

SB

112

SFIN

FILE

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

S.C. 3/27/96

DATE: 3/20/96

DATE TURNED INTO OFFICE: 3/27/96

The Finance Committee considered SENATE BILL NO. 112

Establishing a discovery royalty credit for the lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and making the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities.

and recommends:

- be replaced with _____ CS _____ (_____)
- adopt previous _____ CS SB 112 (RES)
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to the _____ Committee

- Senate Bill:**
- same title
 - new title
- House Bill:**
- same title
 - technical change
 - new: SCR# _____

SIGNING DO PASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	NR	DNP	AM
<i>David Wiley</i>	✓	<i>Steve Ruzja</i>	✓		
<i>Paul G. Hunt</i>	✓	<i>Bill E. ...</i>	✓		
<i>Bob ...</i>	✓				
Co-Chair: <i>...</i>	✓	Co-Chair:			
Co-Chair: <i>Rich Halford</i>	✓	Co-Chair:			

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department Date Zero Fiscal

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):*

Department Date Zero Fiscal

#3 Nat. Resources	3/22/96		91.0

APPROPRIATION -- no fiscal note

*Include fiscal notes accompanying Governor's bill

FISCAL NOTE

REPORTED OUT OF

SFC 3/21/96

#3

STATE OF ALASKA

BILL NO. CSSB112(RES)

1996 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: Original Dept Affected: Natural Resources
 Title: An Act establishing a discovery royalty credit BRU: Resource Development
 for the lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and... Component: Oil & Gas Development
 Sponsor: Senate Resources
 Requestor: Senate Finance Component Serial No. 439

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02
PERSONAL SERVICES	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1008 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0

Estimate of any current year (FY96) cost: \$ none

POSITIONS

FULL-TIME	1	1	1	1	1	1
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill reinstates Discovery Royalty (which was repealed in 1969) as a means to reduce royalty payments under certain conditions for leases in Cook Inlet Sedimentary Basin.

It is apparent that the discovery royalty incentive has previously been geared toward frontier exploration. In frontier areas, the geologic risk of drilling an unsuccessful well is high, since little geological information is available to the operator prior to drilling. The element of risk was used by the state as an important yard stick for determining eligibility in some previous discovery royalty decisions in Cook Inlet. Cook Inlet was a frontier basin in the 1950's and 1960's. However, today, due to a long history of exploration and production, geologists consider Cook Inlet a mature petroleum province. Almost all wells drilled on state land in Cook Inlet are drilled in close proximity to other wells containing known oil or gas and should be considered step-out wells and not wildcat exploration wells. Step-out wells have relatively low exploration risk when compared to wildcat exploration wells.

Prepared by: Ken Boyd, Director Phone: 269-8800
 Division: Oil & Gas Date: 22-Mar-96
 Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 22-Mar-96
 Agency: Natural Resources

FISCAL ANALYSIS CSSB112(RES) continued...

Based on past experience, SB 112 will be very difficult to administer. Due to the issuance of pre-1970 conditional leases and the holding of other pre-1970 leases by unitization, the state has many current leases that still have a contractual right to a discovery royalty under the repealed program. As of January 1995, the state has 340 active leases that currently retain the discovery royalty provision, and the Division of Oil and Gas still actively manages the program. Under the previous discovery royalty program, thirteen applications were made for wells in Cook Inlet Basin, eight of which were granted and five were denied. Many of these applications were granted or denied only after years of litigation.

Although SB 112 attempts to eliminate many of the administrative problems with the old discovery royalty program, certain significant problems are inherent with both the repealed program and SB 112. These problems were recognized as far back as 1962 and remain today. It is doubtful that new regulations could eliminate the problems faced in the earlier program.

It is unlikely that the Division can draft regulations under the time constraints imposed by the bill.

Analysis of discovery royalty applications is a very time consuming process and will require the addition of one Petroleum Geologist.

**THE FOLLOWING PAGES MAY NOT
FILM LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF THE
POOR QUALITY OF THE ORIGINAL**

Discovery Royalty Provision

DATE: 01/15/75
 FILE: 1117103...

STATE OF ALASKA
 DEPT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

FILE	TYPE	FILE NUMBER	LEAD	ACREAGE	ACRES	UNIT CODE	UNIT DESCRIPTION
1	ADL	500	1	895,010		E	KENAI RIVER
1	ALL	599✓	1			FC	FALLS CREEK
1	ALL	598	1	985,300		KE	KENAI RIVER
1	ALL	591	1	281,720		BE	KENAI RIVER
1	ALL	700	1	40,000		NF	NORTH FORK
1	ALL	2095	0	200,000		NF	NORTH FORK
1	ADL	2097	0	136,070		CL	CANNERY LOOP
1	ALL	2111	1	100,720		BE	KENAI RIVER
1	ADL	2127	1	55,150		ST	STEARLING
	ALL	2175	1				NOT IN TABLE
	ALL	3127	1				NOT IN TABLE
	ALL	151	1				NOT IN TABLE
2	ALL	17577	1	1,210,000		TS	TRADING BAY
	ALL	17580	1	170,000		CC	NICOLA CREEK
	ALL	17584	2			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
	ALL	17587	1			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
	ALL	17589✓	1	1,175,000		NI	NORTH COOK INLET
	ALL	17592	1	1,090,000		NI	NORTH COOK INLET
	ALL	17597	1	1,011,110		BR	SELUGA RIVER
	ALL	17591✓	1	1,050,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ADL	17595✓	2			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ADL	17597	1	560,000		NT	NORTH TRADING BAY
	ALL	17598✓	1	181,000		NC	NICOLA CREEK
	ALL	17599✓	1	497,760		ER	ELUGA RIVER
1	ADL	17600	1	197,000		TR	TRUGA RIVER
				112,120		SL	STUMP LAKE
1	ALL	17602	1	540,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ALL	17606	1	886,000		BR	SELUGA RIVER
1	ALL	18715	1	1,010,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ALL	18717	1	1,000,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ALL	18770	1	1,000,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ALL	18771✓	1			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ALL	18770	1	100,000		NI	NORTH COOK INLET
1	ALL	18771	1	1,000,000		NI	NORTH COOK INLET
1	ALL	18772	1			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ALL	18773	1	100,000		SG	SOUTH MID GRD SHOAL
1	ALL	18774	1	1,000,000		SG	SOUTH MID GRD SHOAL
1	ALL	18751	1			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ALL	18753	1			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ALL	18758	1	100,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ALL	18761✓	1			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ALL	18770	1	1,000,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ALL	18771	1	100,000		NI	NORTH TRADING BAY
1	ALL	18777	1	750,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ADL	18790	0			NP	NONUNITIZED PRODUCING
1	ALL	21060	0	100,000		TS	TRADING BAY
1	ADL	21104	0	100,000		BR	SELUGA RIVER
1	ALL	21127	1	260,000		BR	SELUGA RIVER

✓ DR Granted
 Within Discovered Fields

ALASKA
GENERAL RESOURCES

ADDITIONAL ID	FILE	SECTION	ACQUISITION DATE	ACQ CODE	BIT DESCRIPTION
1	100	1000	1950.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
2	100	1000	1951.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
3	100	1000	1952.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
4	100	1000	1953.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
5	100	1000	1954.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
6	100	1000	1955.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
7	100	1000	1956.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
8	100	1000	1957.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
9	100	1000	1958.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
10	100	1000	1959.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
11	100	1000	1960.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
12	100	1000	1961.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
13	100	1000	1962.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
14	100	1000	1963.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
15	100	1000	1964.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
16	100	1000	1965.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
17	100	1000	1966.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
18	100	1000	1967.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
19	100	1000	1968.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
20	100	1000	1969.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
21	100	1000	1970.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
22	100	1000	1971.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
23	100	1000	1972.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
24	100	1000	1973.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
25	100	1000	1974.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
26	100	1000	1975.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
27	100	1000	1976.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
28	100	1000	1977.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
29	100	1000	1978.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
30	100	1000	1979.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
31	100	1000	1980.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
32	100	1000	1981.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
33	100	1000	1982.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
34	100	1000	1983.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
35	100	1000	1984.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
36	100	1000	1985.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
37	100	1000	1986.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
38	100	1000	1987.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
39	100	1000	1988.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
40	100	1000	1989.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
41	100	1000	1990.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
42	100	1000	1991.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
43	100	1000	1992.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
44	100	1000	1993.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
45	100	1000	1994.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
46	100	1000	1995.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
47	100	1000	1996.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
48	100	1000	1997.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
49	100	1000	1998.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
50	100	1000	1999.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
51	100	1000	2000.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
52	100	1000	2001.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
53	100	1000	2002.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
54	100	1000	2003.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
55	100	1000	2004.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
56	100	1000	2005.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
57	100	1000	2006.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
58	100	1000	2007.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
59	100	1000	2008.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
60	100	1000	2009.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
61	100	1000	2010.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
62	100	1000	2011.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
63	100	1000	2012.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
64	100	1000	2013.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
65	100	1000	2014.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
66	100	1000	2015.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
67	100	1000	2016.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
68	100	1000	2017.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
69	100	1000	2018.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
70	100	1000	2019.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
71	100	1000	2020.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
72	100	1000	2021.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
73	100	1000	2022.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
74	100	1000	2023.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
75	100	1000	2024.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
76	100	1000	2025.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
77	100	1000	2026.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
78	100	1000	2027.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
79	100	1000	2028.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
80	100	1000	2029.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
81	100	1000	2030.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
82	100	1000	2031.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
83	100	1000	2032.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
84	100	1000	2033.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
85	100	1000	2034.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
86	100	1000	2035.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
87	100	1000	2036.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
88	100	1000	2037.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
89	100	1000	2038.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
90	100	1000	2039.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
91	100	1000	2040.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
92	100	1000	2041.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
93	100	1000	2042.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
94	100	1000	2043.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
95	100	1000	2044.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
96	100	1000	2045.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
97	100	1000	2046.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
98	100	1000	2047.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
99	100	1000	2048.000	10	UPANUK RIVER
100	100	1000	2049.000	10	UPANUK RIVER

FILE	FILE	NUMBER	DATE	AMOUNT	DATE	UNIT DESCRIPTION
100	100	20000	10		10	UNITIZED PRODUCT
100	100	20001	10		10	UNIT 10 TABLE
100	100	20002	10		10	UNIT 11 TABLE
100	100	20003	10		10	UNIT 12 TABLE
100	100	20004	10		10	UNIT 13 TABLE
100	100	20005	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 14 TABLE
100	100	20006	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 15 TABLE
100	100	20007	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 16 TABLE
100	100	20008	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 17 TABLE
100	100	20009	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 18 TABLE
100	100	20010	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 19 TABLE
100	100	20011	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 20 TABLE
100	100	20012	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 21 TABLE
100	100	20013	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 22 TABLE
100	100	20014	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 23 TABLE
100	100	20015	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 24 TABLE
100	100	20016	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 25 TABLE
100	100	20017	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 26 TABLE
100	100	20018	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 27 TABLE
100	100	20019	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 28 TABLE
100	100	20020	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 29 TABLE
100	100	20021	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 30 TABLE
100	100	20022	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 31 TABLE
100	100	20023	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 32 TABLE
100	100	20024	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 33 TABLE
100	100	20025	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 34 TABLE
100	100	20026	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 35 TABLE
100	100	20027	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 36 TABLE
100	100	20028	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 37 TABLE
100	100	20029	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 38 TABLE
100	100	20030	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 39 TABLE
100	100	20031	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 40 TABLE
100	100	20032	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 41 TABLE
100	100	20033	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 42 TABLE
100	100	20034	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 43 TABLE
100	100	20035	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 44 TABLE
100	100	20036	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 45 TABLE
100	100	20037	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 46 TABLE
100	100	20038	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 47 TABLE
100	100	20039	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 48 TABLE
100	100	20040	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 49 TABLE
100	100	20041	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 50 TABLE
100	100	20042	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 51 TABLE
100	100	20043	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 52 TABLE
100	100	20044	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 53 TABLE
100	100	20045	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 54 TABLE
100	100	20046	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 55 TABLE
100	100	20047	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 56 TABLE
100	100	20048	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 57 TABLE
100	100	20049	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 58 TABLE
100	100	20050	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 59 TABLE
100	100	20051	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 60 TABLE
100	100	20052	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 61 TABLE
100	100	20053	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 62 TABLE
100	100	20054	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 63 TABLE
100	100	20055	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 64 TABLE
100	100	20056	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 65 TABLE
100	100	20057	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 66 TABLE
100	100	20058	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 67 TABLE
100	100	20059	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 68 TABLE
100	100	20060	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 69 TABLE
100	100	20061	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 70 TABLE
100	100	20062	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 71 TABLE
100	100	20063	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 72 TABLE
100	100	20064	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 73 TABLE
100	100	20065	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 74 TABLE
100	100	20066	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 75 TABLE
100	100	20067	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 76 TABLE
100	100	20068	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 77 TABLE
100	100	20069	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 78 TABLE
100	100	20070	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 79 TABLE
100	100	20071	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 80 TABLE
100	100	20072	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 81 TABLE
100	100	20073	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 82 TABLE
100	100	20074	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 83 TABLE
100	100	20075	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 84 TABLE
100	100	20076	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 85 TABLE
100	100	20077	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 86 TABLE
100	100	20078	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 87 TABLE
100	100	20079	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 88 TABLE
100	100	20080	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 89 TABLE
100	100	20081	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 90 TABLE
100	100	20082	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 91 TABLE
100	100	20083	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 92 TABLE
100	100	20084	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 93 TABLE
100	100	20085	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 94 TABLE
100	100	20086	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 95 TABLE
100	100	20087	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 96 TABLE
100	100	20088	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 97 TABLE
100	100	20089	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 98 TABLE
100	100	20090	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 99 TABLE
100	100	20091	10	1,500.00	10	UNIT 100 TABLE

DATE: 03/15/75
 TIME: 11:27:20.1

STATE OF ALASKA
 DEPT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

FILE	FILE TYPE	FILE NUMBER	INDEED DATE	PARTICIPATION ACRES	UNIT CODE	UNIT DESCRIPTION
21	AGL	25557				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25558				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25559				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25560				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25561				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25562				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25563				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25564		569,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25565		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25566		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25571		2,240,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25576				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25577				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25578				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25579				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25580				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25581				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25582		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25583		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25584		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25585		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25586		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25590		1,250,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25594				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25595				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25596				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25597				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25598				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25599				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25603		1,150,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25604		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25606		1,000,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25607		1,500,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25608		2,240,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25610				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25615				NOT IN TABLE
21	AGL	25627		1,100,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25628		2,512,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25629		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25630		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25631		2,307,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25632		2,416,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25633		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25634		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25635		2,143,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25636		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25627		700,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25638		1,280,000	KU	FRUORGE BAY
21	AGL	25639		2,400,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER
21	AGL	25640		2,550,000	KU	KUPARUK RIVER

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
FOR DISCOVERY ROYALTY BY THE UNION
OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA AND
MARATHON OIL COMPANY (ADL 17594)

State of Alaska
Department of Natural Resources

OPINION IN SUPPORT OF DECISION

This decision concerns the application made by the Union Oil Company of California and Marathon Oil Company, co-lessees of state oil and gas lease ADL 17594, for discovery well certification of the Grayling No. 1-A well. On January 19, 1982, I issued a written decision confirming my November 13, 1981, determination which granted the application. This opinion contains my findings and conclusions which support the discovery royalty award to Union and Marathon.

In order to provide a context for the issues addressed by this decision, a chronological review of all pertinent events also will be presented. This review covers (1) the geologic evolution of Cook Inlet and the formation of the features which produced the hydrocarbons at issue, (2) antecedent federal laws and regulations concerning discovery royalties and geologic structures, (3) the laws and programs adopted by Alaska at statehood, (4) the leasing and development of Cook Inlet for oil and gas purposes, and (5) the sequence of discovery royalty applications and awards considered under the state discovery

royalty program. Finally, this decision will evaluate the Union-Marathon application and the issues pertaining to it.

I. INTRODUCTION.

On May 9, 1965, Union Oil Company of California and its partner, Marathon Oil Company ("Union-Marathon"), commenced a well, Trading Bay No. 1, in Cook Inlet on state lease ADL 18731. This well was plugged and abandoned the same day because the surface casing being set in the well parted. On May 10, Union commenced the Trading Bay No. 1-A well from the same location. At the time, the State of Alaska had an incentive program in the form of a discovery royalty to encourage oil and gas development in the state. A discovery royalty reduced the normal 12.5% royalty rate to 5% for ten years from the date of "discovery" for all production from the lease where a lessee had made the first discovery of commercial hydrocarbons on a new geologic structure. Sec. 18, Ch. 30, SLA 1964.^{*/} Union-Marathon's Trading Bay No. 1-A well encountered commercial quantities of oil in what became known as the Trading Bay Field. They were awarded a discovery

^{*/} The applicable law at the time was AS 38.05.180(a). The relevant provisions of this law were first enacted as subsection 7, section 3, article VIII, chapter 169, SLA 1959, which was amended by section 18, chapter 30, SLA 1964. Legislative amendment in 1967 currailed the discovery royalty program, which was abolished in 1969. 1967 Alaska Sess. L., ch. 91, § 2; 1969 Alaska Sess. L., ch. 65, § 1.

royalty for this lease by the Department of Natural Resources ("department") on August 27, 1965.

Union-Marathon, after further defining their Trading Bay discovery with two additional wells, moved their drilling barge approximately five miles south and commenced the Grayling No. 1 well on September 2, 1965. This well, too, was plugged and abandoned as a result of mechanical problems. The Grayling No. 1-A well was commenced immediately. Again, Union-Marathon found commercial quantities of hydrocarbons in what was to become known as the McArthur River Field. They filed an application for discovery royalty with the department on November 15, 1965, for state lease ADL 17594, which is adjacent to state lease ADL 18731.

It is at this point that the controversy giving rise to this decision began. Under the law, only one discovery royalty could be issued on any new geologic structure found to contain commercial hydrocarbons. 11 AAC 83.215(1) (repealed November 9, 1979).^{*/} The dispute has centered around whether the Trading Bay and McArthur River fields are separate geologic structures, which would permit discovery royalty certification of both the Trading Bay No. 1-A and Grayling No. 1-A wells, or are both part of a single dominant geologic structure, in which case approval of

^{*/} Formerly 11 AAC 505.745(a).

Union-Marathon's application on the Grayling No. 1-A well would not be permissible.

On January 26, 1966, the department issued a decision denying the Union-Marathon discovery royalty application for the Grayling No. 1-A well on the ground that insufficient information existed to determine that the Trading Bay and McArthur features were not part of a single structure. Specifically, department geologists were concerned that shallow productive sands might continuously overlap the larger Hemlock reservoirs on both features, even though the Hemlock zones appeared to be separated by a major fault system and displaced by more than 3,000 feet.

Although the scant geologic data at the time prevented a definitive conclusion on the overlap questions, discovery royalty regulations required that information in support of an application be filed within 90 days after the well had been tested for commercial quantities (which had taken place from November 6-8, 1965). 11 AAC 83.210(c) (repealed November 9, 1979).^{*/} The denial was based on the information submitted within that 90-day time frame.

On February 14, 1966, Union-Marathon petitioned the department for reconsideration and interpretation of its decision

^{*/} Formerly 11 AAC 505.744.

of January 26, 1966, denying the Grayling No. 1-A discovery royalty application. Their petition was made at least partially in response to encouragement from members of the department. Because of disagreement within the department over procedural and substantive questions relating to discovery royalties, no reply was given until October 31, 1968, at which point the commissioner granted Union-Marathon 60 days in which to submit more information. On December 30, 1968, Union-Marathon filed additional geologic information developed during the period since January 1966 and requested that the matter be set for hearing. On February 26, 1970, then natural resources commissioner Kelly established a hearing date of April 17, 1970, but notified Union-Marathon that only the information filed or developed within the original 90-day period would be considered. At the hearing, Union-Marathon submitted more new geologic information, and thereafter sent the commissioner a letter stating why he should consider the evidence acquired after the original 90-day period had expired. On October 7, 1970, Commissioner Kelly issued a decision denying Union-Marathon's application for the discovery royalty based on the evidence submitted within the 90-day period.

Union-Marathon then sought review in the superior court, which remanded the matter to the commissioner for a new decision, including a statement of the basis for the decision. On February 17, 1972, the commissioner reaffirmed his earlier

decision on the basis that insufficient information was submitted within the 90-day period to determine whether or not there were two separate structures. Union-Marathon again sought review in superior court. The court dismissed the appeal on grounds of lack of jurisdiction. Union-Marathon then appealed to the supreme court which reversed on the jurisdictional issue and remanded the case for further consideration. Union Oil Co. of Cal. v. State Dept. of Nat. Resources, 526 P.2d 1357 (Alaska 1974). On remand the superior court concluded that the commissioner of natural resources could not legally consider the after-acquired evidence and that the original decision was sustainable on the basis of the evidence submitted within the 90-day period. From that decision, entered July 31, 1975, Union-Marathon again appealed to the supreme court.

In its decision, dated February 10, 1978, the Alaska supreme court remanded certain questions relating to this application to the commissioner of natural resources for determination. Union Oil Co. of Cal. v. State, 574 P.2d 1266 (Alaska 1978). The threshold question was whether the 90-day limit of 11 AAC 505.744 (recodified as 11 AAC 33.210(c) (repealed November 9, 1979)) on submitting data regarding geologic structure was unreasonable as applied to Union and Marathon. If so, the commissioner was ordered to receive additional evidence regarding geologic structure and to rule on the application on the basis of all the data submitted.

In compliance with the supreme court's order, I first determined that the 90-day limitation, as applied to the applicants in this case, was unreasonable.*/ Thereafter, I received additional evidence concerning the issue of whether the Grayling 1-A well was the first discovery of oil or gas in a new geologic structure.

With the goal in mind of sustaining Commissioner Kelly's decision, several officials of the Alaska Department of Law (including then deputy attorney general Wilson L. Condon and then assistant attorneys general Susan A. Burke and Jeffrey B. Lowenfels) undertook an extensive effort to gather evidence which would challenge the validity of Union's and Marathon's claims. As part of this effort, they traveled extensively throughout the United States and conducted numerous interviews with federal officials employed by the United States Department of the Interior, including the United States Geologic Survey ("USGS"), who were intimately familiar with implementation of the federal discovery royalty program and the concept of a "known geologic structure of a producing oil and gas field" ("KGS"). Interviews were conducted with Interior official in Washington, D. C., and USGS officials in Langley, Virginia; Casper, Wyoming; Denver, Colorado; and Los Angeles, California. Among those federal officials interviewed was Emmett A. Finley, former chief of the Minerals Classification

* / See Part VI of this opinion.

Branch of USGS and author of USGS Circular 419, which purported to codify USGS practice in administering the KGS system. Interviews were also conducted within Alaska with state officials from the departments of Revenue and Natural Resources who were familiar with the state's discovery royalty program.

The Department of Law also compiled a glossary of all geologic terms relevant to the definition of the term "geologic structure" and prepared a comprehensive documentary history, in seven volumes, describing the development and administration of the discovery royalty provision of AS 38.05.180(a). Volume I (entitled "Summary of Documents") is a summary of their findings; it discusses certain federal oil and gas leasing practices (summarized in Section III of this opinion); describes the evolution of the Alaska Land Act and the Alaska oil and gas lease form (summarized in Section IV of this opinion); and traces the history of early oil and gas discoveries in the Cook Inlet region, the development of regulations governing discovery royalties, and the administration of those provisions with respect to applications for discovery awards on state leases in the Cook Inlet region (summarized in Section V of this opinion). Volume II describes the territorial and state administrative organization for the oil and gas from 1958 to 1970 (Appendix A), the evolution of the oil and gas lease form (Appendix B), and oil and gas development in the Cook Inlet region (Appendix C) and contains copies of the relevant affidavits (Appendix D). Volumes

III - VII are an extensive compilation of the correspondence and other documents which are summarized in Volume I.

Beginning March 13, 1980, I held a hearing to enable the applicants to submit additional evidence in support of their application. In preparation for that hearing, I had reviewed the following materials:

1. the Summary of Documents and appendices;
2. the documents referred to in the summary;
3. a videotape of a deposition of Emmett A. Finley and the exhibits submitted at that deposition;
4. the maps submitted in support of the applications for discovery certification of Union-Marathon's Trading Bay State No. 1-A well, Union-Marathon's Kustatan No. 1 and 1-A wells, Atlantic Richfield's West Foreland Unit No. 3 well, Texaco's Trading Bay No. 1 and 1-A wells, and the Grayling No. 1 and 1-A wells;
5. information submitted in support of the application for discovery well certification of Atlantic Richfield's Trading Bay State No. 1 well, including: the baroid mud log and dual induction laterolog submitted with the affidavit of

establishment of priority as to time and date on June 7, 1967; the materials submitted to the Oil and Gas Conservation Committee on September 27, 1967, to establish a separate geologic structure, including an evaluation of the mechanical logs (Exhibit 1), a structure contour map (Exhibit 2), a structural cross section -- A-A¹ (Exhibit 3), completion information drafted on an electric log (Enclosure 1), and a core analysis -- cores 1-10 (Enclosure 2); additional information supporting the application transmitted on December 30, 1968, including a structure contour map (Exhibit 1), an east-west cross section -- A-A¹ (Exhibit 2), and an east-west cross section -- B-B¹ (Exhibit 3); and exhibits presented at the hearing before the commissioner of natural resources on April 16, 1970, including a structural contour map of the Hemlock formation in the Trading Bay and North Trading Bay fields (Exhibit 1) and a structural contour map of the Hemlock formation showing producing trends in the Cook Inlet Basin (Exhibit 2);

6. all materials submitted by Union-Marathon through March 13, 1980, including the "blue box" and accompanying geologic reports; the light blue folders submitted at the April 17, 1970, hearing; and Volume III of the green folders, dated September 28, 1979, including the redrawn maps which were submitted later; and

7. all available information from Union-Marathon's Trading Bay State No. 2 and No. 3 wells which were drilled in the

late summer of 1965 and Union-Marathon's A-20 well drilled from their Monopod Platform on July 24, 1977.

Also in preparation for the hearing, I interviewed Tom Marshall, a petroleum geologist formerly employed by the state Oil and Gas Conservation Committee, regarding state administrative practices relating to discovery royalty applications and his understanding of Cook Inlet geology; William Van Alen, a petroleum geologist from the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, on the structural history of the Trading Bay area; and William Van Dyke, a reservoir engineer employed by the division of minerals and energy management, regarding his interpretation of the well data in state files and Union-Marathon's interpretation of that data as depicted in their exhibits.

At the hearing testimony was given by Thomas Wilson, Jr., who worked as a geologist for Marathon Oil Company and had participated in joint Union-Marathon exploratory work in the Cook Inlet area since 1958 (he discussed the results of Marathon's exploratory and drilling work in the Trading Bay and McArthur River fields from 1959 through 1965); Richard A. Lyon, who worked as the Alaska District Exploration Manager for the Union Oil Company from 1963 through 1966 (he gave his perceptions of Alaska's discovery royalty program and its impact on Union's early exploration efforts in Alaska); Robert C. Warthen, who worked as a geologist for Union Oil Company (he presented a

compilation of all geologic information collected in the area by Union and Marathon to date, including updated geologic information not previously submitted to the state); Kenneth Zerda, a reservoir engineer for Union Oil Company (he compared the reservoir characteristics of the McArthur River and Trading Bay fields); Gerould H. Smith, a geochemist employed by Union (he compared the geochemical characteristics of the oil found at Trading Bay with the oil found at McArthur River); Ed Hall, a geologist from Union (he presented maps he had prepared based on examples of KGSs he had collected from several USGS offices); Charles M. Schwartz, a geologist in charge of Union's exploration and production activities in Alaska (he compared the physical characteristics of the two fields and hypothesized regarding the structural growth of these areas); and Joseph David "Red" Cerkel, Jr., a retired geologist who had served as chief of the Minerals Classification Branch of the USGS. Tom Cook, then director of the division of minerals and energy management; K. Daniel Hinkle, Marathon Oil Company's attorney; and Arden Page and John Sedwick, Union Oil Company's attorneys, also attended the hearing.

On April 23, 1981, I took testimony from William Van Alen, who gave a presentation on the geologic history of the Cook Inlet sedimentary basin and formation of the ancestral Trading Bay anticline (summarized in Part II of this opinion) and Thomas R. Marshall, who discussed the application of the Greater Trading Bay Structure concept to the award of discovery royalties by the

Oil and Gas Conservation Committee. Also present were Assistant Attorney General Michael E. Arruda, Mr. Page, and Mr. Sedwick.

As a result of the efforts of the Department of Law and Union-Marathon, examination of the issues in this case was extremely thorough. For the reasons set forth in my decision, however, I determined that this matter should be resolved in favor of the applicants.

More specifically, I determined that there is sufficient subsurface information to determine that the McArthur River feature, on which the Grayling 1-A well is located, is not overlapped by the previously certified Trading Bay feature and, furthermore, is a separate geologic structure within the meaning of then applicable 11 AAC 83.200 and 11 AAC 83.205(2) (repealed November 9, 1979).^{*/} On this basis, the application for discovery well certification of the Grayling 1-A well was granted.

II. GEOLOGIC EVOLUTION OF THE COOK INLET SEDIMENTARY BASIN AND THE TRADING BAY AND MCARTHUR GEOLOGIC FEATURES.

The Trading Bay and McArthur River geologic features which are the subject of this case are located within the Cook Inlet sedimentary basin, a major oil and gas province.

^{*/} Formerly 11 AAC 505.74 and 11 AAC 505.741(b), respectively.

PAGES 13-22 ARE AVAILABLE FROM KEN BOYD, DNR/DO&G. THESE PAGES CONTAIN GEOLOGIC INFORMATION FROM THE EARLY JURASSIC PERIOD TO THE PLEISTOCENE PERIOD.

A SUMMARY OF THESE PAGES IS ON PAGE 23, WHICH FOLLOWS THIS PAGE.

II. Summary

In summary, the Cook Inlet Basin as we know it today began with the deposition of volcanoclastic materials (the Taikeetna formation) nearly 200 million years ago. Approximately 175 million years ago, sediments and organic matter were deposited in the Tuxedni Group, which became the source rock for most of the hydrocarbons in Cook Inlet. Over the succeeding 100 million years, additional coarse materials were deposited in the area which experienced the alternating uplift and subsidence, mountainous formation and folding conducive to generating the lateral and vertical compression and geothermal heat required for the formation of petroleum hydrocarbons in the Tuxedni source rock. At or slightly before the beginning of Tertiary time (65 million years ago) and thereafter, the area experienced (1) downwarping of the Cook Inlet trough exposing the westward and eastward ends of the Tuxedni source rock and forcing the migration of oil upwards; (2) the creation of the present day Alaska, Chugach and Kenai mountain ranges, creating a further depositional environment in Cook Inlet beginning with the Larimide revolution; (3) deposition of sedimentary materials constituting the West Foreland formation and the Kenai group, which became the reservoir rock formations receiving upward migrating oil from the exposed Tuxedni source rock; (4) general east-west folding of

stratigraphic layers in the Cook Inlet Basin caused by mountain formation and the underthrusting of the North Pacific Oceanic Plate, initially establishing north-south anticlines which became entrapping mechanisms for hydrocarbons and, through further foldings, steepening the flanks of those anticlines (including Trading Bay) to the point that reverse faulting occurred; (5) the counterclockwise rotational movement of the Alaskan (North American) Continental Plate and subjacent thrusting of the North Pacific Oceanic Plate causing right-lateral strike-slip faulting along major regional faults (for example, the Castle Mountain fault) and similar movements along subordinate faults (for example, the Bruin Bay and Trading Bay faults). The last of these forces caused the upper portion of what was once a single Trading Bay anticline to migrate eastward approximately three and one-half miles. Therefore, through the composite action of folding, reverse faulting, normal faulting and strike-slip faulting occurring over the past 25 million years, the Trading Bay anticline has evolved from a simple fold into a complex structure with the Trading Bay field portion offset from the McArthur River Field portion.

III. ANTECEDENT FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS.

Alaska statutes and regulations adopted at statehood provided for a discovery royalty to be awarded to a lessee that was the first to encounter commercial quantities of oil and gas

on a new geologic structure. Neither the concept of a discovery royalty nor of using the term "geologic structure" for oil and gas regulatory purposes was without precedent. The term "KGS" had been used by the USGS since 1920 to determine whether land would be leased competitively or noncompetitively for oil and gas purposes. From 1937 to 1958, the term "geologic structure" was used for purposes of establishing reduced royalties on noncompetitive leases under regulations implementing the Alaska Oil Proviso of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. ^{*/}

Therefore, the use by federal officials of the term "geologic structure" and the federal discovery royalty provide some background for interpretation of the provisions of Alaska law contested in this case.

^{*/} A discovery incentive program was initiated by the federal government in 1942 to encourage petroleum discoveries in the interest of national defense. This program, authorized by the so-called O'Mahoney Amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act on December 24, 1942, Pub. L. No. 832, Stat. 1080 (1942), placed a 12½ percent ceiling on royalty rates for discoveries of a "new oil or gas field or deposit." The amendment had the effect of reducing royalties on oil and gas production. The federal program was, in many ways, much easier to administer than the state's "new geologic structure" program because it was administered in a way that looked only to whether a discovery was made in a new "deposit." See Appendix 1. The concept of a separate field or deposit is much more easily defined than the concept of a separate geologic structure. The United States Department of the Interior never adopted specifications to administer this program until it was further amended in 1946. The six diagrams in Appendix 1 of this decision entitled "Possible Interpretations Under Act of December 24, 1942," clearly illustrate how the program was in fact administered.

A. Competitive-Noncompetitive Leasing Determinations.

In 1920 Congress passed the Federal Mineral Leasing Act, 41 Stat. 437 (1920), which was the organic statute governing oil and gas leasing in the United States. Under the act, land could be leased for oil and gas purposes either competitively or noncompetitively. The law required that land be leased competitively if it were located on a KGS. From then on, USGS geologists followed petroleum exploration activities in the United States, drawing and platting KGSs as new discoveries were made. Oil and gas rights to land not covered by a KGS could be obtained noncompetitively.

Although the USGS plotted hundreds of KGSs over the years after 1920, no regulations defining a KGS were adopted until 1970. In 1959, however, Emmett A. Finley authored a document entitled, "The Definition of Known Geologic Structures of Producing Oil and Gas Fields" (Circular 419).. This document was considered the principal reference in making KGS determinations.

B. Discovery Royalties.

The 1920 Federal Mineral Leasing Act also contained a section known as the "Alaska Oil Proviso." This section authorized the secretary of the United States Department of the

Interior to establish special lowered royalty rates on leases issued in the State of Alaska in order to encourage oil and gas development in this frontier area. Although regulations implementing the Alaska Oil Proviso were amended several times (which usually changed the lowered royalty formula), by 1950 they provided for payment of a 5% royalty (compared to the normal 12.5%) for ten years following the date of discovery by any lessee that made the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a new geologic structure. The Alaska Oil Proviso was virtually identical to a provision of the discovery royalty statute enacted by the Alaska legislature in 1959 except that the Proviso applied to noncompetitive land only. The Alaska Oil Proviso was repealed in 1958.

In summary, at the time of statehood, the term "known geologic structure" had been used by the USGS since 1920 to determine whether land would be leased competitively or non-competitively. During the same period, the term "geologic structure" had been used for purposes of awarding discovery royalties under the Alaska proviso, but on noncompetitive leases only.

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF A STATE DISCOVERY ROYALTY PROVISION.

Because the territorial government had no land to manage, territorial land officials had little experience with

land management, including oil and gas leasing. With the approach of statehood, these officials began the massive preparation necessary for the transition from territorial status and the problems which statehood would bring, including problems associated with the receipt of immediate title to 45 million acres of tide and submerged land and the selection of 103,350,000 acres of upland.

In order to assume their new responsibilities, territorial officials began developing programs for the selection, management, and disposal of state land and its resources. Special attention was given to the leasing and management of land containing oil and gas resources because of its potential for generating revenue for the cash-poor state. The major concern was development of a well-conceived leasing program which would avoid land speculation in areas of oil and gas potential.

During the two years before statehood, there was continued activity by territorial officials debating the provisions to be included in the Statehood and Alaska Land acts. Much of the discussion centered on the extent to which the state would competitively lease land with oil and gas potential. Although the territorial land board retreated from its initial proposal to competitively lease all sedimentary basins, their final proposal required competitive leasing on a broader scale than the federal act had. There also was considerable discussion regarding

adoption of a discovery royalty program by the state. The oil industry advocated its adoption on the ground that the federal royalty program had attracted the industry to Alaska in the first place.

The Alaska Land Act passed in 1959. Unlike the federal act which limited competitive oil and gas leasing to land containing a KGS, the state act required competitive leasing on land known or believed to contain oil or gas. The state act also contained a discovery royalty provision virtually identical to the terms of the Alaska Oil Proviso. Under this provision a lease holder that drilled and made the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a geologic structure could be rewarded by paying a discovery royalty of only five percent of the value of oil and gas extracted for the first ten years, after which the normal rate of 12½ percent was applicable. The new state oil and gas leasing form also contained a provision which repeated verbatim the discovery royalty provision included in the state act.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATE'S DISCOVERY ROYALTY PROGRAM IN THE COOK INLET REGION.

A. Early Leasing Activity.

Although Alaska received a large entitlement of land at statehood, this was a nonliquid asset. The state was cash poor

and unable to adequately operate the government and provide essential public services. To obtain the revenue needed to run the new state, state officials quickly began implementing programs which would generate cash from the land. High on their list of activities was oil and gas leasing, as evidenced by the quick succession of legislation (the Alaska Land Act was signed on May 2, 1959), regulations (effective September 15, 1959), and lease sales (the first was conducted in December of 1959).

From 1959 through 1966 the state conducted 17 competitive oil and gas lease sales. All major oil discoveries and most major natural gas discoveries in Cook Inlet were made on leases sold at the seventh and ninth lease sales (held on December 19, 1961 and in July of 1962, respectively). Virtually all subsequent discovery royalty determinations involved leases sold in these two sales.

Most land opened by the state for oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities in the upper Cook Inlet area was leased by a small number of oil companies in combination. Pan American Petroleum Corporation and its partners (the Pan American group) leased by far the greatest amount of acreage in the seventh and ninth competitive lease sales. The SRS group (consisting of the Shell Oil Company, the Richfield Oil Company, and the Standard Oil Company of California) acquired the second largest amount of acreage. Union Oil Company of

California and Marathon Oil Company, as partners, acquired four leases in these sales and a fifth by assignment. Union also acquired an interest in two other leases in partnership with Mobil. Texaco and Superior together obtained three leases. Atlantic Refining Company obtained eight leases.

B. Initial Exploratory Efforts Affecting Land in the Seventh and Ninth Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sales.

Given the large amount of land leased by the Pan Am group and the SRS group in the seventh and ninth competitive oil and gas lease sales and the close proximity of these leases to one another, it was likely that these two groups would compete for discovery royalty awards if oil or gas were found in the area. During the summer of 1962, even before the ninth lease sale was held, four wells (two by the Pan Am group and two by the SRS group) were commenced to test the potential of the leases in this area.

On May 15, 1962, the Pan American group spudded its Middle Ground Shoal State No. 1 well from a drilling barge on lease ADL 17595 in the area now known as the Middle Ground Shoal Field. This well blew out one week later while it was being drilled at a depth of 1,132 feet. It was brought under control on the same day. While being drilled at a depth of 5,216 feet,

the well blew out again upon encountering a high pressure gas zone. The well remained out of control for 45 days, and a large gas flow erupted through the inlet floor 700 feet from the well. During this period Pan Am pumped into the well 25,265 barrels of mud and lost circulation material, 16,480 sacks of cement, 975 sacks of Cal Seal, and a large quantity of diesel gel cement, topped off by burlap sacks, parachutes, gravel, sand, and sawdust. Finally, on July 25, 1962, the well was controlled. It was then plugged and abandoned.

On May 30, 1962, Shell, as operator for the SRS group, spudded a well, State No. 1, on lease ADL 17582. This well was drilled roughly halfway between what is now known as the Middle Ground Shoal Field and Cook Inlet Gas Field. The well was drilled to a depth of 14,401 feet and completed on September 14, 1962. Although shows of oil were found in various tests of the well, no commercial discovery was made.

On May 31, 1962, Pan Am, on behalf of the Pan Am group, spudded a second well, Cook Inlet State No. 1, on lease ADL 17589 in the area now known as the Cook Inlet Gas Field. While it was being drilled at a depth of 12,237 feet, this well also blew out. Because of the high volume and pressure of escaping hydrocarbons, the drilling barge had to move off the well and the escaping gas and oil had to be ignited. A relief well was spudded about 1,500 feet to the northeast one week later. The initial well continued

to blow ignited for almost fourteen months before it was finally controlled by pumping salt water down the relief well.

On April 19, 1962, at an onshore location on a federal lease adjacent to lease ADL 17599, the Standard Oil Company of California, as operator for the SRS group, spudded a well. The well was tested on December 1, 1962. On December 4, Standard announced that it had discovered what became known as the Beluga River Gas Field.

C. Development of the Discovery Royalty Regulations.

The drilling of the four wells described above led representatives of the Pan Am group and the SRS group to ask the department about the policies and procedures for making discovery royalty awards. The state, as lessor, and the oil companies, as lessees, were all faced with the same problem: neither the statute authorizing discovery royalty awards, the regulations adopted to implement the statute, nor the state lease form defined what was meant by the terms "first discovery," "commercial quantities," or "geologic structure."

The need to define the terms "first discovery" and "commercial quantities" was brought to a head by the advent of Pan Am's two blowouts. This situation made plain that the state had implemented a discovery royalty program without adequately

considering the practical problems which materialize after a program is put into practice. After four wells had been drilled, the department began to attempt to untangle the confusion which the lack of specifics in the regulations had created. There followed extensive exchanges of memoranda, position papers, and other communications among members of the department, oil companies, and the Western Oil and Gas Association as they attempted to work out acceptable solutions. Concurrently, Pan American applied for discovery royalty awards for leases covered by the two wells that had blown out the previous summer, and SRS applied for a discovery royalty for the gas discovery in their Beluga River well (Appendix 4 summarizes all state discovery royalty applications in Cook Inlet). While the department did not want to make hasty discovery royalty awards, state officials were also concerned that drilling races would result from the department's failure to answer essential questions on discovery royalty awards where there was mixed ownership of leases over a potential structure.

Further confusion occurred within the department because of differing views on the problems caused by the absence of detailed discovery royalty regulations. While aware of the problems relating to the definitions of "first discovery," "commercial quantities," and "geologic structure," the commissioner's office was also concerned about whether a discovery royalty award applied to all production from within the lease, all production from only a particular pool or interval, or all production from within the exterior boundaries of the discovery structure on the lease.

On January 15, 1963, the department issued a decision granting Pan Am's application for the Middle Ground Shoals well on state lease ADL 17595 (for the structure only). (A map prepared by the Union Oil Company which accompanied the testimony of E.A. Hall and illustrates federal and state discovery royalty awards generally is attached to this opinion as Appendix 2.) The award was contested by SRS. Concurrently, the Western Oil and Gas Association was urging the department to define discovery royalty terms by regulations in a manner which would clear up any misunderstandings.

Subsequently, department officials conducted hearings on proposed discovery royalty regulations. These hearings were characterized by acrimony and disagreement between oil companies and other organizations. Although most of the discussion concerned the meaning of the term "first discovery" (because of Pan Am's two blowout wells), there was also some discussion of the definition of "geologic structure," although a factual dispute involving this term had not yet arisen.

A hearing was held in June of 1963 to consider new department draft regulations put out at the end of May. After the hearing some revisions were made. The final regulations were filed in July and became effective in August. Those regulations read as follows:

505.73 Royalty.

The royalty rate on production under competitive leases will be fixed in the lease form for each lease offer and shall not be less than 12 1/2 percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the leased lands, except as provided in Section 505.74.

505.74 Discovery Lease.

Any operator who by time and date first encounters sufficient evidence of oil and/or gas in a particular geologic structure covered by any State oil and gas lease to cause said operator diligently to continue in good faith testing, reworking, drilling or other operations on said lease, whether in the same hole or other holes, in an effort to establish production of oil and/or gas in the same structure shall be qualified for a discovery well certification under the terms of said state lease should he complete a well and establish production in commercial quantities in the same zone in which oil and/or gas was first encountered.

505.741 Definitions.

With regard to regulations 505.74 through 505.748 and applicable provisions in State leases, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated.

(a) "Discovery" shall be the first acceptable evidence in a drilling well of the existence of oil and/or gas which can be produced in commercial quantities after well completion.

(b) "Geologic Structure" shall be any structural and/or stratigraphic entrapping mechanism containing one or more intervals, zones, strata, formations, or fault blocks which has the necessary physical characteristics to accumulate and prevent the escape of oil and/or gas. It is intended that the meaning shall be similar to that as used by the United States Geological Survey in the administration of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437) as amended.

(c) "Completed Well" shall be a well which is cased, controlled and in which all underground work in connection therewith has been finished and such well is capable of producing oil and/or gas.

(d) "Commercial Quantities" shall be those amounts of oil and/or gas which after well completion would appear to a reasonable and prudent operator to be sufficient to recover ordinary costs of drilling, completing and producing an additional well on the same geologic structure at an offset location with a reasonable profit to the operator, if a market were available.

(e) "Committee" shall be the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Committee composed of the Director of Mines and Minerals (Chairman), the State Petroleum Geologist, the State Petroleum Engineer and the Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources or his designee.

505.742 Establishment of Priority as to Time and Date.

To establish priority as to time and date of discovery, an operator must furnish the Committee with a sworn statement substantiating evidence, acceptable to the Committee, that oil and/or gas has been encountered in sufficient showing to cause a reasonable and prudent operator to conduct further operations in an effort to complete a well in the discovery zone so that such well can be tested for potential oil and/or gas production in commercial quantities. Such statement must include the time and date of first discovery, the exact location of the well concerned, the precise interval of discovery and the Alaska Division of Lands lease number on which said well is located. Such statement should be furnished to the Committee as soon as possible, but not later than thirty (30) days after the date claimed for the discovery.

505.743 Establishment of Commercial Quantities.

To establish and prove oil and/or gas in commercial quantities, operator must: (a) Conduct a potential test of the discovery

zone within one year after completion of a discovery well. (b) Notify the Committee or its designated representative five days in advance of such scheduled potential test and furnish transportation (if requested) for a designated representative of the Committee to witness such test. The Committee may at its option or at the option of its designated representative waive the witnessing of the test and require sworn evidence to establish results of said test. Any such sworn evidence shall be delivered to the Committee or its designated representative within thirty (30) days after such test.

505.744 Establishment of Geologic Structure.

To establish the geologic structure from which the oil and/or gas can be produced, the operator must furnish pertinent data to the Committee which will enable it to determine the geologic structure from which the oil and/or gas is being produced. This may include but is not limited to, geophysical data, total depth, casing records, perforation data, electric logs, drilling and mud logs, core analyses, sample cuttings and sample logs, and the operator's interpretation thereof, together with any other records and interpretations the operator deems pertinent. This data must be supplied within ninety (90) days after the date of the potential test as required in Section 505.743. All such data submitted shall be held confidential for a period of 24 months unless written authorization from the operator for the release of same is secured.

505.745 Certification After Compliance and Application.

After compliance with Sections 505.742 through 505.744 inclusive, the operator may apply to the Director for discovery well certification. Within ten (10) days of receipt of such request the Director will publish notice of such application allowing thirty (30) days for any interested party to object to or protest the application. If no protest or objection is received by the Director, the Director will, within seventy (70) days after the receipt of an application, either certify the well as in (a) or

deny the application as in (c) of this section. If any protest or objection is made it must be submitted in writing to the Director within the specified thirty (30) day period. After receipt of said protest or objection the Director will advertise and hold an open public hearing in accordance with the Alaska Land Act (AS 38.05) and in accordance with the Alaska Administrative Procedures Act (AS 44.62.300 - AS 44.62.630). Within thirty (30) days after such hearing the Director will do one of the following.

(a) Certify the well in question a first discovery well which has established oil and/or gas in commercial quantities in (name geologic structure) as of (time) on (date), and specify the date of commencement of the 10 year 5 per cent discovery royalty term which date shall be the first of the next succeeding month from the established date of initial discovery. After discovery well certification, no other well, regardless of when drilled, shall be eligible for consideration for certification as to the same geologic structure.

(b) Continue the hearing at a later specified date.

(c) Deny the application for discovery well certification.

505.746 Cancellation.

At any time after discovery well certification should any information supplied to the Committee be later proven false or erroneous and such information would affect the decision of the Director to the extent that the original application for certification would have been denied on such basis, the certification shall be immediately revoked. Such action also may be taken when it is determined that error was caused by failure to disclose full and complete knowledge available to the operator at the time of application for certification. After such certification is revoked royalty payment of 7 1/2 per cent on production theretofore shall be immediately due and payable and 12 1/2 per cent royalty on all subsequent production shall be paid. Should the royalty due not be paid on demand, the State shall take legal steps to cancel the lease involved.

505.747 Termination.

In the event of the termination of a discovery lease for any cause, the 5 per cent discovery royalty terminates and will not be allowed or reinstated on the same geologic structure.

505.748 Five Per Cent Discovery Royalty.

A "First Discovery Well Certification" shall secure the 5 per cent royalty rights for the holder of the State lease on which such well is located on all production from all zones, strata, formations and structures under and within the exterior boundaries of said lease. If at any time before or after discovery well certification, the State lease on which such well is located is subject to or made a part of any development unit, pooling or consolidation contract, the 5 per cent discovery royalty rate shall apply only to the production allocated to said lease under such agreement.

In 1973 the state's discovery royalty regulations were recodified. 11 AAC 84.152 -- 11 AAC 84.168 were the discovery royalty provisions applicable to competitive leases and 11 AAC 84.407 -- 11 AAC 84.422 were the discovery royalty provisions applicable to noncompetitive leases. In 1974 these two sets of regulations were combined into one set of discovery royalty provisions generally applicable to all oil and gas leases, 11 AAC 83.200 -- 11 AAC 83.230. These regulations were repealed on November 9, 1979.

D. The Dispute Between Pan Am and Shell Over the Middle Ground Shoal Discovery Royalty Award.

In May of 1963 the SRS group spudded a well in the Middle Ground Shoal area immediately to the south of the lease on which Pan Am had drilled the gas blowout the previous year and for which Pan Am and its partners had been awarded a discovery royalty in January. The first day the new regulations on discovery royalties were in effect, SRS filed an affidavit of first discovery based on encountering oil sands in various intervals in the area. Their application was denied by the department in December of 1963.

SRS requested reconsideration by the department and concurrently filed a document claiming that Pan Am's discovery award was not valid because the well was a blowout and, therefore, ought to be revoked. Several documents were filed on both sides.

The department issued a decision in May of 1965 upholding the original discovery royalty award to Pan Am and denying Shell's petition. This matter was then appealed to the courts. In 1969 the Alaska supreme court upheld the department's decision. Pan American Petroleum Corp. v. Shell Oil Co., 455 P.2d 12 (Alaska 1969).

E. Discovery Royalty Awards for North Cook Inlet, Jeluga River, and Falls Creek.

1. North Cook Inlet award.

On November 12, 1962, the date Pan American had applied for discovery award for the Middle Ground Shoal No. 1, Pan Am also applied for a discovery award on ADL 17589 on the basis of the Cook Inlet No. 1 blowout. The department decided not to act on this application until after the discovery royalty regulations went into effect.

In August of 1963 (after the new regulations became effective), Pan Am was informed that a potential test to verify the existence of commercial quantities would be required. No testing was possible until the summer of 1964.

In the interim Shell protested any award of discovery benefits to Pan Am for the Cook Inlet No. 1 well and spudded a well on the lease immediately to the north of the lease where Pan Am had drilled the Cook Inlet No. 1 and No. 1-A wells.

In June and July of 1964, the Cook Inlet No. 1-A well was tested by Pan Am. In December of 1964, Pan Am was granted a discovery royalty for lease ADL 17589 based on the discovery made in the Cook Inlet No. 1 well and the potential test of the Cook Inlet No. 1-A well.

2. Beluga River and Falls Creek awards.

The SRS group had requested a discovery royalty in December of 1962 in conjunction with its Beluga discovery. Action on this request was initially delayed because the commissioner of natural resources believed that the Beluga discovery might be on the same structure as Pan Am's North Cook Inlet blowout. The SRS group contended, however, that it had an automatic right to an award because the state had recognized the Beluga discovery for the purpose of reclassifying adjoining state upland acreage from noncompetitive to competitive. There was an exchange of information between the department and the SRS group over this application at the same time as the deliberations on the adoption of the discovery royalty regulations were occurring.

In May of 1963 the SRS group applied for a discovery royalty for lease ADL 00590 on the basis of the gas discovery made in the Falls Creek Unit Number 1 well in April of 1961. When the department decided to defer action on both the Falls Creek and Beluga River applications until after the discovery royalty regulations were adopted, The SRS group objected that it was being treated unfairly.

In September and October of 1963, the SRS group reapplied for Beluga discovery certification. It was awarded on the same day that the SRS application for the Middle Ground Shoal oil discovery was denied.

In December of 1963 an application was submitted for the Falls Creek lease. It was processed under the new regulations, and a discovery royalty award was made on February 18, 1964.

F. Application for and Award of Discovery Royalty Certifications in the Trading Bay, McArthur River, and Nicolai Creek Areas.^{*/}

1. Introduction.

In 1965, for the first time, offshore wildcat wells were drilled along the west shore of Cook Inlet on leases issued during the seventh and ninth competitive lease sales. Mobil and Union drilled the Granite Point No. 1 well on Lease ADL 18761 from April 5, 1965, to August 5, 1965. The well resulted in discovery of the Granite Point oil field. The companies applied for a discovery royalty for the lease, which was awarded on September 14, 1965.

^{*/} A map depicting the top of the Hemlock geologic formation and illustrating applications for discovery royalty awards in the Trading Bay and McArthur River areas is attached to this opinion as Appendix 3. Appendix 2 should be referenced to locate the Nicolai Creek area for which a discovery royalty award was also sought.

During this same drilling season Union (on behalf of itself and its co-lessee, Marathon) drilled four wells in the Trading Bay-McArthur River area. These wells and others which followed encountered oil in almost every instance in reservoirs contained in the Hemlock formation, which also contained the major oil reservoirs in the Middle Ground Shoal and Swanson River fields.

A number of exploratory wells were drilled in the Trading Bay-McArthur River area during the 1966 drilling season. Filings for five of these wells were made with the state, which initiated the discovery royalty certification process.

2. Application for and award of a discovery royalty certification for the Union Trading Bay No. 1-A well.

On May 9, 1965, Union, on behalf of itself and Marathon, spudded the first well on lease ADL 18731. The well (Trading Bay No. 1) was drilled to a depth of 747 feet. The casing parted at a depth of 126 feet while it was being set in the well, and the well was plugged and abandoned. On May 23, 1965, Union spudded another well from the same location, Trading Bay No. 1-A. In drilling this well Union discovered oil in the Trading Bay field. The well was completed at a depth of 6,832 feet on June 25, 1965.

Union and Marathon applied for a discovery royalty for lease ADL 18731 based on this discovery. The department found that Union and Marathon had adequately established a discovery date of May 23, 1965, and that the potential test conducted on June 17, 1965, had established that the Trading Bay No. 1-A well was capable of producing commercial quantities. The department also found that the Trading Bay feature was a separate structure. The application for this discovery award was processed and certified on August 27, 1965.

3. Application for a discovery royalty certification of the Grayling No. 1-A well.

Union and Marathon drilled two more wells from locations on lease ADL 18731 after the Trading Bay No. 1-A discovery. In the late summer of 1965 the drilling barge which had been used to drill these wells was moved to lease ADL 17594 immediately to the south, also a Union-Marathon lease. Union commenced the Grayling No. 1 well here on September 2, 1965. As a result of mechanical problems encountered in the early stages of drilling, the well had to be plugged and abandoned at a depth of 817 feet.

Grayling No. 1-A was commenced immediately and tested for commercial quantities from November 6 to November 8, 1965. An application for discovery royalty certification was submitted on November 15 and amended on November 19. Oil and gas sands

were encountered intermittently in this well from depths of 3,305 feet to 9,770 feet, including a 400-foot pay interval from 9,370 to 9,770 feet in the Hemlock zone.

The department found that the date of discovery for the Grayling No. 1-A well was October 24, 1965, and that commercial quantities had been encountered within the Hemlock zone. However, for the first time since the discovery royalty program was commenced, there was a serious question as to whether the discovery had been made on a new geologic structure. The decision issued on January 26, 1966, concluded:

Insufficient subsurface information exists to determine that the McArthur River feature on which the Grayling No. 1-A well is located is not overlapped by the previously certified Trading Bay geologic feature. Thus, the well does not satisfy the requirement for being a discovery well on a geologic structure previously uncertified, and the application on the Grayling No. 1-A well is hereby denied.

On February 10, 1966, a meeting took place in Anchorage between Union-Marathon officials and department officials to discuss the decision denying Union-Marathon's request for discovery certification. In one meeting Tom Marshall of the division of mines and minerals told Union-Marathon officials that he was concerned about the possibility that shallow productive sands continuously overlaid both the Trading Bay structure and the Grayling structure. Marshall also told one of the oil

company representatives that his view of the McArthur River application relied heavily on the "dominant structure concept" referred to in USGS Circular 419. Another meeting was held with Erle Mathis, chief of the minerals section of the division of lands, who encouraged Union and Marathon to request time to submit additional evidence.

On February 14, 1966, Union filed a document with the division of lands entitled, "Petition for Reconsideration and Interpretation of Decision of the Director of the Division of Lands Dated January 26, 1966, in the Matter of Discovery Well Certification Grayling No. 1-A well -- ADL 17594." In this petition Union requested that applicable regulations be interpreted to permit Union to submit additional and supporting information at a later time or to allow reconsideration by the director of his decision on the basis of additional supporting information then available, including evidence satisfying the criteria used for the determination of geologic structures by the USGS in administering the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920.

Erle Mathis prepared a proposed decision responding to Union's petition. He conferred with Tom Marshall about it before sending it to the commissioner. The proposed decision denied Union's request for reconsideration on the ground that the state's oil and gas leasing regulations would not permit it. However, the proposed decision permitted Union to submit any

additional supporting information and authorized an award of discovery royalty if that information established that Grayling No. 1-A was on a separate geologic structure. This proposed decision was never issued.

Beginning on February 16, 1966, Tom Marshall provided Jim Williams, director of the division of mines and minerals and chairman of the Oil and Gas Conservation Committee, with a series of reports regarding his February 11 meeting with Union-Marathon. In these reports Marshall stated that the discussion was limited to the state's interpretation of the definition of geologic structure and that USGS Circular 419 was the principal basis used for determining geologic structure. He outlined a number of problems regarding the definition of geologic structure, including the complicating effects of stratigraphically controlled production, dominant structure, trends of folding, the interpretation and accuracy of seismic records, and the absence of subsurface data.

In his reports Marshall reiterated that the main problem with the Grayling application was the occurrence of undefined stratigraphic traps in the shallow horizons. He felt that it would be a mistake to award a discovery royalty for the Grayling well before the extent and continuity of those traps were known. He mentioned the other problem of determining how much vertical displacement along faults is required to separate geologic structures, and wondered what development of the field

would provide sufficient subsurface information to resolve this problem.

Marshall also said that the procedures used by the USGS in determining KGSs were discussed and that the point was made that the state regulations did not allow the state to make a tentative determination regarding geologic structure, unlike federal regulations which allowed federal officials to delineate an undefined KGS. He noted that state officials were without the benefit of surface geology available to persons working in unccvered upland areas. He explained that the USGS makes its final KGS determination after an evaluation of all controlling factors, but that like information was not available to the state with respect to the Trading Bay and McArthur River areas at this time.

On March 2, 1966, the commissioner of natural resources responded to Earl Mathis' suggested reply to Union-Marathon's petition for reconsideration. In his response the commissioner concluded that there were two separate geologic structures present, but expressed concern about the problem of one lease covering a portion of two separate structures -- an entirely different issue than that being dealt with by Marshall, Williams, and Mathis. He felt that the time limit imposed by the regulations could be circumvented if the petition were accepted by the commissioner rather than the division of lands, thus enabling

a study of the problem to be made. He also indicated that the attorney general had been requested to review the question of whether a five percent royalty would apply to the entire lease if a discovery well were drilled in a new structure where the area of the lease also covered a second structure that had been previously certified as a discovery on a different lease. It is apparent from this opinion request that the commissioner was concerned with lease boundaries (the legal interpretation of the words "all production from the lease") rather than a question involving the boundaries of a geologic structure.

On August 26, 1966, an opinion was issued by the attorney general's office which resolved the question of lease boundaries. The conclusion was that all production from the lease should enjoy the benefits of discovery royalty even though it were derived from a structure which was previously the subject of a discovery royalty on another lease. However, the principal questions of whether or not Trading Bay and McArthur River were separate structures was not addressed by this opinion.

There was no further active consideration of the Union-Marathon application until 1968.

4. Discovery royalty certification of the Nicolai Creek State No. 1 well.

Because the term of the leases issued in the seventh and ninth competitive sales was five years, there were a large number of wells drilled and several discovery well certification applications filed in the 1966 drilling season.

The first discovery royalty request in the 1966 drilling season came for a well drilled by Texaco -- Nicolai Creek State No. 1. Texaco had spudded this well in the fall of 1965. On May 23, 1966, Texaco submitted evidence in support of an April 28, 1966, priority date. In early May the well was tested and found to be capable of producing commercial quantities of gas. Texaco applied for discovery well certification on June 13, 1966, which was approved on August 19, 1966.

5. Discovery affidavit for the SAS Foreland Channel State No. 1 well.

On June 10, 1966, Shell (on behalf of itself, Standard Oil of California, and Atlantic Richfield) filed an affidavit of first discovery for the SAS Foreland Channel State No. 1 well. No potential tests were conducted on this well, and no discovery certification application was filed.

6. Discovery affidavit for the Pan Am North Redoubt Well No. 1.

Pan Am drilled the North Redoubt Well No. 1 for the Pan Am group in the spring and summer of 1966. According to the affidavit filed on June 23, 1966, the depth in that well corresponded very closely to the Hemioc discovery in Union's Grayling No. 1-A well. Although geologic structure boundary information and evidence of commercial quantities were submitted in early September, Pan Am did not actually apply for discovery royalty certification.

7. Application for discovery royalty certification of the Kustatan No. 1-A well.

Meanwhile, Union had been drilling the Kustatan No. 1 well on Union-Marathon's lease ADL 18729, immediately to the south of their Grayling lease. This well was drilled to 11,600 feet during April, May, and June 1966. Union filed affidavits to establish priority of time and date of discovery for this well. During the period August 5 to 7, 1966, a commercial quantities test was witnessed by the state. On September 6, 1966, Union formally applied for discovery certification. One week later Union withdrew the application pending submission of additional information, which was submitted on October 7, 1966. Union withdrew this application in December 1966 before any action on it had been taken by the department.

8. Application for discovery royalty certification of the West Foreland Unit No. 3 well.

Atlantic Richfield drilled the West Foreland Unit No. 3 well on lease ADL 18777 into the upper left arm of the McArthur River Hemlock reservoir. On August 3, 1966, an affidavit of first discovery was filed in support of a July 25, 1966, discovery date with the Oil and Gas Conservation Committee. A commercial quantities test was conducted on August 16, 1966.

On September 28, 1966, Atlantic Richfield submitted its geologic structure boundary evidence to the Conservation Committee. In an explanatory letter which accompanied this evidence, Atlantic Richfield explained why it believed the Hemlock reservoir, in what it labeled the "Foreland Field," was separate from the Hemlock reservoir encountered by Union in Grayling No. 1-A. The explanation claimed that a barren syncline separated the Hemlock field encountered by the Grayling 1-A well from that encountered by the West Foreland Unit No. 3 well and that the hydrocarbon accumulation in the McArthur River structure was not in communication with that of West Foreland No. 3.

On September 30, 1966, Atlantic Richfield formally applied to the division of lands for certification of discovery royalty of the West Foreland Unit No. 3 well. On the basis of this submission, there was further discussion within the

department on the definition of geologic structure and whether the concept of dominant structure, originally advanced by Tom Marshall from USGS Circular 419, was the best interpretive approach to solving this issue.

On December 9, 1966, a decision was issued by the director of the division of lands denying Atlantic Richfield's request for discovery royalty certification on the ground that the well was on the Greater Trading Bay structure for which a discovery royalty had been previously awarded. He made this decision notwithstanding the fact that the earlier denial of Union-Marathon's application was on the basis that there was insufficient evidence to determine whether the Trading Bay and McArthur River features were separate structures. On December 30 Atlantic Richfield filed a petition for reconsideration of the director's decision. There was discussion within the department on whether and when to consider the petition for reconsideration (Atlantic Richfield was in favor of delay until further information from drill reports from subsequent operations became available). Like the Union-Marathon request for reconsideration, there is no indication in the record that any thought was given to the matter until a year later.

9. Application for discovery royalty certification of Texaco's Trading Bay State No. 1 well.

In the late summer of 1966 Texaco, on behalf of itself and Superior Oil Company, commenced the Trading Bay State No. 1 well on lease ADL 17597. On September 27, 1966, the well was tested for commercial quantities. This test also served as the basis for an affidavit of first discovery. The well was drilled through the oil bearing zones in both the Kenai and Hemlock formations.

On March 7, 1967, denial of Texaco's application was issued by the director of the division of lands on the grounds that the well was not capable of producing oil in commercial quantities and that it was located on the Greater Trading Bay structure on which discovery certification was previously granted.

10. Application for discovery royalty certification of Atlantic Richfield's Trading Bay State No. 1 well.

Another discovery was claimed in the McArthur River-Trading Bay area in the summer of 1967. This claim was made by Atlantic Richfield for the Trading Bay State No. 1 well on lease ADL 34531. According to the affidavit of first discovery, evidence of first discovery was encountered in the well on June 7, 1967. The well was drilled into the Hemlock accumulation north of the McArthur River Hemlock reservoir on the downthrown side of the Trading Bay fault. Atlantic Richfield named this

accumulation the Ivan Bering Field. A commercial quantities test was conducted on June 25, 1967. Application for discovery royalty certification was filed on September 27, 1967. The application was then considered by state officials.

The decision of the Oil and Gas Conservation Committee issued to the division of lands recommended that certification be denied on the ground that drilling the Trading Bay State No. 1 well had not resulted in the first discovery on a new geologic structure. The relevant portion of the committee's decision stated:

Section 505.744 - Establishment of Geologic Structure: It is the opinion of the Oil and Gas Conservation Committee that the Ivan Bering Field discovered by the Trading Bay State #1 well is controlled by a fault or faults associated with the Greater Trading Bay Structure. Inasmuch as a discovery royalty was previously awarded to the Trading Bay Structure, the Committee does not consider that the Trading Bay State #1 well is the first discovery on the dominant geological structure.

On December 7, 1967, the decision denying Atlantic Richfield's application for discovery royalty certification of the Ivan Bering field was issued. By letter dated December 21, 1967, Atlantic Richfield requested reconsideration of the decision rejecting their application and permission to submit additional data. This petition was supplemented on December 28, 1967.

11. Application for discovery royalty certification for Redoubt Shoal No. 2.

There was one more discovery well certification application considered by the state for a well drilled in the Trading Bay vicinity. In the summer of 1968, Pan American drilled Redoubt Shoal Unit No. 2 well on lease ADL 29690. This well was drilled into a Hemlock accumulation 4 1/2 miles south of the McArthur River Hemlock reservoir. An affidavit to establish priority of discovery was filed in early October 1968. The formal application for discovery certification was filed on November 12. The committee concluded that commercial quantities had been encountered but that the Redoubt Shoal feature was a downfaulted nose subsidiary to the Trading Bay dominant geologic structure which had been previously awarded a discovery royalty. Pan American filed a notice of appeal to the superior court on February 19, 1969, but the appeal never proceeded to a disposition on the merits.

12. Reconsideration of the Grayling No. 1-A, West Foreland Unit No. 3, and Atlantic Richfield Trading Bay State No. 1 applications for discovery royalty certification.

Atlantic Richfield's application for reconsideration of the denial of discovery royalty certification for the discovery

in the Ivan Zering field prompted Pedro Denton, chief of the minerals section of the division of lands, to change his mind about how much time should be given to discovery certification applicants to prove the boundaries of geologic structures. On January 29, 1968, he wrote to then Commissioner Thomas E. Kelly that the cutoff period established by the regulations provided a reasonable time period, that holding discovery royalty applications in abeyance would cause serious financial administrative problems, and that no evidence gathered after the time limit should be accepted. He was concerned that if the period were unlimited, some companies would continue to demand refunds or credit many years after the ten year term from first encounter had expired, with severe adverse effects on state fiscal planning.

On October 31, 1968, the commissioner sent out three decisions with respect to these three long-standing discovery royalty applications, Union-Marathon's Grayling 1-A (ADL 17594), ARCO's West Foreland No. 3 (ADL 18777) and ARCO's Trading Bay State No. 1 (ADL 35431). Each of these decisions provided as follows:

1. On the basis of the information available at this time, the Director's decision was proper.
2. Adequate time has been allowed the applicant to submit supporting information as requested in their petition for reconsideration.
3. That applicant's request for an opportunity to submit supporting information is reasonable.

Therefore, the applicant is granted 60 days from receipt of this decision in which to supply supporting information or to schedule a hearing at a time mutually agreeable to the state and the applicant. If no supporting information or hearing is scheduled within the time allowed, the Director's decision will be affirmed.

Atlantic Richfield filed a letter, three exhibits, two enclosures, and a copy of the notice describing the well tests ending July 1, 1967, with Commissioner Kelly in response to these decisions on December 26, 1968. The letter suggested a meeting with state officials to discuss and develop technical data supporting the application. The technical data submitted with this letter included Exhibit 1, an evaluation of mechanical logs; Exhibit 2, a structure contour map; Exhibit 3, a structural cross section A-A¹; Enclosure 1, well completion information drafted on an electric log; and Enclosure 2, a core analysis -- cores 1-10. They all pertained to lease ADL 34531 and the Ivan Bering field and purported to show that the field was on a separate structure from both the Trading Bay and McArthur River fields. Atlantic Richfield filed nothing with respect to lease ADL 18777 and the West Foreland Unit No. 3 well. These letters were followed up on January 26, 1968, with a legal brief from Theodore F. Stevens and Russell H. Holland, representing Atlantic Richfield. The brief was almost word-for-word the same as the one filed a year earlier in support of Atlantic Richfield's discovery royalty application for the West Foreland Unit No. 3 well.

On December 30, 1968, Union supplemented their application for certification of the Grayling No. 1-A well by filing a blue box which was labeled, "Appendix: Geologic Reports and Exhibits." In the box were maps and exhibits and a narrative interpretation explaining the maps and exhibits. Union requested that the matter be set for a hearing at the earliest possible time.

On January 9, 1969, Pedro Denton forwarded to the commissioner his arguments on why the 90-day time limit on geologic structure information ought to be strictly enforced.

On February 7, 1969, Atlantic Richfield was notified that the decision of December 9, 1966, denying discovery certification of the Foreland field was affirmed because no additional information had been submitted.

On June 5, 1969, the Oil and Gas Conservation Committee informed the director of lands that they had reviewed the documents and exhibits submitted to the division of lands on December 30, 1968, and found that this additional information did not warrant a change in the committee's original decision dated January 1, 1966. This letter was signed by Tom Marshall and O. K. Gilbreth, Jr. The results of the review were never forwarded to Union-Marathon.

No further action was taken on either Union's or ARCO's application until February 26, 1970. At that time the commissioner sent out decisions to both Atlantic Richfield and Union-Marathon establishing hearing dates of April 16, 1970, and April 17, 1970, for the pending certification applications. In this notice Commissioner Kelly notified both sets of applicants that his review would be limited to information which was filed within the original 90-day period.

The Atlantic Richfield hearing was conducted on April 16, 1970. At the hearing additional information was presented to show that the Ivan Bering field was one of several entrapping mechanisms on separate structures, each of which should be entitled to discovery royalty certification.

The Union-Marathon hearing was conducted on the next day. At this hearing Union and Marathon introduced a light blue folder full of new exhibits corresponding with Volumes 1 and 2 of the exhibits later submitted on September 28, 1969.

On June 8, 1970, Union-Marathon sent Commissioner Kelly a letter stating the legal reasons why he should look at the after-acquired evidence. Pedro Denton then sent the commissioner a copy of his January 7, 1969, notes which argued that after-acquired evidence should be disregarded.

In August of 1970 the Conservation Committee sent Commissioner Kelly a memorandum which concluded that the original Union-Marathon decision was correct. Pedro Denton then drafted a decision to send to Union-Marathon which contained a lengthy justification for disregarding the after-acquired evidence. The commissioner did not sign Pedro Denton's proposed decision. Rather, he signed a final decision prepared by the Attorney General's office. This decision, again denying Union-Marathon's application for discovery certification, was sent on October 7, 1970.

On November 5, 1970, the chief of minerals forwarded to the commissioner for signature a proposed decision denying Atlantic Richfield's discovery royalty application for ADL 35431. The commissioner signed the decision on December 3, 1970, and the decision was sent to Atlantic Richfield.

13. Judicial review of the decisions denying discovery royalty for Union's Grayling No. 1-A well and Atlantic Richfield's Trading Bay State No. 1 well.

Both Union-Marathon and Atlantic Richfield appealed to the courts. Union and Marathon sought review of the commissioner's October 7, 1970, decision in the superior court, which remanded the matter to the commissioner for a new decision including a statement of the basis for the decision. The

commissioner issued a decision on February 17, 1972, denying discovery well certification on the grounds that insufficient information had been submitted within the 90-day period prescribed by the regulations to determine whether the Grayling well was on a separate geologic structure and that evidence submitted after the 90-day period could not be considered. The companies again sought review in the superior court which dismissed the appeal on the ground that the court lacked jurisdiction. Union-Marathon then lodged their first appeal with the supreme court, which reversed and remanded the matter for further consideration. Union Oil Co. of Cal. v. State Dept. of Nat. Resources, 526 P.2d 1357 (Alaska 1974).

On remand, the superior court affirmed the administrative decision and concluded that the commissioner could not legally consider the after-acquired evidence offered by the applicants, that the commissioner had not granted them the right to submit after-acquired data, and that the director's decision denying discovery royalty certification was clearly sustained by the evidence. Union-Marathon appealed to the supreme court for the second time. The court concluded that the commissioner could legally consider after-acquired evidence and remanded the matter to the commissioner for a determination of the reasonableness of the 90-day limit and to receive additional data and rule upon the basis of all data submitted if, under the circumstances, the limit were found to be unreasonable.. Union Oil Co. of

Cal. v. State Dept. of Nat. Resources, 574 P.2d 1266 (Alaska 1978).

The Atlantic Richfield case was stayed in the superior court by stipulation pending resolution of the Union-Marathon application. Atlantic Richfield Co. v. State Dept. of Nat Resources, No. 3AN-70-3789 Civ.

VI. THE 90-DAY LIMITATION.

In its 1978 decision the supreme court addressed the question of whether the commissioner has the power to consider new evidence of geologic structure which is supplied after the 90-day deadline established by 11 AAC 505.744 (recodified as 11 AAC 93.210(c) (repealed November 9, 1979). The court concluded that the unreasonableness of the 90-day limitation could not be answered on the basis of the record before it. Therefore, it ordered that Union-Marathon be given the opportunity on remand to demonstrate that the 90-day limitation, as applied to them in this case, was unreasonable.

In its decision the supreme court discussed some of the factors which are pertinent to a determination of whether the 90-day requirement should be waived in this case. 574 P.2d at 1272-74. These factors included the advantages of finality, the

desire for stability, the importance of administrative freedom to reformulate policy, the extent of party reliance upon the first decision, the degree of care or haste in making the first decision, and the general equities of each problem, among others.

I determined this issue without affording Union-Marathon the opportunity to demonstrate that the 90-day limitation, as applied to them was unreasonable. My consideration of the factors raised by the supreme court led to my conclusion that I should waive the 90 day limitation and consider data submitted after that period where that data contains evidence of facts in existence at the time the original decision was made. I reached that conclusion for the following reasons.

1. Prompt adjudication of discovery royalty applications was of some importance given the incentive nature of the discovery royalty program. Early decisions on awards would tend to maximize the incentive from the standpoint of applicants and other lessees. Delays in processing applications would have diluted the incentive were they to become a consistent pattern. However, most of the applications were relatively routine. Therefore, permitting occasional delays for the submission of additional evidence on unusually difficult applications would not have significantly dampened the incentive. Moreover, the state experienced no trend in false submissions requiring expeditious denial as an enforcement mechanism.

2. Agencies often request additional specified information if the information in the original submittal is not sufficient to provide grounds for a firm decision. In this case, the applicable regulations plainly did not guarantee conclusive determinations in every instance because the evidence in support of a geologic structure determination was largely left to the discretion of the applicant. For example, 11 AAC 83.210(c) (repealed November 9, 1979)^{*/} states that this evidence may include the "operator's interpretation" of geophysical and other specified data in addition to the data itself. Other than a definition of the term "geologic structure," there are no set criteria establishing the guidelines for the state's decision. 11 AAC 33.200 - 11 AAC 33.230 (repealed November 9, 1979).^{**/} The exercise of some latitude in the handling of each application is therefore implicit in the content of these regulations. Under the circumstances, an extension of time to submit additional evidence would not be considered unusual as a matter of agency practice. Moreover, the supreme court strongly suggested that there would be no prejudice to the public interest in considering data obtained after the 90-day period where the data (in this case subsurface geology) would not change over time. See 574 P.2d at 1273.

^{*}/ Formerly 11 AAC 505.744.

^{**}/ Formerly 11 AAC 505.74 -- 11 AAC 505.741. -

3. During the early years of the discovery royalty program in Cook Inlet, the government had little or no information other than the data submitted by the applicant. In the case of the Grayling No. 1-A application, Union-Marathon submitted during the 90-day period unusually complete information which included a cross-sectional interpretation of the data. It was this cross section which led Tom Marshall to postulate a possible overlap in the shallow Middle Kenai sands extending into the Trading Bay feature. See Section V.F.3 above. This was only an hypothesis; later-acquired evidence proved it to be incorrect. Nevertheless, Marshall's hypothesis led the department to deny the discovery royalty application on the ground that insufficient subsurface information existed to determine that the McArthur River feature was not overlapped by the previously certified Trading Bay geologic structure.

It is only logical to permit the submission of additional evidence when (1) the applicant submitted unusually detailed information originally, (2) the information generated possible doubt about the validity of the application but could not be proved, (3) the government could only deny the application based on insufficient (rather than contrary) evidence withⁱⁿ the 90-day period, and (4) the regulatory requirements governing submission of evidence were vague and judgmental. In order to establish procedural finality, the government could have set a cutoff date for any further evidence. However, while

Union-Marathon appealed the initial denial of January 26, 1966, on February 4, 1966, the Department took no action at all for 2½ years, at which time it granted Union 60 days to submit more information. On December 30, 1968, Union submitted additional information and requested a hearing.

The department did not hold a hearing until April 17, 1970, almost five years after the 90-day period had elapsed. Half a year after the hearing, on October 7, 1970, the commissioner summarily affirmed the original decision. His decision was appealed to the superior court, which remanded the matter to the commissioner for a new decision, including the basis for the decision. On February 17, 1972, the commissioner denied certification on exactly the same grounds as the original 1966 decision, namely that insufficient information was submitted during the 90-day period to determine whether Grayling No. 1-A was on a separate structure.

In summary, although the state's decision not to consider evidence beyond the 90-day period may initially have been reasonable, by virtue of its subsequent behavior it has waived any opportunity to confine additional evidence to a limited period. Further, the discovery royalty program was repealed in 1969, so there is a limited potentially adverse precedent to consider.

Therefore, it is appropriate to consider all geologic evidence submitted by Union-Marathon in conjunction with this case to determine whether they are entitled to a discovery royalty on the grounds that the McArthur River feature is a separate geologic structure from the previously certified Trading Bay geologic structure.

VII. GEOLOGIC STRUCTURE.

A. Applicable Law.

At the time that Union-Marathon applied for discovery well certification of their Grayling No. 1-A well, the holder of a state oil and gas lease that drilled and made the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a geologic structure could be rewarded by paying a discovery royalty of only five percent for the first ten years, after which the normal rate (12 1/2 percent of the value of the oil and gas produced) was applicable. AS 38.05.130(a). The pertinent portion of AS 38.05.130(a) provided:

. . . the holder of a lease who drills and makes the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a geologic structure shall pay a royalty on all production under the lease of five per cent for 10 years following the date of discovery and thereafter the royalty rate shall be not less than 12 1/2 per cent.

(Emphasis supplied.)

The regulations contained at 11 AAC 83.230 (repealed November 9, 1979) (formerly 11 AAC 505.74--11 AAC 505.748) specified the procedures for proving the three elements required by AS 38.05.130(a) for discovery well certification: date of discovery, commercial quantities, and geologic structure. 11 AAC 83.210(c) (repealed November 9, 1979) (formerly 11 AAC 505.744) specified the procedure for establishing geologic structure, the only criterion at issue here. The relevant portion provided:

To establish the geologic structure from which the oil or gas can be produced, the operator must furnish pertinent data to the committee which will enable it to determine the geologic structure from which the oil or gas is being produced. This may include, but is not limited to, geophysical data, total depth, casing records, perforation data, electric logs, drilling and mud logs, core analyses, sample cuttings and sample logs and the operator's interpretation thereof, together with any other records and interpretations the operator deems pertinent. This data must be supplied within 90 days after the date of the potential test as required in (b) of this section.

Additional guidance was provided by 11 AAC 83.205(2) (repealed November 9, 1979) (formerly 11 AAC 505.741(b)), which defined the term "geologic structure" as:

any structural and/or stratigraphic entrap-
ping mechanism containing one or more in-
tervals, zones, strata, formations, or fault
blocks which has the necessary physical
characteristics to accumulate and prevent the
escape of oil and/or gas. It is intended
that the meaning shall be similar to that

used by the United States Geological Survey in the administration of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437) as amended.

The discovery royalty system was curtailed and finally abolished by legislative amendments in 1967 and 1969. 1967 Alaska Sess. L., ch. 97, §2; 1969 Alaska Sess. L., ch. 65, §1.

B. Historic Background.

In 1959 Alaska was a cash-poor state. At this time, exploitation of the state's oil and gas resources was thought to be the best avenue for remedying this situation. The cash would come from bonuses from lease sales and from royalties from leases producing hydrocarbons in commercial quantities. An active leasing program and aggressive exploration activities by lessees were therefore desired goals. Against this background the state's discovery royalty program (which made its first appearance as section 3(7), article VIII, chapter 169, SLA 1959) was adopted to provide a substantial incentive to oil companies to come to Alaska (which was, at the time of statehood, a frontier area from the standpoint of its oil and gas potential) and conduct exploratory drilling operations for and produce oil and gas on state leased land.

The discovery royalty program was plainly successful. It is obvious from the attention devoted to including the dis-

covery royalty program in the 1959 Alaska Land Act, the active participation of oil companies in the drafting of the discovery royalty regulations, and the disputes among the companies over controversial awards that discovery royalty provided an incentive for oil companies to come to Alaska. It is also evident that the discovery royalty program generated drilling races between competing companies on neighboring leases. Undoubtedly, Cook Inlet would have been explored and developed by the oil companies even without the discovery royalty program. However, the state's discovery royalty program definitely accelerated exploration and development activities on state oil and gas leases, thus helping to satisfy the state's objective of obtaining cash as quickly as possible after statehood to fund the state government and finance the provision of essential public services.

C. Decision Criteria.

In considering the issue of geologic structure, there were several approaches suggested in the course of the hearings which I did not consider a valid basis for determining the issue.

First, I did not use the predeposition approach advanced by Mr. William Van Alen. Under this approach Mr. Van Alen constructed a paleostructure map depicting the greater Trading Bay feature at the time hydrocarbons were deposited in the reservoir rock. This paleostructure map was constructed

using all available well data by (1) restoring all fault blocks to the positions they occupied before faulting took place, (2) undoing the effects of compression acting on the structure, and (3) restoring the location of sediments to their original position. The result was that Mr. Van Alen demonstrated the existence of an ancestral Trading Bay anticline dating back approximately 60 million years. The Trading Bay and McArthur River features which exist today evolved from a once undistorted anticline similar in general appearance to that at Middle Ground Shoal. Were I to adopt Mr. Van Alen's approach, I would deny the Union-Marathon application on the ground that both the Trading Bay No. 1-A and Grayling No. 1-A wells penetrated features the origin of which was a single anticline.

I have accepted the accuracy of Mr. Van Alen's paleo-structure map as well as his outstanding analysis of the general development of Cook Inlet geology notwithstanding some contrary interpretations submitted by Union-Marathon. However, I do not believe that the existence of an ancestral Trading Bay anticline is pertinent to this decision. Given the incentive nature of the discovery royalty program, it is my belief that the determination should be made on the basis of the geology as it existed at the time of the alleged discovery, regardless of whether that geology was substantially different at an earlier period in time. Otherwise, the program might not have accomplished its purpose of encouraging the discovery of new geologic structures.

145

Second, I did not employ the K65 concept used by the USGS in the administration of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, 41 Stat. 437, as amended, as described further in USGS Circular 419. That the KGS concept is not dispositive of the issue is demonstrated by the conflicting testimony of Emmett Finley and Joseph David "Red" Cerkel, both formerly serving as chief of the Minerals Classification Branch of the USGS, the agency responsible for making KGS determinations.

Based upon well completion reports from the original Trading Bay No. 1-A well, Mr. Finley drew the KGS boundary around the 7000 foot contour (essentially describing the Trading Bay feature). When shown the well completion reports from the other Trading Bay wells and the Grayling No. 1-A well, Mr. Finley stated that USGS practice would have been to extend the KGS boundary to encompass both areas. Thus, his opinion was that only one KGS would have been drawn around the Trading Bay and McArthur River features by the USGS. Mr. Finley adhered to this conclusion even after reviewing Union's after-acquired evidence graphically displaying the best current geologic understanding of the Trading Bay and McArthur River fields.

However, based on the information available at the time of Union-Marathon's discovery royalty application for the Grayling No. 1-A well, Mr. Cerkel testified that he would have placed an undefined KGS around each feature. When presented with

the updated information, he testified that it was sufficient to completely define the areas and warranted their formal promulgation as two separate defined KGSs.

Further, Mr. Ed Hall, a witness appearing on behalf of Union-Marathon, systematically reviewed USGS KGS determinations in various oil and gas provinces around the United States and demonstrated conclusively that USGS practice varied substantially from area to area. He proved that either Mr. Finley's or Mr. Cerkle's approach might have been used in this case. Moreover, the KGS concept was used by the USGS to make determinations as to whether lands would be leased competitively or noncompetitively, not for discovery royalty awards. The competitive determination is considerably less crucial than a decision as to whether a lessee is to receive a discovery royalty award, and substantial flexibility in applying the KGS for its original intended purpose is acceptable, since the principal effect is on prospective rather than existing lessees. This may explain why the UGS did not feel compelled to issue Circular 419 until 1959 despite the use of the KGS concept in thousands of competitive/noncompetitive determinations since 1920, and the observation in Circular 419 that no phrase in the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act "has resulted in more speculation as to its precise meaning than the phrase 'known geologic structure of a producing oil and gas field.'" In essence, the KGS concept was far less precise than the task it was expected to accomplish in circumstances such as presented by

this case. It worked adequately in obvious cases and not well at all in closer ones. Therefore, while the authors of Alaska's discovery royalty statute and regulations may have intended to follow federal practice, the KGS concept did not provide sufficiently specific criteria to properly found a decision.*/ J

A third approach which did not present a sufficient basis for determination of this case was the "dominant structure" concept used by the department during the early 1960s on a number of discovery royalty applications. This concept, developed by Thomas Marshall, was used as the basis for rejecting discovery royalty applications filed by Atlantic Richfield for certification of its West Foreland Unit No. 3 and Trading Bay State No. 1 wells, by Texaco for its Trading Bay State No. 1 well, by Amoco for the Redoubt Shoals well, and by Union-Marathon for the Grayling No. 1-A well. All of these applications except the Grayling application were rejected on the basis that the geologic structure on which each well was located was part of the previously certified Greater Trading Bay geologic structure. The Grayling application was rejected on the basis that insufficient

* / In addition, none of the regulations implementing the Alaska Oil Proviso, the federal counterpart to Alaska's discovery royalty program, ever used the term "known geologic structure of a producing oil and gas field." Rather, like Alaska's discovery royalty provision, the term "geologic structure" was used. There is, therefore, no express application of the Circular 419 KGS methodology contained in either federal or state law governing discovery royalties.

subsurface information existed to determine whether or not the McArthur River feature was overlapped by the Greater Trading Bay structure.

Mr. Marshall testified that this approach was designed to treat essentially intact anticlinal areas as dominant structures for purposes of aggregating discovery royalty applications. It was devised in response to the inherent ambiguity of the discovery royalty statute. The statute provided for the award of a discovery royalty to the first well drilled on a new "geologic structure" which, from the standpoint of geology, could be as large as Cook Inlet or as small as a microfold. Two competing objectives needed to be reconciled in the context of the inherent ambiguity of the statute: (1) the provision of a sufficiently strong incentive to encourage the oil industry to venture expeditiously into a frontier oil and gas province, and (2) the need to avoid a discovery royalty approach which would result in the award of a discovery royalty for every new accumulation of oil that was found.

Generally, the department did an excellent job in the award of discovery royalties; a review of all discovery royalty awards for Cook Inlet shows that only one was made for each major anticline in the Cook Inlet area. Any other approach would have resulted in too few or too many awards to have successfully meshed the competing objectives mentioned above. However, all of

the other anticlines in Cook Inlet are relatively intact and undisturbed; the Trading Bay/McArthur River features constitute a geologic exception to the pattern of reservoirs discovered in Cook Inlet. The "dominant structure" concept is simply overly general to provide a conclusive answer to a situation where a once single anticline was subsequently severely compressed, distorted, and offset into two distinct features. As a result, the "dominant structure" concept does not provide a sufficient basis to deny a discovery royalty award solely on a finding that a well is located on the same essentially intact anticlinal area as a previously certified discovery well.

Consequently, in order to determine whether the Grayling No. 1-A well was drilled on the same "geologic structure" as the Trading Bay No. 1-A well, there must be an inquiry based on a common sense analysis of the purposes of the discovery royalty program. I have determined that this inquiry must have two parts:

Predrilling Expectation: Did the lessee's opportunity to drill the Grayling No. 1-A well on the McArthur River prospect, based on the information available at the time the decision was made, constitute a proposition of sufficient risk with respect to the possible discovery of a new reservoir such that the state would wish to encourage it by providing a discovery royalty incentive?

Post-drilling Verification: Did the geologic evidence generated after the Grayling No. 1-A well was drilled tend to confirm the lessee's initial belief that the McArthur River feature was relatively distinct from the Trading Bay feature, and that a decision to drill constituted a risk which should be rewarded by granting the discovery royalty incentive?

The Predrilling Expectation inquiry is necessary because the discovery royalty incentive operates at the time a lessee is faced with a decision to commence a well on a new prospect. If the geologic information then available indicated a magnitude of difference in the characteristics of the Trading Bay and McArthur River features, the potential award of a discovery royalty could substantially influence the outcome of the decision on whether and when to drill the well, which was the purpose of the discovery royalty program.

The Post-drilling Verification inquiry is required to demonstrate that the Predrilling Expectation, as contained in the lessee's geologic interpretation of the area, was not seriously in error as a result of substandard evaluation efforts and that a distinct structure has been discovered.

The Predrilling Expectation factor is important; reliance solely on geologic information acquired long after a well has been drilled to adjudicate an application would render

the discovery royalty concept a mere sporting proposition. The Post-drilling Verification factor is equally necessary; inadequate geophysical evaluation at the time of a decision to drill a well could make a gamble out of what would be a virtual certainty for a prudent lessee, and the incentive would be promoting inefficiency. Therefore, both inquiries must be satisfied to justify the discovery royalty award.

D. Analysis

1. Predrilling Expectation. The decision by Union-Marathon to drill the Grayling No. 1-A well was accompanied by sufficient risk with respect to discovery of a new major reservoir, given the information available at the time, as to justify the provision of an incentive by the state, for the following reasons:

a. Union-Marathon's recognition of the existence of two separate features in the Trading Bay area resulted from data provided by their 1959 offshore seismic survey of Cook Inlet. The results of offshore gas exploder seismic surveys conducted in 1960-1961 in preparation for a 1961 state lease sale further defined these two structures. At this time, the companies assigned separate code names to both prospects. Although evidence indicated that Union-Marathon was aware of the discovery royalty implications inherent in the designation of two struc-

tures rather than one collective Trading Bay structure, it is apparent that the companies considered these separate features with differing characteristics. Mr. Richard Lyon testified that the seismic data on the Trading Bay feature consistently showed a sharply defined and attractive potential entrapping mechanism. The data for McArthur River, however, was less consistent. While indicating the presence of an anticline which might be a considerable reservoir, the anticline was shallow and less well defined with a substantial possibility that insufficient closure existed to contain any hydrocarbons which might have been produced. As a result, Union-Marathon bid ten times the bonus money to acquire the tract overlying the Trading Bay feature as it did for the tract covering the McArthur River feature.

b. Seismic work done in 1963 and 1964 further defined these two prospects and was used to locate sites for test wells. Pre-drilling interpretations of this seismic data showed the existence of two features separated by faulting and a syncline at both the shallow and deep horizons. In 1964 separate AFEs (authorizations for expenditure) were prepared for management approval of the test wells to be drilled on each geologic prospect. Mr. Lyon testified that the presence of a discovery royalty provided him with additional support within his company in the competition to obtain AFEs for both wells.

c. In 1965 three wells (including the Trading Bay No. 1-A discovery well) were drilled to locate the accumulation limits of the Trading Bay structure and to define the boundaries of the Trading Bay structural trap. While the Trading Bay discovery did confirm that the Hemlock was a producing zone within at least part of the collective Trading Bay area as it was elsewhere in Cook Inlet, the evidence of substantial faulting between Trading Bay and McArthur River (and therefore the likelihood of noncommunication between any productive zones) was, if anything, reinforced. Moreover, doubts regarding closure of the McArthur River anticline were in no way diminished.

d. While it may have been logistically convenient for Union-Marathon to move its drilling large south from Trading Bay to drill the Grayling No. 1-A well, Tom Marshall testified that this action definitely represented a stepping out by Union-Marathon into an area of very considerably^e uncertainty. It must be remembered that the seismic data and even well data at this point were very scarce and relatively unreliable. Moreover, all of the wells in this area were offshore, and there was no surface geology which could be used to assist in confirming seismic data interpretations. Most important, although it is difficult to appreciate now that platforms are a routine part of the landscape, Cook Inlet was a frontier area during the years shortly after statehood. With the presence of ice, severe tides, and highly adverse weather conditions, there was no assurance

that the area would be successfully developed even if hydrocarbons were present. It was viewed, therefore, much as the Beaufort Sea or the Chukchi Sea are looked at now as potential oil and gas provinces.

e. While the Hemlock zone which produced oil at Trading Bay was considered prospective, Union-Marathon were more attracted by structures at shallower horizons. Thus, the prime target with respect to potential reservoir rock was different at McArthur River than at Trading Bay, increasing the risk factor.

f. In summary, the McArthur River prospect was very much the type that the state would have wanted to have explored. The area was definitely doubtful despite a discovery at Trading Bay, but the potential returns were large given the size of the prospect. Seismic data existing at the time before the drilling of the area indicated two separate prospects of considerably different characteristics and risk, and would have been so viewed by any competent lessee. Under these circumstances, the application of an incentive to obtain early and expeditious drilling of the McArthur River prospect was plainly in the state's interest.*/

*/ Whether the discovery royalty program actually caused or influenced Union-Marathon's decision to drill the Grayling 1-A well is irrelevant. To deny an award based on the fact that the particular lessee would have drilled the well anyway for its own reasons would be unjustly punitive. The question is whether there was sufficient risk or doubt regarding success that the state would have wanted to encourage an affirmative decision to drill.

2. Post-Drilling Verification. The after-acquired evidence submitted by Union-Marathon demonstrates that the situation occurring at the Pre-Drilling Expectation stage was as perceived, and that the risk involved at the time justified the application of the discovery royalty incentive. In fact, the after-acquired evidence substantiates that the separateness and differing characteristics of the respective reservoirs was somewhat greater than believed in 1965. This conclusion is warranted by the following factors:

a. Evidence presented by the applicant demonstrates that there is no overlap in any gas or oil formation between the Trading Bay and McArthur River features.

b. The extensive number of wells drilled in the intervening area between the Trading Bay and McArthur River features establishes that there is no communication between hydrocarbon accumulations in either of the features.

c. Although both the Trading Bay and McArthur River features possess oil bearing sands in the Hemlock formation, there are both gas (above D zone) and oil (West Foreland) producing horizons in the McArthur River feature which are not present in the Trading Bay feature.

d. The geochemistry for McArthur River hydrocarbons differs significantly for paraffins, aromatics, and naphthenes from that discovered at Trading Bay.*/

e. The area between the Trading Bay and McArthur River features is transected by a massive strike slip fault. The area within the Trading Bay feature which at the time of the ancestral anticline was opposite the McArthur river feature is now 3 1/2 miles to the east. Moreover, there is a very large displacement of the Hemlock zone to the extent that it is 3,500 feet deeper in McArthur River than in the Trading Bay feature.


It is the last factor which is most persuasive. When looking at the oil and gas fields discovered in Cook Inlet, they are nearly all readily discernable and intact anticlines with primarily a single defined reservoir within each. One discovery royalty was awarded for each of these anticlines. While nearly all of these anticlines contain some local faulting, no discovery royalty was awarded before or after the Grayling 1-A well on the

* / While the applicant claimed that this resulted from different geologic origins of Trading Bay and McArthur River, it is my opinion that the McGoon and Claypool report (referenced in Exhibit 1 to Mr. Van Alen's testimony) is more likely correct. It is their belief that variations in geochemistry resulted from differing bacterial deterioration rates of accumulated hydrocarbons during the post-deposition stage rather than from a totally different geologic origin in the context of source rock. However, this does not affect my conclusion that the once existing Trading Bay ancestral anticline developed into two very distinct structures.

basis that local faulting created separate structures (in fact, most applications initially filed on this basis were later withdrawn). The greater Trading Bay/McArthur River area, however, is the one heavily distorted and displaced anticline in Cook Inlet, the only one in which major oil accumulations are divided by a large regional fault (in fact, the only regional fault present in Cook Inlet), and substantially offset in vertical distance as well.

In the context of Cook Inlet geology, the pattern of discovery royalty awards, the purpose of the discovery royalty system, and the potential risk of drilling on the McArthur River feature (which appeared very different from the Trading Bay feature before drilling and was confirmed to be very different after drilling) justifies the conclusion that (1) both the Pre-drilling Expectation and Post-drilling Verification analyses confirm the propriety of applying a discovery royalty from the standpoint of the purpose of the program, (2) McArthur River is, therefore, a separate geologic structure from the structure at Trading Bay within the meaning of the discovery royalty statutes and regulations, and (3) Union-Marathon is, therefore, entitled to a discovery royalty award for all production from lease ADL 17594.

Dated August 10th, 1982, in Juneau, Alaska.


Geoffrey Haynes
Deputy Commissioner
Department of Natural Resources

APPENDIX 1

4/1/96

Received after
the bill was
reported out.

Copies to Lurry
and H. Fin.

Revision Date: _____ Dept. Affected: Revenue
 Title: Discovery Royalty Credit BRU: Revenue Operations
 Component: Oil and Gas Audit
 Sponsor: (S) Resources
 Requestor: (S) Rules COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 115

Expenditures/Revenues: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES () See Analysis

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other						
TOTAL

Estimate of any current year (FY96) cost \$ _____

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill would grant a royalty rate of 5 percent to all oil and gas produced from the lease from which a discovery was made for a period of ten years following the date of discovery.

The revenue impact would depend on the size of the discovery and the timing of the development of the discovered oil and gas accumulation.

See attached analysis for potential revenue loss.

Prepared by: Chuck Logsdon Phone: 277-5627
 Division: Oil and Gas Audit Date: March 28, 1996
 Approved by Commissioner: Walter J. Anderson Date: March 28, 1996
 Agency: Department of Revenue

PREPARED TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

Fiscal Note Analysis
CSSB 112 (RES)

This bill would grant a discovery royalty rate of 5% for production from a previously undiscovered oil or gas pool attributed to and under a lease in the Cook Inlet sedimentary basin for 10 years following the date of discovery of that pool. This would apply to oil discovered in the Cook Inlet 180 days following the enactment of the bill.

The revenue impact would depend on the size of the discovery and the timing of development of the discovered oil and gas accumulation. The following hypothetical Cook Inlet example would be indicative of the cost of the lower discovery royalty rate.

Oil = 2 wells * 250 bbl/day/well * 365 * \$15/bbl * (.125 - .05) = \$205,000 per year

Gas = 1 well * 10,000 mcf/well * 365 * \$2.25/mcf * (.125 - .05) = \$616,000 per year

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

SFC _____

DATE: 3/20/96

DATE TURNED INTO OFFICE: 3/27/96

The Finance Committee considered SENATE BILL NO. 112

Establishing a discovery royalty credit for the lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and making the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities.

and recommends:

- be replaced with _____ CS _____ (_____)
- adopt previous _____ CS SB 112 (RES)
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to the _____ Committee

- Senate Bill:**
- same title
 - new title
- House Bill:**
- same title
 - technical change
 - new: SCR# _____

SIGNING DO PASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	NR	DNP	AM
<i>David Wiley</i>	✓	<i>Steve Rasmussen</i>	✓		
<i>Paul J. Hensley</i>	✓	<i>Bill F. Hays</i>	✓		
<i>Bob W. Hays</i>	✓				
Co-Chair: <i>David Wiley</i>	✓	Co-Chair:			
Co-Chair: <i>Rick Helford</i>	✓	Co-Chair:			

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department Date Zero Fiscal

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):*

Department Date Zero Fiscal

Nat. Resources	3/22/96		91.0

APPROPRIATION -- no fiscal note

*Include fiscal notes accompanying Governor's bill

FISCAL NOTE

REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR #3
SFC 3/24/96

STATE OF ALASKA 1996 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSSB112(RES)

Revision Date: Original Dept Affected: Natural Resources
 Title: An Act establishing a discovery royalty credit BRU: Resource Development
 for the lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and... Component: Oil & Gas Development
 Sponsor: Senate Resources
 Requestor: Senate Finance Component Serial No. 439

Expenditures/Revenues

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02
PERSONAL SERVICES	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
----------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

CHANGE IN REVENUES (I)						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0

Estimate of any current year (FY96) cost: \$ none

POSITIONS

FULL-TIME	1	1	1	1	1	1
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS:

(Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill reinstates Discovery Royalty (which was repealed in 1969) as a means to reduce royalty payments under certain conditions for leases in Cook Inlet Sedimentary Basin.

It is apparent that the discovery royalty incentive has previously been geared toward frontier exploration. In frontier areas, the geologic risk of drilling an unsuccessful well is high, since little geological information is available to the operator prior to drilling. The element of risk was used by the state as an important yard stick for determining eligibility in some previous discovery royalty decisions in Cook Inlet. Cook Inlet was a frontier basin in the 1950's and 1960's. However, today, due to a long history of exploration and production, geologists consider Cook Inlet a mature petroleum province. Almost all wells drilled on state land in Cook Inlet are drilled in close proximity to other wells containing known oil or gas and should be considered step-out wells and not wildcat exploration wells. Step-out wells have relatively low exploration risk when compared to wildcat exploration wells.

Prepared by: Ken Boyd, Director Phone: 269-8800
 Division: Oil & Gas Date: 22-Mar-98
 Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 22-Mar-98
 Agency: Natural Resources

Based on past experience, SB 112 will be very difficult to administer. Due to the issuance of pre-1970 conditional leases and the holding of other pre-1970 leases by unitization, the state has many current leases that still have a contractual right to a discovery royalty under the repealed program. As of January 1995, the state has 340 active leases that currently retain the discovery royalty provision, and the Division of Oil and Gas still actively manages the program. Under the previous discovery royalty program, thirteen applications were made for wells in Cook Inlet Basin, eight of which were granted and five were denied. Many of these applications were granted or denied only after years of litigation.

Although SB 112 attempts to eliminate many of the administrative problems with the old discovery royalty program, certain significant problems are inherent with both the repealed program and SB 112. These problems were recognized as far back as 1962 and remain today. It is doubtful that new regulations could eliminate the problems faced in the earlier program.

It is unlikely that the Division can draft regulations under the time constraints imposed by the bill.

Analysis of discovery royalty applications is a very time consuming process and will require the addition of one Petroleum Geologist.

FISCAL NOTE

No. 2
 Bill Version: SB112
 (S) Publish Date: 3-20-96

STATE OF ALASKA
 1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: 3/14/95 Dept. Affected: Revenue
 Title: Discovery Royalty Credit BRU: Revenue Operations
 Component: Oil & Gas Audit
 Sponsor: (4) Resources
 Requester: (4) Resources COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 115

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES: ()See Analysis.....

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ _____

POSITIONS

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This Bill would grant a royalty rate of 5 percent to all oil and gas produced from the lease from which a discovery was made for a period of ten years following the date of discovery.

The revenue impact would depend on the size of the discovery and the timing of the development of the discovered oil and gas accumulation.

Prepared by: Chuck Logsdon Phone: 277-5627
 Division: Oil and Gas Audit Division Date: 3/14/95
 Approved by Commissioner: Deborah Voigt Date: 3/15/95
 Agency: Revenue

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office

FISCAL NOTE

No. 1

Bill Version: SB112

(S) Publish Date: 3-20-96

**STATE OF ALASKA
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

Revision Date: Original Dept Affected: Natural Resources
 Title: An Act establishing a discovery royalty credit for the BRU: Resource Development
lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and making first discover Component: Oil & Gas Development
 Sponsor: Senato Resources
 Requestor: _____ Component Serial No. 439

Expenditures/Revenues	(Thousands of Dollars)					
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
PERSONAL SERVICES	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

FUND SOURCE	(Thousands of Dollars)					
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ _____

POSITIONS						
FULL-TIME	1	1	1	1	1	1
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill reinstates Discovery Royalty (which was repealed in 1969) as a means to reduce royalty payments under certain conditions. This is accomplished by stipulating that a lessee who makes the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a particular geologic structure will pay a royalty of 5% for the first ten years of production.

While this bill appears simple there are problems with some of its provisions. Terms such as "first discovery" and "geologic structure" are not always easily determined. There may be unintended conflicts with AS 38.05180(f)(3)(D) which provides for a fixed cash bonus and a variable Net Profit Share as bid variables for a lease sale. This bill would potentially create a 5% royalty burden where none was contemplated through the lease sale process.

Fiscal impacts as to revenue are difficult to predict because of the speculative nature of the increased activity that this bill may generate. Presumably this new legislation will encourage the discovery of new fields that would not have been otherwise developed. The additional work load and analysis of the Discovery Royalty applications would be time consuming and require an additional Petroleum Geologist.

Prepared by: Ken Boyd, Acting Director Phone: 762-2547
 Division: Oil & Gas Date: 14-Mar-95
 Approved by Commissioner: *Michael J. Donohue* Date: 3-14-95
 Agency: Natural Resources

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

ENATE COMMITTEE REPORT
First Committee of Referral

FN FORTHCOMING
FOR CS

DATE: 3/7/95

FURTHER: Finance

Date of 5-Day Notice: 3-15-95
(in accordance with Uniform Rule 23)

DATE TURNED INTO OFFICE: 3-20-96

Resources Committee considered SB 112

Establishing a discovery royalty credit for the lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and making the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities.

FN's

and recommends:

- be replaced with CS SB 112 (RES)
- adopt previous CS ()
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to the _____ Committee

Senate Bill:

- same title
- new title
- House Bill:
- same title
- technical title
- new: SCR# _____

SIGNING/DIPASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	NR	DNP	AM
<i>Chris C. Taylor</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
<i>Tom Hoff</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
<i>Fred Frank</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
CHAIR: <i>me</i>					

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Zero	Fiscal
DNE/D+G			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Revenue-Dir Audit		<i>indeterminate</i>	

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):*

Department	Date	Zero	Fiscal
Revenue-Dir Audit			
Revenue-Dir Audit			

TO SB only

APPROPRIATION -- no fiscal note

*include fiscal notes accompanying Governor's bill

3120195
 (S)RES,
 FIN #2

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
 1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. SB 112

Revision Date: 3/14/95 Dept. Affected: Revenue
 Title: Discovery Royalty Credit BRU: Revenue Operations
 Component: Oil & Gas Audit
 Sponsor: (S)Resources
 Requester: (S)Resources COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 115

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()**See Analysis**.....

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ _____

POSITIONS

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This Bill would grant a royalty rate of 5 percent to all oil and gas produced from the lease from which a discovery was made for a period of ten years following the date of discovery.

The revenue impact would depend on the size of the discovery and the timing of the development of the discovered oil and gas accumulation.

old '95 F/N.

Prepared by: Chuck Logsdon Phone: 277-5627
 Division: Oil and Gas Audit Division Date: 3/14/95
 Approved by Commissioner: Deborah Vogt Date: 3/15/95
 Agency: Revenue

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office

3/16/95
(S) RES, FIN

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA

BILL NO. SB112

1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: Original Dept Affected: Natural Resources
 Title: An Act establishing a discovery royalty credit for the BRU: Resource Development
lessees of state land drilling exploratory wells and making first discover Component: Oil & Gas Development
 Sponsor: Senate Resources
 Requestor: _____ Component Serial No. 439

Expenditures/Revenues	(Thousands of Dollars)					
	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
OPERATING EXPENDITURES						
PERSONAL SERVICES	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

FUND SOURCE	(Thousands of Dollars)					
	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ _____

POSITIONS

FULL-TIME	1	1	1	1	1	1
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS:

(Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill reinstates Discovery Royalty (which was repealed in 1969) as a means to reduce royalty payments under certain conditions.

This is accomplished by stipulating that a lessee who makes the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a particular geologic structure will pay a royalty of 5% for the first ten years of production.

While this bill appears simple there are problems with some of its provisions. Terms such as "first discovery" and "geologic structure" are not always easily determined. There may be unintended conflicts with AS 38.05180(1)(3)(D) which provides for a fixed cash bonus and a variable Net Profit Share as bid variables for a lease sale. This bill would potentially create a 5% royalty burden where none was contemplated through the lease sale process.

Fiscal impacts as to revenue are difficult to predict because of the speculative nature of the increased activity that this bill may generate. Presumably this new legislation will encourage the discovery of new fields that would not have been otherwise developed.

The additional work load and analysis of the Discovery Royalty applications would be time consuming and require an additional Petroleum Geologist.

Prepared by: Ken Boyd, Acting Director Phone: 762-2547
 Division: Oil & Gas Date: 14-Mar-95
 Approved by Commission: _____ Date: 3-14-95
 Agency: Natural Resources

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

3601 C STREET, SUITE 1380
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503-5948
PHONE: (907) 762-2549

March 20, 1995

DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS

The Honorable Loren Leman
Alaska State Legislature
Room 113 Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182
MAIL STOP 3101

Dear Senator Leman:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 112 last Friday. I'm sorry for all the confusion, but I was trying to do two hearings at once. I hope both you and the Committee found this testimony useful as an introduction to the history of discovery royalty.

Virtually all my testimony is contained in a discovery royalty decision prepared for Union Oil and Marathon Oil in 1982. This has already been submitted to the Committee through Annette.


I made three other points regarding my reasoning for the Discovery Royalty provisions being repealed in 1969:

- All major Cook Inlet fields were in production
- Prudhoe bay had been discovered
- Lease sale 23 was to be held in September of 1969. This sale contained acreage that surrounded Prudhoe Bay.

I have no "proof" that these three things were going through the minds of the Legislature in early 1969, but I suspect they were. The reason to repeal Discovery Royalty was fairly simple—Alaska didn't need such a provision any more. Lots of companies were bidding lots of money without any extra incentives. Lease sale 23 brought in over \$900 million in bonuses—the richest sale in State history—without any incentives.

Things are different in the Alaska oil patch now and maybe some sort of incentives are warranted. Whether it should be Discovery Royalty—or something else—I expect will be debated as the hearings progress.

Sincerely,



Kenneth A. Boyd
Acting Director

Senator Loren Leman
SB 112
Senate Resources Committee

This is additional information for SB 112: Discovery Royalty Credit.

Please put this information in your committee packet for SB 112.

Stewart Petroleum Company

Denali Towers North, Suite 1300
2550 Denali Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99503
(907) 277-4004 • FAX (907) 274-0424

TESTIMONY

of

WILLIAM R. STEWART

before the

SENATE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

19TH ALASKA LEGISLATURE

MARCH 6, 1996

Chairman Leman and members of the Senate Resources Committee, my name is Bill Stewart, President of Stewart Petroleum Company. I have 26 years of oil and gas industry experience in Alaska. Our company is a small Alaska-based independent exploration and production company active in Alaska and seven other states. Our primary area of interest within Alaska is Cook Inlet Basin. In late 1991, we were fortunate in discovering the West McArthur River Oil Field, a field of significant size on the west side of Cook Inlet. We are in the development stage at the present time and, with a pipeline system in place, production from three wells is underway. Our current production averages about 5000 BOPD which, due to the advanced age of Cook Inlet's other fields, makes us the second biggest producer in the basin at this point. Total production since start up in 1993 has exceeded 2,000,000 bbls.

By industry standards here in Alaska, our project is small. It would be sizeable almost anywhere else. Investment to date exceeds \$50 million. Taxes and royalties paid thus far to the State of Alaska total approximately \$3.2 million. We employ between 15 and 60 Alaskans depending on activity and we do business at all times possible with Alaskan vendors and services companies who employ Alaskans. Having said all that, the operation is on the marginal side due to its remoteness and high operating costs per barrel.

According to available information, we were the first independent to establish commercial oil production in Alaska in modern times. (I say "modern times" because oil production was established by independents much earlier at Katalla (near Cordova) in 1902. The field produced low gravity crude until their on-site refinery burned in 1933.) In fact, it may interest you to know that about 60 wells have been drilled here by independents, including the first well in Alaska. That well was drilled by a group of independents in 1898 on the Iniskin Peninsula utilizing cable tools and undoubtedly following up on natural oil seeps that still exist there today.

Back to modern times, I was asked to testify today on SB 112 which, if enacted, would re-establish a discovery royalty program. As each of you are probably aware, the State of Alaska had a discovery royalty program in effect throughout the 1960's and until its repeal in the 1970's. Under the program, royalty burden (on the discovery lease only) was reduced from 12.5% to 5% for a period of ten years commencing with date of discovery.

Most of the Cook Inlet discoveries made during the 1960's were made on State leases which provided for discovery royalty benefit. I was there at the time just getting started and, in my opinion, the discovery royalty program resulted in

implementation of more aggressive development schedules by operators than otherwise would have taken place. Assuming overall field economics were positive, pipelines and platforms were built without delay in order that the discovery royalty benefit could be realized. Equally as important as aggressive development, new prospects were drilled by the operating companies which led to other discoveries. Activity led to more activity. The bottom line was the discovery of 7 major oil fields totalling 1.3 billion bbls of recoverable oil and 15 gas fields totalling 6.4 trillion cubic feet of gas. From those fields the State of Alaska has realized taxes and royalties far in excess of the benefit granted to industry by discovery royalty. (Remember that the discovery royalty was a temporary benefit which applied only to the discovery lease and not to the surrounding acreage). Equally important were the jobs that were created by industry activity.

On December 19, 1967, Arco's Prudhoe Bay State #1 discovered hydrocarbons in commercial quantities, also on a discovery royalty lease (ADL - 28303) and, as the extent of the giant Prudhoe Bay field became known, industry focus shifted from Cook Inlet to the North Slope. The "first wave" of exploration in Cook Inlet Basin, therefore, ended early despite substantial remaining potential. Arco's discovery at Sunfish along with our discovery at West McArthur River (both in 1991) could mark the beginning of a "second wave" of exploration in Cook Inlet. Regional geology tells us that there could be another 1.3 billion bbls of oil and 6.4 trillion cubic feet of gas yet to be discovered in the basin. On the up side, we have 1960's potential with 1990's technology. On the down side, we have both natural and man made obstacles. The natural obstacles include weather conditions and remoteness. The man made obstacles include a regulatory system which is improving, but is still filled with roadblocks to development. The man made obstacles are tougher. Both result in high costs. Each operating company, large

or small, has to weigh those factors prior to exploration and encouragement from state government is needed at this time.

I believe that SB 112 with certain modifications would provide at least part of the needed encouragement for renewed industry activity in Cook Inlet Basin. I know that my own company's activities at West McArthur River and elsewhere in the basin would accelerate. I can't speak for the majors, but I suspect that other independents would take a new look at Cook Inlet Basin with discovery royalty in place. (As an independent producer, we are in touch with many other independent producers. There are roughly 10,000 members in IPAA, the Independent Petroleum Association of America. Most of the IPAA members will never venture to Alaska, but in the wake of our success, we are beginning to hear cautious expressions of interest from quite a few.) Independents can function in Alaska, despite the obstacles that we have here, but incentives are necessary.

With respect to the specific language of SB 112, much of the bill deals with leasing matters not related to discovery royalty. The language that does relate to discovery royalty, in my opinion, falls short in a couple of respects:

1. Reduced royalty for the primary term only is not much a benefit. Recent leases in Cook Inlet have been issued for a primary term of seven years rather than the usual ten. Finding oil takes time. Geological studies, geophysical field work (which is often seasonal), integration of geological and geophysical data for prospect delineation, selection of bottom hole objective, well planning, permitting activities, drilling rig arrangements, acquisition of supplies and actual drilling are among the myriad activities involved (not to mention huge amounts of money and luck) in finding oil. I don't have a precise study at hand, but I suspect most of the actual discoveries in Alaska were made in the last few years of the primary term of the oil and gas lease involved, or more often, during a term extended by

unitization. While SB 112 is a good concept, the time limitation in large part removes the benefit.


2. Unless the Act is retroactive as to effective date, the applicability provision will exclude all currently issued leases. Those leases which are the most ready for development will not receive the benefit of reduced royalty. Operators can only look to future leases in lease sales, which may or may not occur, leases which they may or may not be successful in acquiring. At the risk of obvious self service, it is appropriate to have an effective date of January 1, 1991. Both West McArthur River and Sunfish would benefit. In the case of West McArthur River, development would definitely continue at a more rapid pace. Also, our other projects in Cook Inlet Basin would commence earlier. These items translate into jobs and long term benefit for the state.

In other words, I propose reinstatement of the original 10 year program which would apply to discoveries made after January 1, 1991 effective upon date of discovery. Previous royalty payments paid subsequent to such discovery date which are in excess of five percent royalty would constitute a credit against future royalty payments. Suggested language is attached. (Please note that the suggested language applies only to Cook Inlet Basin as a means of revitalizing Alaska's oldest petroleum producing province.)

Enactment of SB 112 with these modifications could help continue the fledgling "second wave" of exploration in Cook Inlet. It is my sincere hope that, by the upcoming new millennium "5000 bbls" will be an insignificant number in Cook Inlet Basin rather than the daily production of the second biggest producer (whomever that might be by that time).

Thank you for inviting me today. I'll try to answer any questions you may have.

STEWART PETROLEUM COMPANY

By: 

W. R. Stewart, President

SENATE BILL NO. 112

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

NINETEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE SENATE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Introduced: 3/7/95

Referred: RES. FIN

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

"An Act establishing a discovery royalty for the lessees of state land located in Cook Inlet Basin, Alaska's oldest petroleum producing province, who drill exploratory wells and make the first discovery of oil and/or gas in commercial quantities."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

***Section 1. AS 38.05.180 is amended by addition of a new section (cc) to read:**

(cc) The holder of a lease who drills and makes the first discovery of oil and/or gas in commercial quantities in a geologic structure shall pay a royalty on all production under the lease of five percent for the first 10 years following the date of discovery and thereafter the royalty shall be payable as originally provided in such lease at date of issue; provided, however, that such lease shall not upon expiration of said 10 year period be disqualified from benefit under other available royalty reduction or incentive programs, if any, for which it may qualify.

The provisions of this section shall apply only to discoveries made after January 1, 1991 within the Cook Inlet sedimentary basin, effective upon date of discovery. Any previous royalty payments paid subsequent to such discovery date which are in excess of the five percent royalty provided hereunder, shall constitute a credit against future royalty payments under this section.

SBO112A

SB 112

Original sponsor: The Rules Committee
request of the Governor

Offered: 5/10/69

THE SENATE

BY THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
SIXTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

A BILL

For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to oil and gas leases; and providing
for an effective date."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

Section 1. AS 38.05.180(a) is amended to read:

(a) All tide and submerged lands, mental health lands, school lands, and university lands shall be leased by competitive bidding, and whenever oil or gas is discovered in commercial quantities, the commissioner shall determine the extent of the area of lands in addition to tide, submerged, mental health lands, school, or university lands in the same general area of the discovery well which, by reason of the discovery, the commissioner reasonably believes to be capable of producing oil or gas, and the additional lands shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations, in units of not exceeding 2,560 acres (except that tide and submerged lands shall be leased in units of not exceeding 5,760 acres), which shall be as nearly compact in form as possible, upon the payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the commissioner and of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease which shall not be less than 12 1/2 per cent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. [HOWEVER, THE HOLDER OF A LEASE WHO DRILLS AND MAKES THE FIRST DISCOVERY OF OIL OR GAS IN COMMERCIAL QUANTITIES IN A GEOLOGIC STRUCTURE SHALL PAY A ROYALTY ON ALL PRODUCTION UNDER THE LEASE OF FIVE PER CENT FOR 10 YEARS FOLLOWING THE DATE OF DISCOVERY AND THEREAFTER THE ROYALTY RATE SHALL BE NOT

o page

From: *Bruce Leg. Liaison*
File to: *Annette 3810 3/0 Sen. Lemay*

1 LESS THAN 12 1/2 PER CENT, PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THE ROYALTY RATE
2 FOR THE FIRST DISCOVERY IN ANY UNPROVEN AREA OF THE COOK INLET SEDI-
3 MENTARY BASIN SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 12 1/2 PER CENT UNLESS THE COM-
4 MISSIONER SPECIFICALLY PROVIDES THAT SUCH ROYALTY SHALL BE LESS AT THE
5 TIME SUCH LANDS ARE OFFERED FOR LEASE AND IN NO EVENT SHALL SUCH
6 ROYALTY BE LESS THAN FIVE PER CENT.] All lands other than those above
7 provided to be leased by competitive bidding may be leased competitive
8 or noncompetitively as determined by the commissioner to be in the best
9 interests of the state. Noncompetitive leases shall be issued in units
10 of not exceeding 2,560 acres in any one lease. Noncompetitive leases
11 shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of
12 12 1/2 per cent in amount or value of the production removed or sold
13 from the lease. [HOWEVER, THE HOLDER OF A LEASE WHO DRILLS AND MAKES
14 THE FIRST DISCOVERY OF OIL OR GAS IN COMMERCIAL QUANTITIES IN A GEOLOG-
15 IC STRUCTURE SHALL PAY A ROYALTY ON ALL PRODUCTION UNDER THE LEASE OF
16 FIVE PER CENT FOR 10 YEARS FOLLOWING THE DATE OF DISCOVERY AND THERE-
17 AFTER THE ROYALTY RATE IS 12 1/2 PER CENT.] Competitive leases issued
18 under this subsection shall be for 10 years except that in the Cook
19 Inlet sedimentary basin, leases shall be for a primary term of not more
20 than 10 years and not less than five years at the discretion of the
21 commissioner, and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is
22 produced in paying quantities. Noncompetitive leases issued under this
23 subsection shall be for a primary term of five years and shall continue
24 so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. If
25 drilling has commenced on the expiration date of the primary term of
26 the lease and is continued with reasonable diligence, such operations
27 to include redrilling, sidetracking or other means necessary to reach
28 the originally proposed bottom hole location, the lease shall continue
29 in effect until 90 days after drilling has ceased and for so long

ATE
EDI-
OM-
T THE
bove
live
best
lits
#

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. If all or part of the lands covered by the lease are lands that have been selected by the state under laws of the United States granting lands to the state and a patent has not been issued thereon, a conditional lease may be issued. However, no term extension may be granted for the period during which the lease was conditional. (CONDITIONAL LEASE WAS ISSUED THEREON, THE TERM OF THE LEASE SHALL BE EXTENDED FOR A PERIOD EQUAL TO THE PERIOD DURING WHICH THE LEASE WAS CONDITIONAL)

* Sec. 2. This Act takes effect on the day after its passage and approval or on the day it becomes law without approval.

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages = 2

To	ANNETTE KREITZER	From	MARY FAGENKOPF
Ca.		Ca.	
Dept.		Phone #	3808
Fax #	3810 3810	Fax #	4844



LAWS OF ALASKA

1969

Source

CS SB 81 am H

Chapter No.

65

AN ACT

Relating to oil and gas leases; and providing for an effective date.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

Section 1. AS 38.05.100(a) is amended to read:

(a) All tide and submerged lands, mental health lands, school lands, and university lands shall be leased by competitive bidding, and whenever oil or gas is discovered in commercial quantities, the commissioner shall determine the extent of the area of lands in addition to tide, submerged, mental health lands, school, or university lands in the same general area of the discovery well which, by reason of the discovery, the commissioner reasonably believes to be capable of producing oil or gas, and the additional lands shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations, in units of not exceeding 2,560 acres (except that tide and submerged lands shall be leased in units of not exceeding 5,760 acres), which shall be as nearly compact in form as possible, upon the payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the commissioner and of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease which shall not be less than 12 1/2 per cent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. All lands other than those above provided to be leased by competitive bidding may be leased competitively or noncompetitively as determined by the commissioner to be in the best interests of the state. Noncompetitive leases shall be issued in units of not exceeding 2,560 acres in any one lease. Noncompetitive leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12 1/2 per cent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Competitive leases issued under this subsection shall be for 10 years except that in the Cook Inlet sedimentary

basin, leases shall be for a primary term of not more than 10 years and not less than five years at the discretion of the commissioner, and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Noncompetitive leases issued under this subsection shall be for a primary term of five years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. If drilling has commenced on the expiration date of the primary term of the lease and is continued with reasonable diligence, such operations to include redrilling, sidetracking or other means necessary to reach the originally proposed bottom hole location, the lease shall continue in effect until 90 days after drilling has ceased and for so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. If all or part of the lands covered by the lease are lands that have been selected by the state under laws of the United States granting lands to the state and a patent has not been issued thereon, a conditional lease may be issued. However, no term extension may be granted for the period during which the lease was conditional.

* Sec. 2. This Act takes effect on the day after its passage and approval or on the day it becomes law without approval.



LAWS OF ALASKA

1969

Source

Chapter No.

HB 233

66

AN ACT

Relating to sale of timber and materials.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

* Section 1. AS 38.05.115 is amended to read:

Sec. 38.05.115. LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SALE.
 (a) The commissioner, upon recommendation of the director, shall determine the timber and other materials to be sold, and the limitations, conditions and terms of sale. The limitations, conditions and terms shall include the utilization, development and maintenance of the sustained yield principle, subject to preference among other beneficial uses. The director may negotiate sales of timber or materials without advertisement and on the limitations, conditions, and terms which he considers are in the best interests of the state, subject to the approval of the commissioner. However, not more than 500 M.B.M. of timber or more than \$2,500 of materials may be sold by nonadvertised, negotiated sale to the same purchaser within a one-year period.

(b) Negotiated sales for timber or materials not exceeding a value of \$250 are exempt from the provisions of AS 34.15.150.

Approved by governor: May 5, 1969
 Actual effective date: August 3, 1969

The House was called to order at 11:25 a.m.

CSHB 332 Mr. Pink withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, amendment No. 3 was adopted.

amendment No. 4 by Beirne:

Page 2, line 5: Strike "period" and add "provided the applicant shall have complied with AS 08.80.110(5)"

Mrs. Beirne moved and asked unanimous consent that amendment No. 4 be adopted. Mr. Guess objected. Mr. Guess withdrew his objection. Mr. Sweet objected. Mr. Sweet withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, amendment No. 4 was adopted.

Mrs. Beirne moved and asked unanimous consent that COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 332 amended be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 332 amended was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 332 amended pass the House?" The roll was called with the following result:

Yeas: 32 - Anderson, Banfield, Beirne, Boardman, Borer, Bradner, Bronson, Cornelius, Croft, Deveau, Eliason, Guess, Harris, Haugen, Hensley, Hillstrand, Hohman, Holm, Jackson, Kay, McGill, McVeigh, Miller, Orbeck, Paukan, Reeves, Rettig, Sackett, Schwamm, Sweet, Tillion, Young.

Nays: 5 - Pink, Kerttula, Metcalf, Ray, Sarsara.

Excused: 3 - Chance, Moses, Peratrovich.

And so, COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 332 amended passed the House and was referred to the Chief Clerk for engrossment.

Mr. Guess moved and asked unanimous consent that the House revert to Reports of Standing Committees. There being no objection, the House reverted to

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

CSHB 81 The Finance Committee has had COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 (relating to oil and gas leases) under consideration and a majority of the members of the committee recommends it do pass with the following amendment:

amendment No. 1 by the Finance Committee:

Page 3, lines 1 through 4: Feature deleted material on lines 1 through 4 ending with the word AND.

Page 3, line 4: Insert following material after AND:
"patent has not been issued thereon, a conditional lease may be issued.

However, no term extension may be granted for the period during which the lease was conditional."

CSHB
81

The report was signed by Mr. Ray, Chairman, and concurred in by Ray, Croft, Bradner, Sackett, Haugen and Borer.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 was referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar.

CONSIDERATION OF DAILY CALENDAR (continued)

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 191 (relating to property exempt from execution) was read the second time with the Judiciary Committee report (pages 718 - 719 of the Journal).

CSHB
191

amendment No. 1 by the Judiciary Committee:

Page 1, lines 14, 17 and 18: Delete "a single person" and insert in its place "he is not the head of a family."

Mr. Cornelius moved and asked unanimous consent that amendment No. 1 be adopted. There being no objection, amendment No. 1 was adopted.

CSHB
191
an
11

Mr. Cornelius moved and asked unanimous consent that COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 191 amended by the House be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 191 amended by the House was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 191 amended by the House pass the House?" The roll was called with the following result:

Yeas: 29 - Anderson, Banfield, Beirne, Boardman, Bronson, Cornelius, Croft, Deveau, Pink, Guess, Haugen, Hensley, Hohman, Holm, Jackson, Kay, Kerttula, Metcalf, Miller, Moses, Orbeck, Paukan, Reeves, Rettig, Sackett, Sarsara, Schwamm, Sweet, Young.

Nays: 6 - Borer, Bradner, Eliason, Harris, Hillstrand, Tillion.

Excused: 5 - Chance, McGill, McVeigh, Peratrovich, Ray.

Mr. Eliason changed his vote from yea to nay.

And so, COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 191 amended by the House passed the House and was referred to the Chief Clerk for engrossment.

SENATE BILL NO. 86 (relating to the rights of initiative, referendum and recall reserved to the people of the

SD
86

HB 341 And so, HOUSE BILL NO. 341 passed the House.
Mr. Ray moved and asked unanimous consent that the roll call on the passage of HOUSE BILL NO. 341 be considered the roll call on the effective date clause. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

HOUSE BILL NO. 341 was referred to the Chief Clerk for engrossment.

HB 273 HOUSE BILL NO. 273 (relating to the examination for communicable diseases of persons in custody) was read the second time with the Health, Welfare and Education Committee report (page 333 of the Journal) and the Judiciary Committee report (pages 745 - 746 of the Journal).

CSHD 273 Mr. Cornelius moved and asked unanimous consent that COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 273 be adopted in lieu of HOUSE BILL NO. 273. Mr. Guess objected. Mr. Guess withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 273 was adopted.

Mr. Cornelius moved and asked unanimous consent that COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 273 be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 273 was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 273 pass the House?" The roll was called with the following result:

Yeas: 20 - Anderson, Banfield, Beirne, Boardman, Bronson, Cornelius, Deveau, Fink, Guess, Harris, Haugen, Hillstrand, Hohman, Holm, Kay, Kerttula, McGill, Metcalf, Miller, Moses, Orbeck, Peratrovich, Ray, Rettig, Sackett, Schwann, Sweet, Tillion, Young.

Nays: 0 - Borer, Bradner, Croft, Eliason, Reeves.

Excused: 6 - Chance, Hensley, Jackson, McVeigh, Paukan, Saccara.

And so, COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 273 passed the House and was referred to the Chief Clerk for engrossment.

THIRD READING OF SENATE BILLS

CSHD 81 COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 (relating to oil and gas leases; and providing for an effective date) was read the second time with the Resources Committee report (page 571 of the Journal) and the Finance Committee report (pages 794 - 795 of the Journal).

amendment No. 1 by the Finance Committee:

Page 3, lines 1 through 4: Portion deleted material on lines 1 through 4 ending with the word AND.

Page 3, line 4: Insert the following material after AND: "patent has not been issued thereon, a conditional lease may be issued. However, no term extension may be granted for the period during which the lease was conditional."

CSHD 81

Mr. Croft moved and asked unanimous consent that amendment No. 1 be adopted. Mr. Kay objected. Mr. Kay withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, amendment No. 1 was adopted.

CSHD 81 am II

Mr. Croft moved and asked unanimous consent that COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. Mr. Fink objected. Mr. Fink withdrew his objection. Mr. McGill objected. Mr. McGill withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House pass the House?" The roll was called with the following result:

Yeas: 37 - Anderson, Banfield, Beirne, Boardman, Borer, Bradner, Bronson, Cornelius, Croft, Deveau, Eliason, Fink, Guess, Harris, Haugen, Hillstrand, Holm, Kay, Kerttula, McGill, Metcalf, Moses, Orbeck, Peratrovich, Ray, Reeves, Rettig, Sackett, Schwann, Sweet, Tillion, Young.

Nays: 1 - Miller.

Excused: 7 - Chance, Hensley, Hohman, Jackson, McVeigh, Paukan, Saccara.

And so, COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House passed the House.

Mr. Guess moved and asked unanimous consent that the roll call on the passage of COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House be considered the roll call on the effective date clause. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House was referred to the Chief Clerk for engrossment.

Mr. McGill gave notice of reconsideration of his vote on COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House.

Mr. Cornelius gave notice of reconsideration of his vote on COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 amended by the House.

SENATE BILL NO. 142 amended (relating to Physical Therapists; and providing for an effective date) was read the second time with the Health, Welfare and Education Committee report (page 673 of the Journal) and the Commerce Committee report

CSHD 142

January 30.

Also, if it is agreeable with the members of the House and Senate, I would suggest 3 p.m., this same date, as the time for presentation of the budget message and 1969-1970 budget appropriation bill to a joint session of the Legislature.

I join with all Alaskans in wishing the members of the First Session of the Sixth State Legislature a productive and rewarding session.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

s/ Keith H. Miller
Keith H. Miller
Governor"

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message dated January 30, 1969, was read requesting the Senate meet in joint session January 30, 1969, at 11:00 a.m. to hear the Governor's State of Affairs message, and at 3:00 p.m. to receive the Governor's budget message.

Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that a message be transmitted to the House accepting their invitation. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that a message be sent to the House asking it to join with the Senate in inviting Congressman Howard W. Pollock to address a joint session of the Legislature February 10, 1969. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

• • •

Senator Blighett requested permission to be excused from a call of the Senate from today until Monday, February 2. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

ENGROSSMENT

108 The Secretary reported that SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 2 (honoring the late E. L. "Bob" Bartlett) had been correctly engrossed, signed by the President and Secretary and transmitted to the House for their consideration.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS

109 SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1 by Senator Begich,

expressing concern of the Legislature for sound oil and gas conservation practices in Alaska and directing that a study be made, was read the first time and referred to the Resources Committee. SCR 3

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS

SENATE BILL NO. 80 by Senator B. Phillips, entitled: SB 80

"An Act relating to the state museum."

was read the first time and referred to the State Affairs Committee.

SENATE BILL NO. 81 by the Rules Committee by request of the Governor, entitled: SB 81

"An Act relating to oil and gas leases; and providing for an effective date."

was read the first time and referred to the Resources Committee.

The Governor's transmittal letter covering SENATE BILL NO. 81 is as follows:

"January 29, 1969

The Honorable Jay S. Hammond
Chairman, Senate Rules Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Pursuant to State Law and the Uniform Rules of the Legislature, I am transmitting herewith a bill entitled 'An Act relating to oil and gas leases; and providing for an effective date.'

This amendment eliminates the extension of term on the lease for lands on which the State has only tentative approval at the time of leasing. A conditional lease has often been considered by most companies as drillable title and the fact of conditionality is no detriment to development of the leases. Some leases have extended to 15 years. I feel that the State did not contemplate nor intend for a lessee to be entitled to hold a lease beyond a ten year primary term. This bill also reverts to a minimum five year term oil and gas lease, at the discretion of the Department. The shorter term will hasten development and drilling activities in many areas and will open up more opportunities for smaller companies and independents not presently active in Alaska, by causing the land to be released at an earlier date.

Sincerely yours,

SEN The above two resolutions were referred to the Rules
4 Committee for placement on the calendar.

SEN
6

SEN The State Affairs Committee has had SENATE CONCURRENT
7 RESOLUTION NO. 7 (study of Alaskan natives' employment)
under consideration and the committee recommends
it do pass. The report was signed by Senator Engstrom,
Chairman, and concurred in by Senators Koslosky, Merdes,
Butrovich and Blodgett.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 7 was referred to the
Rules Committee for placement on the calendar.

Senator Blodgett moved and asked unanimous consent
that his name be added as a sponsor on SENATE CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION NO. 7. There being no objection, it was so
ordered.

SEN The State Affairs Committee has had SENATE BILL NO. 105
105 (Statute of L. L. Bartlett) under consideration and the
committee recommends it do pass. The report was signed
by Senator Engstrom, Chairman, and concurred in by
Senators Merdes, Butrovich, Koslosky and Blodgett.

SENATE BILL NO. 105 was referred to the Rules Committee
for placement on the calendar.

SEN The State Affairs Committee has had SENATE BILL NO. 133
133 (Human Rights Commission) under consideration and the
committee recommends it do pass. The report was signed
by Senator Engstrom, Chairman, and concurred in by
Senators Butrovich, Merdes and Blodgett. Not concurring
was Senator Koslosky who recommends: "Do not pass."

SENATE BILL NO. 133 was referred to the Rules Committee
for placement on the calendar.

SEN The State Affairs Committee has had COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE
133 HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1, am (National Secretary
133 133 133) under consideration and the committee recom-
1 am mends it do pass. The report was signed by Senator
Engstrom, Chairman, and concurred in by Senators Butrovich,
Merdes, Blodgett and Koslosky.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1, am,
was referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the
calendar.

SEN The State Affairs Committee has had HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
133 133 (posthumous olive branch, the late Sen. E. L. "Doc"
Bartlett) under consideration and the committee recommends
it do pass. The report was signed by Senator Engstrom,
Chairman, and concurred in by Senators Merdes, Butrovich,
Koslosky and Blodgett.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 14 was referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar.

HJR
14

The State Affairs Committee has had HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6 (commending Senator Gruening) under consideration and the committee recommends it do pass. The report was signed by Senator Engstrom, Chairman, and concurred in by Senators Koslosky, Merdes and Butrovich. Not concurring was Senator Blodgett, who had no recommendation.

HC
6

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6 was referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar.

The Finance Committee has had SENATE BILL NO. 70 (appropriating for Legislative Affairs Agency) under consideration and the committee recommends it be replaced with COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 70, with the same title, and that the Committee Substitute do pass. The report was signed by Senator V. Phillips, Chairman, and concurred in by Senators Lewis, Bradshaw and Haggland. Not concurring was Senator Miller who had no recommendation.

SB
70

SENATE BILL NO. 70 was referred to the Rules Committee for placement on the calendar.

The Resources Committee has had SENATE BILL NO. 81 (oil and gas leases) under consideration and the committee recommends it do pass with the following amendment:

SB
81

- Page 2, line 4: "and the area north of the crest of the Brooks Range between the Arctic Ocean and the Alaska-Canada border, and all state-owned lands seaward of this area."
- Page 2, line 5: Place period after "12 1/2 per cent." and delete remainder of sentence which ends on line 8 with the words, "less than five per cent."
- Page 3, line 21: after word "leases," insert "in the Cook Inlet Basin"

The report was signed by Senator Palmer, Chairman, and concurred in by Senators Thomas, Butrovich, Koslosky, Hammond and Poland. Not concurring was Senator Christensen, who had no recommendation.

SENATE BILL NO. 81 was referred to the Commerce Committee.

Senator Engstrom moved and asked unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee report be adopted. There being no objection, the report was adopted thus adopting the amendment offered by the Judiciary Committee (page 303 of the Journal).

There being no further amendments, Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that SENATE BILL NO. 73, am, be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

SENATE BILL NO. 73, am, was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall SENATE BILL NO. 73, am, (national forest income) pass the Senate?" The roll was taken with the following result:

Yeas:	18	Begich, Blodgett, Butrovich, Christiansen, Engstrom, Haggland, Hammond, Josephson, Koslosky, Merdes, Miller, Palmer, V. Phillips, Poland, Rader, Thomas, Ziegler and B. Phillips.
Nays:	1	Bradshaw.
Absent:	1	Lewis.

And so, SENATE BILL NO. 73, am, passed the Senate.

SENATE BILL NO. 73, am, was referred to the Secretary for engrossment.

SENATE BILL NO. 81 (oil and gas leases) was read the second time.

Senator Haggland moved and asked unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee report be adopted, thus adopting COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81. Senator Miller objected. Senator Miller withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, the Commerce Committee report was adopted, thus adopting COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81.

There being no amendments, Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. Without objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 (oil and gas leases) pass the Senate?" The roll was taken with the following result:

Yeas:	19	Begich, Blodgett, Bradshaw, Butrovich, Christiansen, Engstrom, Haggland, Hammond, Josephson, Koslosky, Merdes, Miller, Palmer, V. Phillips, Poland, Rader, Thomas, Ziegler and B. Phillips.
-------	----	---

Yays: 0

CS

Absent: 1

Lewis.

SB
81

And so, COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 passed the Senate.

Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that the roll call on the passage of COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 be considered the roll call on the effective date clause. Without objection, it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 was referred to the Secretary for engrossment.

SENATE BILL NO. 208 (search warrants) was read the second time.

SB
208

There being no amendments, Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that SENATE BILL NO. 208 be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. Without objection, it was so ordered.

SENATE BILL NO. 208 was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall SENATE BILL NO. 208 (search warrants) pass the Senate?" The roll was taken with the following result:

Yays: 19

DeGleh, Blodgett, Bradshaw, Butrovich, Christiansen, Engstrom, Haggland, Hammond, Josephson, Koslosky, Merdes, Miller, Palmer, V. Phillips, Poland, Rader, Thomas, Ziegler and B. Phillips.

Yays: 0

Absent: 1

Lewis.

And so, SENATE BILL NO. 208 passed the Senate.

SENATE BILL NO. 208 was referred to the Secretary for engrossment.

SENATE BILL NO. 218 (single judicial ballot in each judicial district) was read the second time.

SB
218

There being no amendments, Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that SENATE BILL NO. 218 be considered engrossed, advanced to third reading and placed on final passage. Without objection, it was so ordered.

SENATE BILL NO. 218 was read the third time.

The question being: "Shall SENATE BILL NO. 218 (single judicial ballot in each judicial district) pass the Senate?" The roll was taken with the following result:

SR 275 A message dated April 19, 1969, was read, stating the House has passed SENATE BILL NO. 275, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 36 and SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 38 and returning same.

SJR 36 SENATE BILL NO. 275, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 36 and SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 38 were referred to the Secretary for enrollment.

CSRB 81 A message dated April 19, 1969, was read, stating the House has passed COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 (relating to oil and gas leases) with the following amendment and returning same.

Page 3, Lines 1 through 4: Restore deleted material on Lines 1 through 4 ending with AND.

Page 3, Line 4: Insert the following material after AND: "patent has not been issued thereon, a conditional lease may be issued. However, no term extension may be granted for the period during which the lease was conditional."

Senator Palmer moved that the Senate concur in the House amendment to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81. Senator Ingstrom objected.

Senator Petrovich moved and asked unanimous consent that the House message relating to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 be held one legislative day for action by the Senate. There being no objection, it was so ordered and the Secretary was instructed to reproduce the amendments for distribution to all Senators.

CSRB 136 A message dated April 19, 1969, stating the House had passed COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 136 (Rules) (Rules) (Interest allowed on judgments) with the following amendment and returning same, was read:

HOUSE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 136.

Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendment to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 136 (Rules). Senator V. Phillips objected, and then withdrew his objection. Senator Ingstrom objected.

The question being: "Shall the Senate concur in the House amendment to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 136 (Rules)?" On voice vote, the Senate concurred, and the Secretary was instructed to so inform the House.

HCR 136 HOUSE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 136 was referred to the Secretary for enrollment.

A message dated April 19, 1969, was read, stating the House has passed COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 14, amended, (electrical safety) with the following amendment and returning same:

HOUSE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 14

Senator Thomas moved that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The question being: "Shall the Senate concur in the House amendment to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 14, am?" On voice vote, the Senate failed to concur in the House amendments.

The Secretary was instructed to so inform the House and request that the House recede from its amendment.

A message dated April 19, 1969, was read, stating the House has passed COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 174 (state manpower training program) with the following amendment, and returning same:

Page 2, line 9: Change one to three

Page 2, line 10: Change one to three

Page 2, line 11: Add s to number (twice in line)

Page 2, line 12: Change one to three

Senator Hammond moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 174.

The question being: "Shall the Senate concur in the House amendments to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 174?" On voice vote, the Senate concurred, and the Secretary was instructed to so notify the House.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 174, as H. was referred to the Secretary for enrollment.

A message dated April 19, 1969, was read, stating the House has passed the following resolutions, and they are herewith transmitted for consideration:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 54

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 53

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 56 amended

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 52 by Messrs. Kerttula and Paukan, directing the Legislative Council to conduct a study on the reindeer industry, was read the first time and referred to the Resources Committee.

CSRB
14

CSRB
174

CSRB
174
as H

HCR
52

SENATE JOURNAL

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SIXTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

Juneau, Alaska

April 22, 1969

Eighty-Sixth Day

Pursuant to adjournment the was called to order
by President Phillips at 2:

Roll call showed all members present.

The prayer, offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Ralph
Wegener, follows:

"Our heavenly Father, the Author of all freedom,
we in this hour do thank Thee for the Great
Land in which we live and for all its basic free-
doms. May this freedom mean for us that we are
a responsible people, each having special interests,
and yet living in the hope that a better tomorrow
is actually possible. May it mean that varying
opinions may grow and live side by side and also
flow freely.

We ask Thy divine blessings on this Senate.
Cause the members of this body to deliberate,
to debate, and to decide as individualistic,
self-reliant, property-owning citizens . . .
who are enlightened and aroused as they live in
this atmosphere of freedom to seek to solve our
common problems and to provide for our common
good.

We ask this, humbly grateful for Thy many blessings
we do even now enjoy, in the blessed Savior's
precious name. Amen."

The Secretary certified as to the correctness of the
Journal for the eighty-fifth legislative day in
accordance with the rules. Senator Hammond moved and
asked unanimous consent that the Journal be approved
as submitted. Without objection, it was so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

The message dated April 19, 1969 relating to COMMITTEE
SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 (page 76 of the
Journal) was read again with the House amendments.
This message had been held one legislative day for
study.

CSSD
81

Senator Falser moved and asked unanimous consent that
the Senate concur in the House amendments to COMMITTEE

CSCH SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81 (relating to oil
81 and gas leases). There being no objection, it was
am H so ordered; and the Secretary was instructed to so
inform the House.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 81, am H,
was referred to the Secretary for enrollment.

SJR A message dated April 21, 1969, was read, stating the
45 House has passed SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 45
and SENATE BILL NO. 235 and returning same.

SD
235 SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 45 and SENATE BILL NO.
235 were referred to the Secretary for enrollment.

A message, dated April 21, 1969, was read, transmitting
the enrolled copies of the following resolutions
for the signatures of the President and Secretary:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 54 am

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 44

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 45

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 3.

The enrolled copies of the above resolutions were
signed by the President and Secretary and returned
to the House.

CSNB A message dated April 21, 1969, was read, stating
23 the House has passed COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR
(Jud.) SENATE BILL NO. 23 (Judiciary), amended, with the
am following amendment, and returning same:

HOUSE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE
FOR SENATE BILL NO. 23 as amended by the House:
the amendments follow:

Page 1, line 11: Insert after "operates",
the words: "or drives".

Page 1, lines 16, 19 and 20: Insert
"operating or" before the
word "driving". Delete
"or in actual physical
control of".

Senator Thomas moved that the Senate concur in the
House amendments to COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE
BILL NO. 23 (Judiciary). On voice vote, the Senate
did not concur in the House amendments. The
Secretary was instructed to so inform the House
and ask it to recede from its amendment.

A message dated April 21, 1969, was read, stating
the House has passed HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 57,
am, and transmitting same.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 57, am, by Messrs. Metcalf
and Rettig requesting the construction of two additional
sea-train slip facilities at the Port of Seward, was
read the first time and referred to the State Affairs
Committee.

HJR
57
am

COMMUNICATIONS

"April 19, 1969

The Honorable Brad Phillips
President of the Senate
Alaska State Senate
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Brad:

I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to
you and all my friends in the Senate. I have
spent many happy birthdays, but the Senate
birthday party on Tuesday topped them all.

Again, many thanks to you, the other senators
and the Senate staff members who made the
celebration possible.

Sincerely,

s/ Mark Jacobs, Sr.
Mark Jacobs, Sr.

Senator Hammond moved and asked unanimous consent
that the Secretary send a message to the House
requesting the members to meet in joint session with
the Senate members at 3:00 p.m. Thursday, April 24,
1969, to consider the confirmation of recent appointments
by the Governor. There being no objection, it was so
ordered; the Secretary was instructed to transmit the
message.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

ENCLOSURE 24

COOK INLET DISCOVERY ROYALTY APPLICATIONS

Name of Well	Lessee (present name)	ADL Number	Date of Discovery	First Affidavit or claim of discovery	Date of written decision granting discovery royalty	Effective date of the 10-year discovery royalty	Commencement of commercial production	Date 12 1/2% royalty replaced 5% discovery royalty rate	Period royalty actually reduced
Falls Creek Unit No. 1	Chevron ARCO	00590	4/10/61	12/3/63	2/18/64	5/1/61	None	No royalty ever paid	Never used
Middle Ground Shoal No. 1	AMOCO Getty Phillips	17595	6/10/62	11/12/62	1/15/63	6/10/62	5/66	6/10/72	6 years 1 month
Cook Inlet State No. 1	Phillips	17589	8/21/62	11/12/62	11/24/64	9/1/62	3/69	9/72	3 years 6 months
Beluga River Unit No. 1	Chevron ARCO Shell	17599	12/1/62	9/17/63	12/19/62	1/1/63	3/68	1/73	4 years 10 months
Granite Point No. 1	Mobil Union	18761	5/16/65	5/21/65	9/14/65	6/1/65	5/67	6/75	8 years 1 month
Trading Bay No. 1-A	Union Marathon	18731	5/23/65	6/18/65	8/27/65	6/1/65	1/67	6/75	8 years 5 months
Orrising No. 1-A	Union Marathon	17594	9/29/65	10/28/65	1/19/66	10/1/65	10/67	10/75	8 years 1 month
Nicholas Creek State No. 1	Texaco Superior	17598	4/28/66	5/23/66	8/19/66	5/1/66	10/68	No production after 1972	About 4 years

APPLICATIONS DENIED

Name of Well	ADL Number
Trading Bay No. 1 and No. 2	17597
Shoal Middle Ground Shoal	18754
W. Forland Unit No. 3	18777
Redoubt Shoal No. 2	20690
Trading Bay State No. 1	35431

ENCLOSURE 25

**NORTH SLOPE
DISCOVERY ROYALTY APPLICATIONS**

<u>Lease ADL</u>	<u>Well Name</u>	<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Date of Application</u>	<u>Status of Application</u>
28303	Prudhoe Bay State #1	Prudhoe Bay	ARCO	3/12/68	Granted
25633	Ugnu #1	Kuparuk	ARCO-BP	4/7/69	Granted
34633	Sag Delta #4	Endicott	BP	2/14/78	Granted
34635	Niakuk #5	Niakuk	BP	4/7/85	Granted
28297	Pt. McIntyre #3	Pt. McIntyre	ARCO	5/12/89	Granted
25906	Milne Point G-1	Milne Point	Conoco	12/7/89	Denied

Note:

Between 1968 and 1977 nine additional notice of discovery applications were filed, but the applicants never completed the full application procedure. Those nine applications are now expired.

ENCLOSURE 26



Tom Painter
Division Manager

Conoco Inc.
3201 C Street
Suite 200
Anchorage, AK 99503

September 7, 1989

Mr. James Eason
Director, Division of Oil and Gas
Department of Natural Resources
P. O. Box 7034
Anchorage, AK 99510-7034

RECEIVED

SEP 08 1989

DIV. OF OIL & GAS
DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

Dear Mr. Eason:


Pursuant to paragraph 12 of lease ADL 25906 and 11 AAC 83.210(a), Conoco Inc. is submitting the attached Statement of First Discovery of Oil and Gas in Commercial Quantities in a Geologic Structure precedent to filing an application for discovery royalty for ADL 25906.

As indicated in the attached Statement and Exhibits, oil and gas has been encountered in sufficient showing in well no. G-1 to cause Conoco, a reasonable and prudent operator, to conduct further operations to complete said well in the discovery zone so that the well can be tested for potential oil or gas production in commercial quantities.

As required in 11 AAC 83.210(b), Conoco will undertake production tests in well no G-1 to establish that oil and gas has been discovered in commercial quantities. This testing will take place in the latter half of September, 1989, and we will furnish you sufficient notice and transportation (if requested) for a representative of your department to witness the testing. The geologic data required in 11 AAC 83.210(c) will be furnished in a timely manner.

If you need additional information concerning this Statement, please contact Al Hastings at 564-7650. Conoco respectfully requests that the information contained in the Statement and attached Exhibits remain confidential until the conclusion of the application and certification process.

Very truly yours,


T. R. Painter
Division Manager

AEH(jr)
File 500.58.08

Enclosure 26



Conoco Inc.
Suite 200
3201 C Street
Anchorage, AK 99503
(907) 584-7600

December 7, 1989

RECEIVED

DEC 11 1989

DIVISION OF OIL & GAS
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. James Eason
Director, Division of Oil and Gas
Department of Natural Resources
P. O. Box 7034
Anchorage, Alaska 99510-7034

Dear Mr. Eason:

Pursuant to 11 AAC 83.215, Conoco Inc., as Operator of the Milne Point Unit and the sole Working Interest Owner of ADL 25906, requests discovery well certification for Well No. G-1. Conoco is in compliance with the filing provisions of 11 AAC 83.210.

It is my understanding that the Division of Oil and Gas will publish the appropriate notice of this application for discovery royalty. If you need additional information concerning this discovery royalty application, please contact me at 564-7601.

Attached to this application is a brief discussion of the Pre-Drilling Expectation and the Post-Drilling Verification for Well No. G-1. This discussion summarizes the other criteria that have been used in the more recent discovery royalty decisions.

Very truly yours,


David L. Bowler
Division Manager

AEH(jr)
Attachment
File 500.58.08

ENCLOSURE 27

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

PO BOX 7034
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99510-7034
PHONE: (907) 762-2553

DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

April 4, 1991

DECISION

Conoco, Inc.	:	Oil and Gas Lease
Suite 200	:	ADL 28297
3201 C Street	:	Milne Point Unit
Anchorage, Alaska 99503	:	

MILNE POINT UNIT G-1 WELL DENIED CERTIFICATION
AS A DISCOVERY WELL

The Division of Oil and Gas (division) hereby denies certification of the Milne Point Unit G-1 well (G-1) as a discovery well. As discussed in greater detail below, this denial is based on the determination that overwhelming evidence, including that submitted by Conoco, Inc. (Conoco), clearly establishes that the G-1 well fails the essential "first discovery" requirement. The Shallow Oil Sands (SOS) and the larger structure of which it is a part was clearly discovered by previous exploration, and was publicly known.

Previous discovery is evidenced by: (1) several hundred earlier exploratory, Kuparuk River Unit and Milne Point Unit well penetrations which yield substantial electric log and/or core data to recognize the accumulation, and (2) previous successful flow tests of the accumulation from at least five other wells in the Milne Point Unit, and a pilot project within the Kuparuk River Unit. The division's evaluation is supported by the geological, geophysical, and engineering information submitted by Conoco, as well as by in-house data.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The legal basis for the discovery royalty

The statute that authorized the granting of a reduced royalty rate for a discovery of a separate geologic structure was the former AS 38.05.180(a), which stated in part:

the holder of a lease who drills and makes the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a geologic structure shall pay a royalty on all production under the lease of five percent for ten years following the date of discovery and thereafter the royalty rate of twelve and one half percent.

Although this provision was subsequently repealed, it was in effect when ADL 25906 was issued. Paragraph 12 of the lease describes the discovery royalty provision as follows:

If Lessee shall drill on said land and make the first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in any geological structure, the royalty rate under this lease shall, instead of the rates prescribed in Paragraph 11, be five percent for a period of ten years following the date of such discovery, and thereafter the royalty rates shall be those prescribed in Paragraph 11. If this lease is committed to a unit agreement approved or prescribed by Lessor as provided in the regulations, the five percent royalty rate shall not apply to all, but only, the production allocated to this lease under such agreement.

Regulations implementing the discovery royalty statute were initially adopted in August 1963 and were published at 11 AAC 505.74 - 11 AAC 505.748. They were subsequently amended and renumbered as 11 AAC 83.200 - 11 AAC 83.230. In January 1980, these regulations were repealed. In adjudicating the Conoco request for discovery royalty, the department has used the repealed regulations as a reference only, and does not consider them to be controlling.

Lease History

Humble Oil and Refining Company and Richfield Oil Corporation, in a 50-50 partnership, purchased Oil and Gas Lease ADL 25906 on December 9, 1964 at Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale 13.

The lease was issued as a conditional lease effective March 1, 1965, with a ten-year primary term and a fixed royalty rate of twelve and one half percent. Humble later became Exxon Corporation (Exxon), and Richfield became ARCO Alaska Inc. (ARCO). ADL 25906 was added to the Milne Point Unit during the second expansion of the Unit, effective June 1, 1983. Conoco acquired Exxon's interest in the lease on July 28, 1987 and ARCO's interest on November 2, 1988. Conoco currently retains 100 percent working interest and ownership in ADL 25906.

Drilling History

Four wells have been drilled on ADL 25906. The first well drilled on the lease was the Milne Point Unit G-1, which was spudded on August 10, 1989 and completed on August 22, 1989. The well was drilled to a measured depth of 4745 feet. The operator logged, cored, and tested the Shallow Oil Sands (SOS), which were, as anticipated, productive. Subsequently, three additional development wells have been drilled on G pad and four well each on H, I, and J pads.

Discovery Royalty Application History

Conoco submitted a Statement of First Discovery on September 7, 1989. The statement claimed to have discovered oil in "Upper Cretaceous Formation sandstones" in the Milne Point Unit G-1 well, located on ADL 25906, on August 15, 1989. On December 7, 1989 Conoco tendered an application for discovery well certification for the G-1 well based upon well tests conducted on October 31, 1989. In the discussion attached to and made part of the application, Conoco characterized the claimed discovery in terms of the "Shallow Oil Sands." On December 14, 1989 Conoco submitted "geologic data to establish the geologic structure from which the G-1 well produced oil in commercial quantities." That document also directed itself to the Shallow Oil Sands, and expressly equated intervals within the sands with what ARCO Alaska, Inc. calls the "West Sak" and the "upper Ugnu."

Division staff met with Conoco representatives on January 24 and February 6, 1990 to discuss the application. On November 1990, Conoco submitted additional geological and geophysical data in support of its claim. On December 10, 1990, after division technical staff determined that the application was complete, the division published notice and separately mailed notice of the discovery royalty application to known potentially interested parties.

The division received no responses during the thirty day comment period. Therefore, the application stands unopposed

by any third party. No one has requested a public hearing, and the division has not requested a hearing in light of the vast amount of available data and the fact that the applicant has had a full opportunity to make both formal and informal presentations of its technical and legal positions.

DISCUSSION

The G-1 well did not make a first discovery.

The fatal deficiency of the application, demonstrated unequivocally by materials submitted by Conoco itself, is the absence of any "first discovery." The location and distribution of the SOS have been known for almost two decades. Published maps of the geologic structure and the oil accumulation for the SOS existed prior to the drilling of the Milne Point G-1 well. The application itself makes clear that the operator of the G-1 well had a pre-drilling expectation that the well would in fact penetrate a productive pool within the same geologic structure and interval as had been penetrated by hundreds of other wells within the Milne Point and Kuparuk River Units. In light of the amount of available information prior to drilling, it is clear that the G-1 well can best be described as Conoco's first planned production well within the SOS. Below are listed a few of the facts demonstrating that the structure containing the SOS was discovered long before the G-1 well.

O The East Ugnu No. 1 Well

In 1969, twenty years before the G-1 well was drilled, the East Ugnu No. 1 well discovered¹ two structures containing hydrocarbons: the deeper Kuparuk Formation (which forms the basis of production from both the Kuparuk River Unit and the initial participating area of the Milne Point Unit), and a shallower structure (which contains the intervals Conoco refers to as the SOS). The shallower structure was tested and flowed heavy oil at a rate of 20 barrels per day.

The East Ugnu No. 1 well is located four and three-fourths miles to the southwest of the G-1 well. The geologic isopach and structure maps, cross sections and interpreted seismic data supplied by Conoco show that the SOS, present in both the

¹ Based upon this discovery by the East Ugnu No. 1 Well, the owners of ADL 25633 were granted discovery royalty rights for any production of oil and gas and associated hydrocarbons attributed to that lease from any zone of production, including the shallow sands, during the first ten years after the date of discovery, i.e., for the period from May 1, 1969 through April 30, 1979.

G-1 and East Ugnu wells, are contained within the same geologic structure. Furthermore, the sands present within the Shallow Sands Interval in both the G-1 and East Ugnu No. 1 well are part of the same reservoir. These sands are part of a large Late Cretaceous and Paleogene deltaic system, and are interpreted as being deposited in shelf, delta front, delta plain and fluvial environments.

Reservoirs found in these environments typically contain multiple stacked and partially isolated sands. The individual sand bodies which make up the SOS clearly demonstrate this reservoir heterogeneity. However, geological, geophysical, and engineering data indicate that, disregarding localized reservoir discontinuities and small faults, the SOS reservoir is continuous between East Ugnu No. 1 and Milne Point G-1.

○ Conoco's discovery royalty certification application

On December 7, 1989, Conoco filed its application for discovery royalty certification. Attached to and made part of that application was a discussion of pre-drilling expectations for the G-1 well. That documents admits

The risk of geologic nonsuccess for the shallow sands at Milne Point is small. Sufficient regional data in existence before the drilling of Well No. G-1 minimized the risk of not finding the geologic structure.

The next paragraph of the document generally discusses the SOS in the Milne Point Unit and the West Sak in the Kuparuk River Unit as the same structure, and estimates that in excess of \$150 million had been expended in drilling, testing and pilot project work. The document bluntly characterizes the difficulty with establishing sustained production from the SOS prior to the G-1 well as a "completion and production problem, and not a question of finding sufficient in-place hydrocarbons."

The attachment to the application goes on to state that pre-drilling expectations were confirmed:

The post drilling confirmed that the basic geologic structural definition before drilling commenced was correct. Minor changes in sand thickness and fluid content slightly altered oil in place values.

This proves beyond any doubt that Conoco did not discover the structure. It knew to a high degree of confidence and specificity what it would encounter.

O The application for a participating area for production from the SOS

On November 16, 1989, Conoco applied to the Division of Oil and Gas for establishment of a participating area within the Milne Point Unit for purposes of production of hydrocarbons from the SOS. That application states that "The Shallow Oil Sands have been tested by six wells within the Milne Point Unit." The G-1 well was drilled in 1989. Of the other five, one, the A-1 well, was drilled in 1980, and the four others were drilled in 1982.

Nothing suggests that the SOS tested in the Milne Point G-1 well contains oil or reservoir rock of significantly better quality or quantity than revealed in the five previously tested wells within the Milne Point Unit. Thus, even without any consideration of the many wells drilled into and testing the SOS in the Kuparuk River Unit, Conoco's own submissions reveal the fact that five prior wells within the Milne Point Unit drilled into and tested the SOS many years prior to Conoco's claimed "first discovery."

O Geologic analysis submitted on December 14, 1989 and in November 1990.

That the SOS was discovered well before the G-1 well is further proven by Conoco's geologic interpretations submitted on December 14, 1989 and in November 1990. The December 14, 1989 document, entitled "Geologic Evidence in Support of the Discovery Royalty for the Shallow Oil Sands" states:

The Shallow Oil Sands (SOS) of Milne Point comprise 17 individual beds that are readily traced between 78 wells in and around the Milne Point Unit. The type log for the SOS at Milne Point is Conoco's A-1 well. ... Although these sands were originally found in 1969 by the SOCAL Kavearak 12-25 well, the nearby A-1 well was chosen as the type well because of its modern (1981) [sic] well log suite.

Emphasis added. This statement admits that the SOS was originally discovered in 1969, and that 78 wells predating the G-1 had explored it to the extent that it could be "readily traced." Indeed, Figure 3 to the document, entitled "SOS Regional Structure," includes a large area of the Kuparuk River Unit within its mapping of the SOS, and traces between four wells within the Milne Point Unit and five wells within the Kuparuk River Unit.

This quotation is also significant because of its use of the A-1 well as the type well. Although well logs from 1989 G-1 well (the claimed discovery well) were available, Conoco chose well logs from the nearby 1982 A-1 well for purposes of discussion of the geology.

The December 14, 1989 submission also correlates the nomenclature used by Conoco in describing the SOS with the nomenclature used by ARCO in describing the West Sak and the upper Ugnu in the Kuparuk River Unit. See second paragraph of the first page, and Figure 2.

The November 1990 submission also correctly encompasses the entire SOS, including West Sak, in its discussion of the geologic structure for which the discovery is claimed. While both the December 14, 1989 and the November 1990 submissions lend support to the conclusion that the SOS is separate from the Kuparuk Formation and the Prudhoe Bay field, they do not support the conclusion that the SOS in the Milne Point Unit are part of a geologic structure that is separate from the previously drilled and tested West Sak or the other SOS intervals previously drilled and tested within the Milne Point Unit.

O Information submitted in support of royalty reduction

In support of its efforts to obtain a royalty reduction for production from the Milne Point Unit (separate from this discovery royalty application), Conoco previously submitted to the Division a copy of a Conoco document entitled "Initial Development Plan for the Shallow Oil Sands in the Milne Point Unit." This document, prepared in 1985 (four years before the G-1 well was drilled), described the "wealth of information" that had been compiled and analyzed about the SOS. Page IV-1. While the document concluded that there was a need for further delineation, it nonetheless described the geology, made estimates of oil in place, and described production methods and scenarios. See, e.g., pages II-1 and II-2.

Tellingly, four years before the G-1 well made what Conoco claims is the "first discovery" of the Shallow Oil Sands, Conoco had developed a "Shallow Oil Sands Development Philosophy":

The shallow oil sands have always been targeted for development after the Kuparuk zone was fully developed and excess facility capacity became available.

Conoco misapprehends the "commerciality" issue.

In the "Pre-drilling Expectation and Post-drilling Verification" discussion submitted with the December 7, 1989 application for discovery royalty certification, Conoco appears to suggest that risks relating to "completion and producing techniques, and crude price and perceived price stability" are somehow pertinent to the issue of whether Conoco's G-1 well made the "first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in a geologic structure." I disagree for the following reasons.

First, the statute and lease term speak in terms of commercial quantities. The basic information about the quantity and quality of hydrocarbons was known before the G-1 well was drilled. As noted above, the well only resulted in "minor" or "slight" adjustments to Conoco's pre-drilling estimates. In short, there is nothing about the drilling of the asserted discovery well that could be characterized as a discovery of a heretofore unknown quantity of oil.

Second, Conoco argues that no well has been certified as capable of producing in "paying quantities" prior to the G-1 well. This argument is irrelevant. There is no evidence that any other party has ever sought a "paying quantities" determination for a well targeted for the SOS. Moreover, the "paying quantities" determination is made only for particular purposes, unrelated to the discovery royalty issue. See, e.g., Pan American Petroleum Corp. v. Shell Oil Co., 455 P.2d 12, 23-24 (Alaska 1969).

Third, the risks Conoco faces in putting the SOS into production are production related, not discovery-related risks. Conoco stresses the "costs of continued experimentation with completions, the risks concerning oil prices and transportation costs." While these are genuine risks, they are not discovery risks, were not unique to this well, and the G-1 well did not resolve those risks.² These

² Conoco explicitly states that the "[p]roduction history also verified that the completion technique utilized in G-1 will not provide the long term completion needed for full scale development. Additional experimentation with completions will be required before economic development is a reality." Thus the G-1 well, besides not being the discovery well for the SOS, did not resolve all production-related impediments either. It is just as clear that there is no nexus between the G-1 well and the resolution of other risks. Nothing about the drilling of the well could possibly affect future taxes, oil prices, and the like.

kinds of risks are common to all development projects. The discovery royalty was designed as a reward for undertaking discovery risks, not development risks. Conoco's 1985 "Initial Development Plan for the Shallow Oil Sands in the Milne Point Unit" and attachment to its December 7, 1989 discovery royalty application demonstrate that the development decision was a matter of timing (in relationship to the production from the Kuparuk Formation), oil prices, transportation prices, taxes, completion and production techniques and other such issues. In other words, actual development was determined by factors unrelated to any discovery efforts made by means of the G-1 well.

The statute was changed to explicitly focus on discovery rather than commercial production.

The Territorial Legislature enacted royalty provisions in 1955 that provided for issuance of oil and gas leases

with a royalty fixed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Mines, at not less than five percentum (5%) the first ten years of new production, and twelve and one-half percentum (12½) each year thereafter

Sec.3, ch.189 SLA 1955. Emphasis added.

In 1957, the incentive was limited to the first producer in a new area. The statute provided, as a general rule, for a floor of 12 1/2%, with the following proviso:

provided that a royalty of not less than five percentum (5%) for the first ten years will be allowed the first producer in a new area.

Art. IX, sec. 2, Ch 184 SLA 1957.


In 1959, the legislature rejected the earlier incentives triggered by commencement of production, and restricted the five percent royalty to the lease upon which a "first discovery of oil and gas in commercial quantities in a separate geologic structure" is made. Section 7, ch. 169 SLA 1959. This leaves no room to award a discovery royalty in this case. The risks and costs of commencing production (whether "new production" generally or as the "first producer in a new area") were rejected by the legislature as a basis for a reduced royalty. The legislature replaced an incentive

tied to commencement of production with an incentive tied to "first discovery." The division has no authority to attempt to circumvent that clear intent.

CONCLUSION

The intent of the repealed statute was clearly to provide an incentive to discover and place on production new fields in previously untested structures. The statute foremost required the holder of the lease to "drill and make the first discovery" in a geologic structure (AS 38.05.180 repealed). Conoco exposed the fact that the G-1 well is not a discovery well in the attachment to its December 7, 1989 application by stating "The risk of geologic nonsuccess for the shallow oil sands at Milne Point is small."

Accordingly, the Milne Point G-1 well clearly does not meet the criteria for a discovery well. This well penetrated the Shallow Oil Sands in a geologic structure that had been discovered and determined to be productive over 20 years ago. Since 1969, the SOS has been penetrated and been found to be a hydrocarbon reservoir by hundreds of wells in the same geologic structure. Therefore, it is clear that the Milne Point G-1 fails to meet either the requirements or the intent of the repealed discovery royalty statute.



James E. Eason
Director

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

PO BOX 107005
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99510-7005
PHONE: (907) 782-2483

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

January 16, 1992

DECISION

Conoco, Inc.
Suite 200
3201 C Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

:
:
:
:

Oil and Gas Lease
ADL 25906
Milne Point Unit

**DECISION AFFIRMING DIRECTOR'S DENIAL OF DISCOVERY
CERTIFICATION BASED ON MILNE POINT UNIT G-1 WELL**

I have carefully reviewed the decision ("Decision") of the Director of the Division of Oil and Gas denying a "discovery royalty" to Conoco, Inc. ("Conoco"). The Decision concludes that Conoco's G-1 well in the Milne Point Unit did not qualify the lease for an award of the reduced "discovery royalty" rate because the well did not make a "first discovery of oil or gas in commercial quantities in any geologic structure." In essence, the Decision concludes that both the existence of the geologic structure (referred to variously as the "Schrader Bluff Formation" the "West Sak," and the "Shallow Oil Sands" ("SOS")) and the quantities of oil accumulated in the structure were known prior to the drilling of the well. The Decision determined that it was most accurate to describe the G-1 Well as "Conoco's first planned production well within the SOS" (Decision at 4, emphasis added), not as a "discovery well."

I have also carefully reviewed Conoco's appellate brief. Conoco does not deny that the structure had previously been discovered through the drilling of other wells, and that prior exploration had yielded confirmation that the structure contained a large accumulation of oil. Brief of Appellant ("Br.") at 1-2, and 3 at n.1. See also Affidavit of Alan Hastings, paragraph 10 ("Hastings Aff."), where it admitted that in 1985, four years before the G-1 Well was drilled, a study by the Milne Point Unit had estimated that there were "over 366 million barrels of oil in place" on the lease at issue alone. In light of this admission that the G-1 Well broke no new exploration ground, it is not surprising that Conoco tries to diminish the significance and common sense meaning of the "discovery" requirement. Thus, Conoco argues that the key requirement is not a discovery at all, but rather the mere drilling of the first well that establishes "commercial quantities." The term "commercial quantities" is, in turn, equated with actual

Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milne Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992

"commerciality" (Br. at 4, 1.1) and "capability of commercial production" (Br. at 2, 11.14-15, emphasis added).

My review of the record of this appeal, and a common sense application of former AS 38.05.180(a) and the lease to the facts, compel me to affirm the Decision of the Director.

The former statute and regulations intended to encourage the discovery of new oil bearing structures and once a new discovery is made, to encourage rapid development of and production from the structure.

The plain language of AS 38.05.180(a) shows that the legislature intended to encourage drilling to discovery previously unknown oil bearing structures and once a discovery is made, to encourage rapid development of and production from the structure. "Discover" means to "be the first to find, learn of, or observe." Am. Her. Dictionary 376 (1970). In this instance, it means to find an oil bearing structure, not previously known. This requirement is emphasized by the term "first discovery." Importantly, the statute ties the finding with "drill(ing)". Thus, the statute obviously seeks to encourage exploratory drilling. The statute also plainly encourages rapid production by limiting the reduced rate to a ten year period following the date of discovery.

The Alaska Supreme Court has stated that the former regulations implementing the statute specified the three elements required by the statute for discovery well certification: date of discovery, commercial quantities, and geologic structure. See Union Oil Co. v. State, 574 P.2d 1266, 1269 (Alaska 1978). The regulations suggest that these elements are separate and distinct, and can be established at different times. When read as a whole these regulations foster the dual purposes of the statute--to encourage exploratory drilling and rapid production.

The regulations define the date of discovery element as the date that an operator first finds oil or, in the exact of language of the regulations, "first encounters sufficient evidence of oil or gas in a particular geologic structure". 11 AAC 83.200. This event starts the running of the ten year reduced rate period. 11 AAC 83.215. At this point, the operator is not required to show that the evidence is sufficient to prove production in commercial quantities, only that the evidence is enough to cause the reasonable operator to continue operations. In order to preserve his priority, he must provide a sworn statement of the first encounter within thirty days of the encounter.

Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milne Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992

The regulations do not require the operator to provide evidence of the second element, commerciality, until later. This is consistent with the reality that an operator first encounters or discovers oil, and then tests or evaluates a find to determine whether it is commercial. See Shoni Uranium Corp. v. Federal-Radrock Gas Hill Partners, 407 P.2d, 712 (Wyo. 1965) ("Upon the discovery . . . there was an implied obligation on the part of the lessee to do whatever was necessary under the circumstances (1) to ascertain whether the deposit existed in commercial quantities; and (2) thereafter to reasonably develop") (deletions in original). The regulations provide that the operator must continue to work diligently to "complete a well in the discovery zone . . . that can be tested for . . . commercial quantities." 11 AAC 83.210. The second event occurs when the operator establishes commercial quantities. 11 AAC 83.210(b)(1).

The third event occurs when the operator establishes that the discovery is in a separate geologic structure. This can occur up to ninety days after the date of the commercial quantities potential test.

Conoco's argument equating the "first to drill and discover oil" with the "first to produce oil" is inconsistent with the statute's plain language and would frustrate its purposes.

The director denied Conoco's application because he found that the G-1 well was not the first well to discover oil in the SOS structure. Both the East Ugnu No. 1 well and the A-1 well had encountered oil long before the G-1 well. Conoco argues that the discovery requirement and the commercial requirement should be collapsed into one test. It asserts that who discovered the oil is irrelevant. Br. 8. According to Conoco, in order to be the discovery well, the well itself must be shown to be "capable of production in commercial quantities." Br. 8.¹ Thus, discovery

¹ I need not address whether the repealed regulations are binding or not. Conoco's argument, which is premised on the regulations continued validity and on Conoco's interpretation of former 11 AAC 83.205(1) which defined "discovery," ignores the entire context of the regulations and is nonsensical. Under the regulations, the first or initial discovery of a discovery zone in a structure is the first encounter. 11 AAC 83.210. The commercial quantities test of the zone may be demonstrated in the first encounter well or a later well in the same structure. 11 AAC 83.200-.215. By misinterpreting 11 AAC 83.205(1), Conoco would
(continued...)

Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milne Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992

depends not upon new knowledge of an oil-bearing structure acquired through drilling, but upon technological improvements, new tax benefits, projected oil price, and the operator's internal economics. See App. Br. 3; Affidavit of Harold D. Haley at 3, paragraph 6.

Conoco's interpretation would change the statutory language whoever "drills and makes the first discovery" to whoever "first completes a production well." The Decision pointed out, this would in essence make the statute read as it formerly did in the territorial days. It would reward purely production risks as opposed to discovery and production risks. As discussed in the preceding section, discovery royalty was intended to reward those who successfully undertook the geologic and economic risks associated with exploration tied to rapid development. While oil prices, cost of production, and efficiency of production influence when an accumulation of oil may be brought into production and what level

¹(...continued)

require that both discovery and commercial quantities be proved in the same well. Br. 8-9.

Conoco's incorrect reading of 11 AAC 83.205 ignores the provisions of 11 AAC 83.200, .210, and .215, all of which contemplate that discovery and commercial quantities may be shown at different times and in different wells. Reading 11 AAC 83.205(1) consistently with these other provisions, "first acceptable evidence in a drilling well of the existence of oil or gas" refers to the first encounter while the modifying clause "which can be produced in commercial quantities after well completion" refers to the requirement that a well in the structure must meet the commercial quantities test. It is noteworthy that 11 AAC 83.205 does not require that the well which provides the first acceptable evidence be tested or produced. 11 AAC 83.205(1) refers to whether the structure can be produced in commercial quantities and refers to a future test in some well, not necessarily the well providing the first acceptable evidence of oil. The commercial quantities test only confirms that the first encounter has met the statutory requirement of a "discovery of oil or gas in any geologic structure." AS 38.05.180(a) (emphasis added). This is consistent with the division's and industry's twenty year history with discovery royalty that "discovery occurs upon the first encounterment of oil and gas, not upon the date of a drill stem test confirming the extent of the discovery of oil and gas." See Niakuk 34635 No. 5 Certified as Discovery Well ADL 34635 Conditionally Granted Five Percent Discovery Royalty (September 2, 1988) at 5.

Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milna Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992

of profits or loss the producer may enjoy, they do not determine when a "discovery" has taken place, or change the quantity of oil that has been discovered. Conoco's interpretation would frustrate the statute's dual purposes.

Conoco's interpretation would allow the operator to choose his discovery well and thereby manipulate the date of discovery to frustrate the rapid production intent of the statute. Since the ten year reduced rate commences on the date of discovery, an operator, who encountered a good show of oil, could delay the commencement of the period by delaying completion of testing of commerciality to coincide as closely as possible with the initiation of actual production.

Conoco's interpretation would also lead to absurd results as illustrated by a hypothetical example. Assume that lessees A and B purchased adjoining leases over the same prospect. However, only lessee A undertook the costs and risks of exploration, discovering a large accumulation. Assume, however, that the low quality of the oil and the high cost of production rendered it uneconomic to produce the accumulation at forecasted oil prices. Further, assume that after the results of lessee A's discovery efforts became public, a war in the mideast caused large price increases. Finally, assume this causes both lessee A and lessee B to commence drilling in order to produce oil from this known accumulation. Under Conoco's theory, lessee B would be credited with making the "first discovery of oil in commercial quantities in a geologic structure" if it were first in completing its well, despite the fact that lessee A had actually undertaken the discovery risks some years earlier, and lessee B did nothing except more quickly respond to a changed economic opportunity. This makes no sense.

The decision in Joseph I. O'Neill, Jr., 77 Interior Dec. 181, IBLA 70-39 (1970), supports my interpretation. In that case an argument similar to Conoco's argument that "discovery of oil and gas in commercial quantities" means "a well that is capable of production in commercial quantities" was rejected by the federal Board of Land Appeals. The Mineral Leasing Act provided that leases segregated from a primary lease would be extended for two years from the date of "discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities" upon any other segregated portion of the lease. The Board of Appeals rejected an argument that a well capable of producing oil or gas in paying quantities was required before an extension would be granted. After stating that "discovery" means "to find something not known before" the Board refused to read into the statute a predicate of a well capable of producing in paying quantities. Id. at 61. It

Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milne Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992

stated that if Congress wanted to impose such a requirement, "it could have easily so provided. It did not." Id. at 62.

Likewise, had the legislature intended to reward only production, it could have easily awarded a reduced royalty to the first producer in the structure like the Territorial legislature did. But, it did not. I will not equate discovery with production.

As explained in detail in the Decision, the G-1 well did not make the first discovery of oil and gas in the SOS structure.² Conoco knew not only of the existence of oil bearing structure, but also the supergiant size of the accumulation, before it drilled. It did not bear any exploratory risk.

Even if Conoco's argument was correct, it would not be entitled to discovery royalty because previous wells demonstrated commercial quantities.

The G-1 well was hardly the first well into the SOS that yielded "acceptable evidence" of commercial quantities in the discovery zone. As explained in the Decision, many wells, including Conoco's own A-1, B-2, A-3, and N-1B wells, drilled and tested earlier in the SOS yielded that evidence. I find that the flow rates from potential tests in several of Conoco's earlier wells yielded acceptable evidence that oil could "be produced in commercial quantities." Furthermore, Arco's pilot program in the SOS structure demonstrated that the structure was currently commercial,

² Conoco cites two other discovery royalty applications in support of its idea that "first discovery" is different from "first encounter." Neither of the cited cases assist Conoco. It is true that Point McIntyre No. 3 was certified despite the fact that earlier wells had penetrated the structure. However, it is clear that merely penetrating the structure does not constitute a first discovery. In the case of Point McIntyre, the operators of the wells making those earlier penetrations (the Point McIntyre No. 1 and No. 2 wells) failed to acquire sufficient evidence of a discovery before abandoning the wells as dry holes. Such corroborative data might have included open-hole logs, tests, or core data from the discovery intervals. This sharply contrasts with the circumstances extant with Conoco's knowledge regarding the SOS, where over a billion barrels of oil were known to exist from prior exploratory drilling.

In the case of the Sag Delta No. 3 well, it encountered no productive interval at all.

**Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milne Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992**

albeit only marginal. See DeRuiter, Nash & Wyrick, Solubility and Displacement Behavior of Carbon Dioxide and Hydrocarbon Gases with a Viscous Crude Oil, SPE 20523 (1990).³

Conoco argues the failure of any previous owner to undertake commercial development demonstrates that the previous wells did not discovery commercial quantities. First, the fact that no earlier lessee applied for certification is irrelevant. Br. at 7-8. The issue is not whether others could have qualified, but whether Conoco does. Second, the other's failure to develop is not surprising, given that the owners' decision to develop the underlying more economic Kuparuk structure first for their own internal reasons.

Even under Conoco's interpretation of "discovery" any benefit from discovery royalty would have expired before the drilling of the G-1 well.

I have previously stated my opinion that the first encounter well is the discovery well. Even if I accepted Conoco's argument that the first well to produce was the discovery well, the first encounter would nevertheless start the running of the ten year reduced royalty period.

Both regulations 11 AAC 83.200 & 210 refer to the first encounter of oil and gas. 11 AAC 83.210 states

to establish priority as to the time and date of discovery, an operator must furnish the committee with a sworn statement and substantiating evidence acceptable to the committee that oil or gas has been encountered in sufficient showing to cause a reasonable and prudent operator to conduct further operations in an effort to complete a well in the discovery zone so that the well can be tested for potential oil or gas production in commercial quantities. The statement must include the time and date of first discovery . . .

³ Conoco misunderstands the commerciality test as defined in the regulations. Conoco would require actual commercial development as the only method of satisfying the commercial quantities test. Br. 5. The regulations only require a potential test which would in the future lead to one additional well with a reasonable profit if a market existed. 11 AAC 83.205. No actual development is required.


Decision Affirming Director's Denial of Discovery
Certification Based on Milne Point Unit G-1 Well
January 16, 1992

It is clear that "first discovery" refers to first encounter in this regulation.

Regulation 11 AAC 83.215 states that "the date of commencement of the 10 year-5 percent discovery royalty term shall be the first of the next month after the established date of initial discovery." It is clear that "initial discovery" in this regulation refers to the same event referred to in 11 AAC 83.210 as "first discovery," namely first encounter of the discovery zone. 11 AAC 83.215 bases the date of initiation of the 10 year reduced royalty on this date, which is distinct from the date in which a well establishes oil in commercial quantities. Both the division and the industry have consistently accepted that the ten year period begins to run from the date of first encounter, not confirmation or establishment of commercial quantities. See Niakuk, supra at 5. Therefore, even if I were to accept Conoco's claim that the G-1 well established commercial quantities in the SOS structure (which I do not), the date of commencement of reduced royalty would be controlled by the date of first encounter. Indisputably the date of first encounter or initial discovery of the SOS occurred more than ten years prior to the drilling of the G-1 well and subsequent initiation of SOS production ADL 25906. Therefore, none of the production from this lease would be entitled to a reduced royalty.

Conclusion

The discovery royalty expressly rewards the one who makes a "first discovery," not the one who is "first into production." I know the difference between discovery and production. Conoco knew when it drilled the G-1 well what the structure was, and, to a high degree of precision, the quantity and quality of the oil accumulation that would be encountered. Conoco faced not the risks of a dry exploration hole, but the economic risks associated with taking someone else's discovery into production. It is not my role as lease manager on behalf of the citizens of the state to transform the discovery incentive into solely a production incentive. Therefore, I affirm the Decision of the director.


Harold C. Heinze
Commissioner

ENCLOSURE 28

MONTHLY SAVINGS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DISCOVERY ROYALTY PROVISION

Example Month: JULY 1994

<u>Field</u>	<u>Savings</u>
Niakuk/Lisburne	\$198,768.00
Point McIntyre	\$534,118.00
North Prudhoe Bay	<u>\$ 51,587.00</u>
TOTAL	\$784,473.00

SB 112 -- Witnesses Before the Senate Resources Committee

Chenoweth, Jack	Leg. Affairs Attorney	3-8-95
Boyd, Ken	Div. of Oil & Gas, Acting Dir.	3-16-95
Boyd, Ken	Div. of Oil & Gas	3-27-95
Van Dyke, Bill	Div. of Oil & Gas	3-16-95
Tabler, Kevin	Mgr. Union Oil Company	3-27-95

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

**LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
STATE OF ALASKA**

*(907) 465-3808
FAX (907) 465-2029
Mail Stop 3101*

*130 Seward Street, Suite 400
Juneau, Alaska 99801-2105*

Copies of minutes listed below were originally included in this file. The minutes are available on the legislative computer database. In order to save space copies of minutes have not been left in the files.

Mary Pagenkopf

Senate Resources Committee
March 8, 1995
3:45 p.m.

March 17, 1995
3:55 p.m.

March 27, 1995
3:40 p.m.