

TESTIMONY OF DALE PITTMAN
ON PROPOSED CSHB 110
TO THE ALASKA HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
March 23, 2011

Mister Chairman, members of the committee:

For the record, my name is Dale Pittman. I am the Alaska Production Manager for ExxonMobil, based in Anchorage. I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to express ExxonMobil's views regarding the Committee Substitute to HB 110, the Governor's proposed amendments to Alaska's oil and gas production tax or ACES.

Let me start by saying that Alaska has been and continues to be an important component of ExxonMobil's world-wide investment portfolio. We have had a presence in Alaska for over 50 years and have been a key player in Alaska's oil industry development, investing over \$12 billion dollars to date. We are the operator of Point Thomson, hold the largest working interest at Prudhoe Bay (36.4%) and the largest lease holder of discovered Alaska gas resources. We expect to be involved in Alaska for many years to come and will continue to evaluate potential development opportunities.

At the outset, so our position is clear, let me say that ExxonMobil supports the presentation you heard today from the Alaska Oil and Gas Association. I do not intend to repeat the thorough technical comments from that testimony.

As for our specific comments, I would like to state, consistent with our prior testimony during the hearings on both the PPT and ACES, and on the proposed tax reform legislation last session, that ExxonMobil believes the changes made to Alaska's oil and gas production tax since 2005 have had a negative impact on business activity in Alaska and Alaska's overall investment climate. Alaska's current production taxes are simply too high to stimulate the additional investment required to fully develop Alaska's oil and gas resources.

It is for this reason ExxonMobil is pleased to see that the Administration recognizes the need for material change to Alaska's current oil and gas production tax system. We are encouraged by Governor Parnell's desire to see increased investments and further oil and gas development. We support his efforts to reform ACES and believe CS HB 110 is a good first step towards what we hope is a thorough review and revision of Alaska's production tax regime to allow the state to fully develop its vast resources.

ExxonMobil supports CS HB 110, and if enacted in its current form, we would expect investment activity in Alaska to increase, resulting in a corresponding benefit of more work for Alaskans. With passage of the Governor's proposed changes to ACES in its current form, we anticipate that industry will reexamine the inventory of Alaska North Slope opportunities and move forward with those projects that are made competitive by the reduced production tax burden. For

example, the proposed enhanced in-field drilling tax credits and reduction to the progressivity tax would allow us to consider additional drilling and well work activity at the Prudhoe Bay Unit. This kind of developmental drilling in the core field on the North Slope is critical to Alaska's future, particularly over the next five to ten years. Production decline must be stemmed until new developments can be discovered, progressed and brought on production.

While the enhanced in-field drilling tax credits and reduction to the progressivity tax are much needed revisions to ACES, we would urge earlier effective dates to accelerate the resulting ramp up in investment activity, Alaskan jobs and future state revenues.

However, merely providing additional tax credits while keeping the overall effective rate of the ACES tax too high is not the long term solution to improving Alaska's investment climate. While the system of tax credits under ACES does provide significant incentives for investing in capital assets to explore for, develop, and produce more oil and gas, the deduction of lease expenditures or the allowance of a tax credit is simply part of the calculation about how much tax a producer owes. The bottom line is that, between PPT and ACES, the industry's production tax obligations have more than tripled over the past five years.

ExxonMobil supports the Governor's proposal as an important first step, but additional reform of ACES is needed.

Additional reforms are needed to improve Alaska's overall investment climate over the long term. Evaluation of a further reduction in the production tax rates should also be considered. Even with the Governor's proposal, Alaska's production taxes are high in comparison to other investment alternatives, making Alaska one of the most expensive states in which the oil and gas industry does business.

As you have heard in prior testimony or may have read in recent newspaper articles, spending on the North Slope has remained relatively flat since the enactment of ACES. But what needs to be clarified is that the majority of that investment has been for maintenance or production enhancement efforts for existing operations, not for new exploration and development opportunities that would bring on new production. It is also worth noting that costs for this investment activity have gone up, so while some may argue there has been additional investment, it doesn't necessarily translate into more activity. For example costs to drill a well have increased over the years, so higher spend on drilling does not necessarily mean more wells are being drilled.

Alaska is currently producing approximately 600,000 barrels of oil per day from the North Slope. Industry currently invests more than \$1 billion per year just to

maintain current North Slope oil production decline at six to seven percent. Without that continued investment, the annual production decline would be in the range of 12 to 15 percent annually.

The Alaska Department of Revenue is forecasting the production from Alaska's currently producing fields to decline by 60,000 barrels of oil per day this year. It goes on to predict that current field production will decline to half of its current 600,000 barrels of oil per day rate in just seven years, a decline of over 300,000 barrels of oil per day. Allow me to put the challenge of stemming that decline in perspective.

Alaska's newest development, the Nikaitchuq field, began production early this year. The field has been more than six years in planning, development and construction and carries a total cost of over \$2 billion dollars. The field is forecasted to reach peak production of about 25,000 barrels per day four years from now. So using this as an example, it would take the startup of two to three Nikaitchuq equivalent fields every year in perpetuity just to hold North Slope production at 600,000 barrels of oil per day. Pioneer's Ooguruk field is another example. It would take three to four fields the size of Ooguruk every year to match the forecasted North Slope production decline.

Clearly, the current outlook for development falls far short, and new fields are urgently needed to stem this decline.

Such development will only occur if there is an improvement in the Alaska investment climate. Alaska production tax policy is key to fostering a favorable investment climate.

Alaska's overall high production tax rates discourage investment. Companies like ExxonMobil are willing to accept the risks of long-term, capital intensive investments when there is a stable and competitive tax structure that encourages investment and ensures a corresponding opportunity for upside potential. When you take away the upside potential through a high progressivity tax you reduce the overall attractiveness of those capital intensive investments, which in turn could lead to reduced investment and resource recovery and, in the long-term, diminished state revenues. Let me reemphasize this point, while higher taxes may bring additional revenues in the short-term, it's reasonable to anticipate that any reduction in investment will decrease production and significantly reduce those revenues in the longer term.

As many of you heard me testify last year, time in the oil and gas industry is not measured in business cycles. It is measured in decades and in generations. Today's production rates are the product of government policies, technical work, and investment decisions made years ago. Increasing production rates in the decades to come will be a direct result from sound policies, decisions, and commitments that are made today. The Governor's proposed ACES changes

are clearly a significant step in the right direction towards much needed reform of Alaska's high oil and gas production tax system.

Alaska needs a long-term resource development policy that will encourage increasing investment to maximize its resource potential while receiving a fair share of the resource revenues; addressing its high level of government take is a start. The reform of ACES needs to result in a competitive, stable and predictable fiscal environment that will encourage investment, recognize that the remaining resources are economically challenged, including both new fields and resource development opportunities in existing fields. The primary driver of Alaska's long-term resource development policy should be to maximize the development of its resource base, not just maximize short-term state revenues.

Let me conclude my testimony by reiterating that while we hope to continue to pursue investment opportunities in Alaska in the future, the resource and cost structure in Alaska is becoming increasingly challenging. Governor Parnell's proposed changes to ACES are a good start to needed fiscal reform - but more is still needed.

ExxonMobil looks forward to working with the Administration, the legislators, industry and the people of Alaska in the future pursuit and development of Alaska's oil and gas resources.

Thank you again Mister Chairman for the opportunity to testify today.

