

Senator Gage said the Board of Oil and Gas Conservation has the best interests of the state at heart and are very vigilant to such possibilities. He felt they would do a very adequate job of overseeing the production levels. The Board keeps a strict eye on all aspects of horizontal drilling, also.

Mr. Tulloch said horizontal drilling entails very detailed measurements. There are industry accepted definitions of linear penetration of a well bore into a formation that begin at a minimum of 150 feet. This drilling is more expensive than straight drilling and is carefully monitored. He said the two year incentives are most necessary as it takes $2-3$ years to recover the investment costs of horizontal drilling.

Senator Yellowtail asked if Mr. Meridian could assure him that Meridian would increase production in Montana if the bill passes.

Mr. Tulloch said he could not be that specific because they are looking at many projects planned. However, they have many mineral rights in the state and are prepared to move forward on a number of projects if the right tax climate exists.

Senator Yellowtail asked the same question of Mr. Williams.
Mr. Williams replied he could not be specific without consulting his production people. However, it is very likely they will be investing in Montana as there are a good many more projects "out there" than they have the money to invest in.

Senator Yellowtail said the fiscal note shows a decrease of $\$ 8$ million over the next biennium. He asked how the $\$ 8$ million will be recouped.

Mr. Adams replied this is built into the Governor's budget. New production would provide $\$ 5$ million assuming there are a million barrels of new production each of the two years. As a result of the new production, there will be new jobs, additional personal property taxes, and additional revenue from the drilling activity itself.

Senator Yellowtail asked if the fiscal note could be redone to show that the impact will be neutral.

Mr. Adams said they were unable to come to that conclusion.
Senator Doherty asked Mr. Ballard what he would think about tying the incentive to a reinvestment back into Montana.

Mr. Ballard said his company does that now so it would be fine with him.

Mr. Tulloch said his company "would not be crazy about the idea", but they could live with it.

Senator Doherty asked Mr. Adams if there has been any success nationwide with recapturing lost revenue.

Mr. Adams replied he did not have a lot of nationwide information. He said one thing that is not reflected in the fiscal note, but would have a definite impact, is the holiday in net proceeds for new production is only 12 months. That is money that goes to local governments. Even though there is still a tax holiday of 24 months at the state level, local revenues will increase significantly and they are not reflected in the fiscal note.

Senator Eck asked if the incentives for strippers would bring MSR back into the state.

Mr. Montalbin said the would come back "absolutely". They built the company in Montana from small strippers and they only left because of negative economic conditions. He said they would be more than happy to bring their $\$ 1$ million back to the state.

He said the backbone of the state is the small independent producer. He committed to bringing $\$ 750,000$ of drilling development money back to the state this year if the incentives are put back in.

Senator Eck asked Mr. Montalbin if the elimination of the flat tax would be advantageous for him.

He said it would as net proceeds was a better tax for his company. The big problem was disallowing capital expenditures. He said it provides a lower tax base for MSR.

## Closing by Sponsor:

Senator Gage said zero means zero. No new production means no new money. The budget is predicated on one million barrels of new production. He said a new fiscal note is needed since he really doesn't know how many barrels will be produced and how much money will be generated.

He noted a great deal of money from oil production goes into the foundation program which benefits all areas of the state, including those counties with no oil or gas. This bill deals with more than the oil and gas operator, there are all the employees and their income tax, support industries, the increased economic benefits to local areas, and agricultural benefits from mineral leases. Big money can be had from big wells in Montana, but most of the production is from stripper wells. He said this is a complicated bill, but it will place Montana in a much better competitive position for oil and gas production dollars.

## ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 10:00 a.m.


MH/jdr

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SENATE TAXATION_COMMITTEE } \quad \text { DATE } 3 / 18 / 9 / \\ & 52 n d \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NAME <br> SEN. HALLIGAN | PRESENT $X$ | ABSENT | EXCUSED |
| SEN. ECK | $X$ |  |  |
| SEN. BROWN | $X$ |  |  |
| SEN. DOHERTY | $x$ |  |  |
| SEN. GAGE | $X$ |  |  |
| SEN. HARP |  |  | $x$ |
| SEN. KOEHNKE | K |  |  |
| SEN. THAYER | $X$ |  |  |
| SEN. TOWE | $X$ |  |  |
| SEN. VAN VALKENBURG | X |  |  |
| SEN. YELLOWTAIL | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Each day attach to minutes.


SENATE BILL 373

## TESTIMONY BY W. W. BALLLARD

3-18-91

Senate Bill 373 is a bill that benefits the economy of Montana in several ways:
(1) It provides an incentive for enhanced recovery techniques which are risky and expensive, but which allows recovery of considerably more of the oil in place (as much as 1 to 1.5 times the primary recovery). This is oil that has already been discovered, thereby eliminating the exploratory risk of finding the reserve. Enhanced recovery techniques, when successful, provides additional income to the producers, royalty owners, service companies, local businesses, while also providing tax revenue to state and local governments that would otherwise not be collected.
(2) It provides an incentive to use the most recent development in drilling technology, horizontally drilled holes, in exploration ventures. This technique has been very successful in Texas, Colorado and North Dakota in the last few years, but drilling costs are generally two to three times as much as conventionally drilled holes, thus the need for a special incentive.
(3) It restores the incentive for new reserve exploration lost when oil prices reached $\$ 25$ per barrel last summer.
(4) It restores the incentive to keep stripper wells producing, which was also lost last summer.

The balance of my testimony will focus on lost incentives.
A bar graph is presented which compares the revenue distribution with the severance tax incentive in place vs. the situation as it exists now. Note that with the incentive in place the loss in severance tax is partially offset by an increase in income tax, and that the reinvestment capital (profit) is increased by $\$ .25$ per barrel. A typical Williston Basin well will produce 300,000 barrels over its productive life and at $\$ 20$ per barrel this will result in an additional $\$ 75,000$ available for investment in another well. This is a very significant incentive, especially for independent operators in the State.

Two other graphs and the table below illustrate the need for reinstatement of the stripper incentive. These illustrations show that the incentives will result in 17 months of additional productive life for an average stripper well and will produce 807 additional barrels of oil. Note on the table that for every $\$ 1$ cut

Senate Bill 373
Testimony by w. W. Ballard
3-18-91
Page 2
in taxes, the economy gains $\$ 31.60$. Montana presently has about 3,000 stripper wells producing and with the incentive that this bill puts in place, 2.4 million barrels of oil will be produced that would otherwise be lost. This will also give an additional $\$ 43,524,000$ boost to the State's economy.

Senate bill 373 is a major step toward bringing the oil and gas explorationists back to Montana. I urge the committee to pass this important piece of legislation.

WITH INCENTIVES
WITHOUT INCENTIVES

## Average Montana Stripper Well

|  | Current Tax Rate | Proposed Stripper Rate | +/- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economic Life | 58 mos | 75 mos | +17 mos |
| Barrels Produced | 3216 bbls | 4023 bbls | +807 bbls |
| Severence Tax Paid | \$7,938 | \$6,407 | -\$1,531 |
| Income Tax Paid | \$888 | \$1,251 | +\$363 |
| Property Tax Paid | \$2,416 | \$3,125 | +\$709 |
| Total Taxes | \$11,242 | \$10,783 | -\$459 |
| Contributions to State Economy |  |  |  |
| Landowner Royalty | \$8,020 | \$10,040 | +\$2,020 |
| Wages | \$17,400 | \$22,500 | +\$5,100 |
| Utilities | \$8,700 | \$11,250 | +\$2,550 |
| Supplies, Contractors | \$17,600 | \$22,438 | +\$4,838 |
|  | \$51,720 | \$66,228 | +\$14,508 |

AVERAGE STRIPPER WELL
EXISTING TAX RATES

AVERAGE STRIPPER WELL
PROPOSED STRIPPER TAX RATES




# PRESENTATION IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 373 <br> to the Senate Taxation Commission <br> of the 52nd Assembly of the Montana Legislature 

March 18, 1991

On Behalf of:
MERIDIAN OIL INC.

Prepared by:
William H. Tulloch
Tax Manager Meridian Oil Inc. 801 Cherry Street Fort Worth TX 76102

This testimony, on behalf of Meridian Oil Inc., is offered in support of SB 373. But the reason for our support goes far beyond the percentage points offered in the way of tax incentives. The real incentive in Senator Gage's bill is in the form of the farsighted view that it presents in recognizing the long-term contributions that a healthy, growing oil and gas industry can make to the economy of Montana.

SB 373 sends a very clear message to our industry. And that message is, "The state of Montana welcomes the oil and gas industry and, to demonstrate the extent of our commitment to this policy, we intend to make the tax policies of this state competitive with any other state."

SB 373 does just that!
A comparative analysis of the tax impact on producing oil and gas properties in various states is shown on the attached Exhibit "A" which reflects current tax policies in most of the major states in which Meridian Oil operates. A more detailed comparison of oil and gas taxation in Montana versus North Dakota is shown on Exhibit "B." This comparison shows the combined rates for state and local taxes imposed on working interest production, and in the case of Montana shows the combined rates currently in effect, as well as the combined rates under SB 373.

As this comparison indicates, under SB 373 the rates proposed for oil and gas stripper production still fall short of the tax treatment accorded stripper production in North Dakota. But the rates proposed by Senator Gage for secondary, tertiary and horizontally completed oil wells plus the tax

$$
\varepsilon_{1}+2
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treatment of new wells for an initial period following completion, all actually exceed the tax incentives currently extended to these types of production in North Dakota.

In our opinion, again, Senator Gage has been very perceptive in recognizing that it is production from these types of wells that holds the greatest potential for long-run future returns to the state and local governments in the form of increased tax revenues.

The logical question is, "Do these types of tax incentives have any impact on a producer's decision, as to where he elects to invest his drilling budget? In the case of Meridian Oil, the answer is a resounding, YES! Obviously, a lot of factors are considered in evaluating a new drilling prospect; but, in evaluating the economics of a presumed successful completion effort, we are keenly aware of the tax considerations that will be imposed on the revenue stream.

I refer you, again, to Exhibit "B" and assuming all other considerations involved in a new drilling prospect are equal, and Meridian has the option of drilling a new horizontal oil well in the Bakken Shale Formation in either North Dakota or Montana. Under current tax structures, it is obvious that Meridian would realize tax savings of 0.7 percent for the first 12 months of production, 7.7 percent for the next three months, and 3.7 percent of revenues for the remaining life of this new well in North Dakota, as opposed to having drilled the well in Montana. Assuming this new well averaged 50 barrels a day, at $\$ 20$ per barrel, had an economic life of 10 years and Meridian $0 i 1$ owned a .875 working interest, the total savings in taxes to Meridian 0 il would be apprximately $\$ 112,000$. But, at the same
time, the total tax revenues collected in North Dakota would exceed $\$ 323,000$, including taxes on working interest and royalty. Now let's look at the same new horizontal well drilled in Montana, i.e., if the tax rates under SB 373 were in effect. Over the same 10 -year life of the well, Meridian would realize tax savings of approximately $\$ 32,000$ compared to North Dakota; while tax revenues collected in Montana over the life of the well would be in excess of $\$ 286,000$.

Just as $I$ know that it is not a function of this Legislature to generate savings for Meridian 0il, I am equally aware of the fact that overall tax structures and revenue needs are not the same in Montana as they are in North Dakota.

So the purpose of this comparison is not to convince you that Montana must match North Dakota dollar for dollar in its tax treatment of oil and gas; rather, it is to point out the basic economic considerations that weigh heavily in determining the anticipated return on the substantial investment required to drill a new well.

The point to be made is, that if Montana wants to be competitive in attracting new oil and gas activity then Montana must, at least, be competitive in its treatment of oil and gas activities. And why would Montana not want additional oil and gas production? When new wells represent a relatively long-run source of revenue for state and local governments; when completed wells are minimally disruptive to the surrounding environment; and when oil and gas production places an extremely low level of demand upon governmental services.

Tax incentives do work. They work for oil and gas just as they work for other types of businesses. To emphasize this fact, during the first two years following passage of the tax holidays of 24 months for severance and 12 months for net proceeds on new wells in Montana, Meridian 0il had actively participated in drilling 25 wells each year. These wells (predominately gas) can be expected to generate over $\$ 8,064,775$ in state and local tax revenues over their expected economic life. This equates to average annual tax revenues $\$ 322,591$ for the state, counties and schools in Montana. This year, without benefit of these tax incentives, all drilling plans by Meridian Oil for Montana are on hold. While in North Dakota, where the tax incentive for new wells is still in place, Meridian Oil plans to drill as many as 15 new wells (and up to 24 depending on budget allocations) in 1991.

Meridian Oil has a vested interest in Montana, not only because of current operations but also owing to a very strong position in rights to explore for oil and gas throughout the state. Even though our first two attempts at horizontal drilling in Montana's Bakken Formation have not proven commercially successful, we have not given up on this potential source of new oil. But until such times as the tax structure in Montana becomes more competitive with that of other states, those other states will continue to receive first call on the funds we budget for exploration and development. It only makes good economic sense.

Finally, the subject of who is and who is not paying their "fair share" of taxes continues to receive alot of discussion by certain interest groups in Montana, particularly during legislative sessions. From our
perspective at Meridian Oil, a tax burden on gross production revenues of 12.7 percent for ofl (new wells) and 15.35 percent for gas (new wells) is extremely high by any measure, and particularly when compared to other oil and gas producing states; this is before adding on the additional burden imposed under the state income tax. In terms of local county and school taxes, as long as a system of property classification exists in Montana, assessing different types of properties at different assessment ratios, there cannot possibly be equity among all taxpayers. Should the time ever come when there is serious consideration given to assessing all property in the state at the same level of assessment, I can assure you that the oil and gas industry will be a willing participant in any such attempt to restructure the local tax system. But, as long as certain types of properties are assessed at less than 4 percent of market value, reappraisals of certain properties are conducted only once every three or five years and any increases in value resulting from reappraisal are phased in over a period of years. Montana will always have a substantial amount of taxable property value that escapes taxation. This, as you know, applies to categories of property other than oil and gas.

In summary, the oil and gas industry would like to forge the kind of mutually beneficial partnership between industry and the state of Montana that exists in other states. The kind of partnership that offers long-term, stable economic opportunities for both parties. We know it works well in other places and there is no reason to believe it cannot work equally well in Montana. We, at Meridian Oil, would like nothing more than to be in a
position to make the kind of contribution in Montana that our aggressive business outlook and technical expertise have enabled us to make in other areas.

With a positive view toward the future, we urge you to work hard for passage of Senate Bill 373 and then allow it enough time to produce the desired result. This issue is certainly important to our company; but in our opinion, it is even more important to the future of Montana. Your decision in this matter carries with it implications for many years to come and I assure you that Meridian Oil is keenly interested in the outcome.


MERIDIAN OIL INC.
state tax comparison


| texas | UTAM | COLORADO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.25\% | $53 / 32 \%$ | $3.0 x$ |
| 2.00\% | 2\% | 4.0x |
| \$5.25/1000 STOCKholders eouity in STATE MINIMUM OF $\$ 68$ | N/A | N/A |

TYPE OF TAX
SALES AND USE TAX:
STATE
COUNTY, CITY, MIA, ETC.
fRANCHISE (3):
(1) DOES NOI CONSIDER MINIMUM AMOUNT UNDER \$2SO PER YEAR
(2) MASOR EXEMPTIONS:

LOUISIANA - TERTIARY RECOVERY PROJECTS UN
LOUISIANA - TERTIARY RECDVERY PROJECTS UNYIL PAYOUI.

- GAS CERIIFIED LOUISIANA ECONOHIC ACCELERAIION PROGRAM WELLS. (EXEMPT UNTIL 1990 OR PRICE OF OIL EXCEEDS S29.50)
- WEW FIELOS DISCOVERY EXEMPT FOR 2 YRS FROM DATE OF REGULAR PRCOUCTION ( FIRST 2 MCF OR 1OO GARRELS PER DAY)

OVER 30,000 but less $\quad$ IMAN 60,000
N. DAKOTA - STRIPPER OIL PRODUCTION EXEMPT FROM 6.5x OIL EXTRACTION.

- WELLS DRILLED AND COMPLETED AFTER 4/27/87: FIRST 15 MONTHS PRODUCTION IS EXEMPT FRCM $6.5 \%$ OIL EXTRACTION TAX, RATE IS $4 X$ THEREAFTER.
- WOROVERS: FRST 12 MONTHS OF PRCOUCTION IS EXEMPT FROM $6.5 \% ~ O I L ~ E X T R A C T I O N . ~$
- SECONDARY/TERTIARY PROJECTS TAXED AT 4X RATE ON OIL EXTRACTION PLUS 5X SEVERANCE.

OHIO - FIRST $\$ 50,000$ of VALUE.

- FIRST SIX MONTHS PROOUCIION FOR WELLS DRILLED AFTER 1983.
ALABAMA - 4X ON PRCOUCTION FRON: ENHANCED RECOVERY PROJECTS AND STRIPPER (25 GARRELS/200,000 MCF PER DAY). - $2 x$ ON PRODUCTION FROM: OCCLUDED WATURAL GAS FROM COAL SEAM WELLS UNTIL 6/7/94.
texas - reduced rate (2.3\%) andor abatement for tertiary recovery projects amd tight formation proouction.
wyoming - stripper oil and tertiary recovery at 4\% severance tax rate.
UTAH: SIRIPPER OIL AND GAS PROOUCTION IS EXEMPT FROM SEVERANCE TAX.
(3) does not consider states with minimum tax.

OIL and GAS PRODUCTION TAXES
on WORKING INTEREST REVENUE
(Combined State and Local)
NORTH DAKOTA v. MONTANA
(in percentage)


GAS:

| Regular (1) | 5.0 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stripper (< 60 Mcfpd) |  |  |  |
| First 30 Mcf | 5.0 | 10.7 | 10.7 |
| Next 30 Mci | 5.0 | 12.29 | 12.29 |
| New Production (2) |  |  |  |
| Initial Period | 5.0 | 3.35 | .7 |
| Following Periods | 5.0 | 15.35 | 15.35 |

(1) Regular is defined as wells completed prior to: 4/27/87 in North Dakota; 7/1/85 in Montana
(2) New production and tax incentive periods are defined as:

North Dakota $=$ Well completed after 4/26/87, tax incentive for first 15 months.
Montana $=$ Well completed after 6/30/85, tax incentive for first 24 months for severance tax, first 12 months for local tax.

SLMME T:XAION


March 16, 1991

Honorable Senator Gage 52nd Legislature
Helena, Mt.
Re: Senate Bill \# 373
Revise Taxation of Oil and Gas
Dear Sir:
I have read through your bill. I have very little experience or expertise in the finance of counties or school districts so will not comment of these portions of the bill. I am the president of Croft Petroleum Co., of Cut Bank, and do have some expertise on the production of and exploration for oil and gas in Montana.

The oil and gas industry in this state relies heavily on out of state sources of money for exploration. In order to attract this ouside funding we must compete with the tax treatment on oil and gas production of other states and nations. In this regard it would be nice to point out to potential investors that the state openly seeks investment here by giving tax holidays on the first year or two of production. Not only that but if the well is small the state will decrease it's tax bite. Such things really do not cost the state much money and they go a long way towards reversing the terrible tax image the state has amoung oil and gas companies.

Due to these reasons I support your bill and feel it would benefit the State of Montana and the oil and gas industry.

# W. M. VAUGHEY,JR. <br> P.O. BOX 46 <br> HAVRE, MONTANA 59501-0046 <br> (406) 265-5421 <br> TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SB 373, THE NEW PRODUCTION AND STRIPPER TAX INCENTIVE BILTL 

## TO BE HEARD BY SENATE TAXATYON COMMITTEE MÁRCH 18. 1991

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Senate Taxation Committee:

My name is Bill Vaughey. I am an independent producer primarily of natural gas. I came to the state in 1968 the result of the discovery the year previous of Tiger Ridge Gas Field, now our state's largest, lying south of Havre and Chinook on the north flank of the Bear paw Mountains.

Those of' us who produce gas in this area and sell that gas to Northern Natural Gas enjoy the unusual situation of having the wellhead taxes we pay on production reimbursed us by the transmission company. Despite that personal situation, $I$, as several Committee members may remember, was a leader in an effort during the 1985 session to revolutionize the tax environment Montana offers the exploration dollar by passage of two key measures during that session. I'm proud to say that Sen. Mazurek and then Rep. Harp carried one of the two flagship bills that were involved. I took part in this 1985 effort through knowledge that our state, at least since the 1950 's, had in every way imaginable discouraged expenditure in Montana of the exploration dollar, 95 cents of which has always come from outside the state. Something needed to be done if Montana was ever to really get in the oil and gas business.

I had my own personal example to look to. In 1978, I saw the need to balance my gas production by using my Montana-gas-generated income to seek oil production, I chose to do so in the state of Alabama, where the total tax burden on production is 8\%. This contrasts with the total tax burden on oil in our state of $12.7 \%$ if SB 373 is passed by your Committee and ultimately becomes law.

I would submit that it must be passed if Montana is to stay in the oil and gas exploration picture and see its tremendous potential as a large petroleum producer realized.

Again in this connection $I$ can relay a personal story. The result of the pro exploration measures passed during the 1985-87 legislatures, I for the first time ventured outside the Bear paw Mountain Area to wildcat for oil and'gas in Montana. For the first time $I$ utilized investment dollars of oil producers who live outside the state because for the first time $I$ was able to show them a tax environment that at least approached being competitive with other producing states. Initial announcement of that program is described in the attached news article.
W. M. Vaughey, Jr.
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Ultimately, in excess of $\$ 500,000$ was expended in leasing land, purchasing seismic information and then drilling the five wildcats in Teton and Ponder Counties that comprised the program. While sad to say all five wells proved to be dry holes, each potentially could have each discovered a sizeable oil field, and in the meantime every dollar of the half million involved went through the hands of Montana working men and women. That's a small story, but it's an apocryphal one. Despite depressed crude oil prices in 1986 and beyond, my industry was just beginning to respond in large measure to the new tax environment our legislature had passed.

SB 373 merely replaces a measure that has been in place since the ' 85 session. It will be nothing less than a tragedy for the state if this bill does not ultimately become law. I urge your Committee's support of SB 373 .



| 1989 (in 000) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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[^0]Senator Mike Halligan, Chairman<br>Senate Taxation Committee<br>Montana State Legislature<br>Helena, Montana<br>Dear Senator Halligan,<br>Please submit the following testimony into the record, in support of SB 373:

Mr. Chairman and Taxation Committee Members,
My name is Lynnette Hintze, and I work as executive director for the Greater Richland County Economic Development Corporation, which serves Sidney and the surrounding communities in Richland County. Richland County is located in the Williston Oil Basin, and has been the target of much oil and gas exploration in years gone by, particularly in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Our Corporation feels that SB 373 will help to encourage the oil and gas industry to begin reinvesting in Montana. Poor economic conditions in eastern Montana could be lessened if oil activity picked up again, and this legislation makes a valiant attempt to offer much-needed incentives.

We support the bill's exemption of new production of oil and gas for 24 months, and because there is increased interest in horizontal drilling recently, we particularly support the portions of SB 373 that deal with incentives for secondary recovery projects and horizontally drilled wells.

The State of Montana has been sending mixed signals to the oil industry for years. The time has come to correct past mistakes, offer competitive, luring incentives, and get oil and gas exploration and production going again in Montana.

Please vote Yes for SB373. Thank you.

WITNESS STATEMENT
To be completed by a person testifying or a person who wants their testimony entered into the record.
Dated this 18 th day of March_, 1991.
Name: Kew Williams
address: 16 E.Gravite (Frtech)
Butte, MT
Telephone Number: $482-4233$
Representing whom?
Entech
Appearing on which proposal?

$$
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$$

Do you: Support? $\qquad$ Amend? $\qquad$
Oppose?
Comments:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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Name: Jerry Croft
address: Mex 1156
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$\qquad$ Oppose? $\qquad$
Comments:


Calculate, administer-
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$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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Dated this $f 8$ day of Mare, 1991.
Name: WILLIAM W. BHCLARD
Address: $\frac{\frac{13 \Delta Y 20170}{B 11 L 1 N 6 S}}{}$
Telephone Number: 259.7860
Representing whom?
BALCRON OIL
Appearing on which proposal?
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Comments:
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To be completed by a person testifying or a person who wants their testimony entered into the record.
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Representing whom?
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Dated this 18 day of MARCN 1991.
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