

Disallowing “deemed capital maintenance” costs
August 8, 2006
Pedro van Meurs

The shut down of Prudhoe Bay has brought in sharp focus that some of the facilities on the North Slope may be in poor shape.

The repair of such facilities could involve billions of dollars over the next two decades.

This raises firstly a fairness issue. Should companies receive a tax deduction and tax credit together for 40% of the value (under the 20/20 system) for replacing a pipeline that was defective and not properly maintained (as BP admitted during their short presentation to the Senate Committee). The pipeline replacement may also be subject to the “2 for 1” formula which would raise the contribution of Alaska to 50%.

However, at the same time this raises a broader issue. It is likely that over time more defective equipment will be identified that needs repair or replacement. The Prudhoe Bay oil field is now 30 years old and the continued operation for the next 30 years may pose a variety of problems.

In cost control there has always been a rather important “grey area” between “repair” and “betterment or replacement”.

Under accounting rules if expenditures are made to replace an asset or improve the asset in a manner that provides it with a longer technical asset life, these costs are typically considered “capital” expenditures, if an asset is merely repaired it is an “operating” expenditure. For auditors it is often difficult to determine the difference.

Under the PPT the capital expenditures can be deducted and also receive a tax credit of 20%. Operating costs can only be deducted. It is therefore logical for companies to try to consider repairs as much as possible as capital expenditures by arguing that they created a “betterment” of the equipment. Or they may decide to simply replace the asset even if it can be repaired because of the tax deductions and credits. This could be an area of misuse under the PPT. A significant percentage of the operating costs could slip into the capital costs to the detriment of the State.

For all these reasons one could simply disallow a small part of the total capital expenditures as “lease expenditures”. In this case they cannot be deducted or used for tax credits.

My suggestion is to disallow the first \$ 0.30 per BTU equivalent barrel as “lease expenditures”.

A section could be added to AS 43.55.165 (e) of the bill as follows under non deductible lease expenditures (*non legal language*):

- (20) deemed capital maintenance expenditures which shall be capital expenditures equal to US \$ 0.30 per BTU equivalent barrel taxable production.

The US \$ 0.30 per BTU equivalent barrel is based on reasonable capital maintenance costs of fields for which I have (confidential) information. Based on a production of 900,000 barrel equivalent per day, this means that about \$ 100 million in capital expenditures per year will not be deductible for PPT purposes. Based on a PPT rate of 20% and a tax credit rate of 20% this means that the companies will pay \$ 40 million more tax per year.

I believe that this would provide a good answer to possible public criticism that under the PPT we would provide 50% of the replacement costs of pipelines as a result of the Prudhoe Bay shut down. I believe this would be popular with the Senate and the House. This could enhance the probability that the PPT would pass.