Oil's Heavy Tax Burden Attributed To Higher U.S. Income Taxes

Higher Federal income tax payments during 1964 have been cited as the principal reason for an increase of almost a half billion dollars in total taxes paid by the domestic petroleum industry as compared to 1963.

In a report prepared by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., it was shown that total taxes on the domestic petroleum industry's earnings, operations and properties rose sharply in 1964 to almost $2.5 billion, compared to $2.0 billion in 1963 and $1.7 billion in 1964.

The study, which has been published by PIRINC in booklet form under the title of "The Tax Burden on the Domestic Oil and Gas Industry — 1964-1966," was prepared to "provide a numerical answer to the frequently discussed question of how the tax burden on the U.S. domestic oil and gas industry compares with that of other American industries."

Working with 27 companies which represent 65 percent of the total domestic crude oil production, 63 percent of domestic refining operations and more than 80 percent of U.S. foreign oil revenues, the Foundation then obtained similar domestic revenue data and total tax payments for all U.S. mining and manufacturing corporations and for all U.S. business corporations.

In order to measure the relative tax burden on oil and other industries, PIRINC computed ratios of total domestic tax payments to total domestic gross revenue, which it considered the most reliable yardstick available to measure the tax burden on a comparable inter-industry basis.

It was learned that the total domestic tax payments of the 27 oil companies amounted to $1.52 billion in 1966, $1.51 billion in 1965 and $1.31 billion in 1964. Federal income taxes during the comparable three years were $658 million in 1966, $435 million in 1965 and $283 million in 1964.

Domestic Taxes of the 27 Petroleum Companies (in million dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Income</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Income</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance &amp; Production</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Ad Valorem</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When these payments were expanded to the entire oil industry on the basis of the companies' composite share in total U.S. production and refining, total tax payments amounted to $2,469 million in 1966 of which $775 million were income taxes; $2,920 million in 1965 of which $518 million were federal income taxes; and $1,725 million in 1964 of which $210 million were income taxes.

Domestic Taxes of the U.S. Oil and Gas Industry (in million dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Income Taxes</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Taxes (except excise &amp; sales)</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Domestic Tax Payments</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal income taxes represented 34 percent of 1965 total taxes as compared to 27 percent in 1963 and 20 percent in 1964.

According to PIRINC, "The distribution of taxes in the petroleum industry differs distinctly from that of U.S. industry in general. Approximately half of the total U.S. corporate tax payments and nearly 60 percent of the total tax payments of U.S. mining and manufacturing industries were federal income taxes for the fiscal periods 1964 and 1965, compared with the 20 percent and 27 percent respectively, of the group of oil companies.

"It is this relatively lower effective federal income tax rate in the petroleum sector than in the U.S. industry in general that has given rise to the question of the equity of the oil industry's tax burden."

"However," the PIRINC study continued, "as was pointed out, all taxes initially are a burden on the taxpayer. Hence, the fact that taxes paid to state and local authorities are proportionately larger for the oil industry than for other industries cannot be ignored in answering the question about the industry's tax equity."

The bulk of the other taxes was levied on the production of oil and gas in the form of severance and production taxes, mainly at the state level, and local taxes, consisting mainly of property taxes levied by communities and counties on oil refineries, terminals, bulk plants, inventories as well as on oil and gas deposits in the ground, the study explained.
The difference in the tax distribution pattern between oil and other industries is due to a number of special factors, including two provisions in the federal income tax适用 to mineral industries only: namely, percentage depletion and the treatment of intangible drilling and development expenditures. Percentage depletion is designed to enable oil and gas producers to recover the value of their depleting deposits by allowing a deduction up to 27.5 percent of the gross value of production (restricted by the 50 percent net income limitation); producers also have the option of either capitalizing or writing off immediately the bulk of their drilling expenditures. Both these factors tend to reduce the petroleum industry's federal income tax burden as defined in this study. Furthermore, however, they apply only to the producing sector of the industry. "It is this sector which bears most of the industry's severance, production and property taxes. Therefore, a determination of whether the petroleum industry pays an equitable share of taxes must take into account these other taxes, too."

In this instance, the study found that in 1966, for each dollar of domestic revenue the 27 companies paid not 0.63 cents in domestic taxes. The average for the three-year period, 1964-66, was 5.5 cents per dollar of revenue (exclusive of excise and sales taxes). It is interesting to note, from the chart, that there was a steady increase in the tax burden during these three years, the principal reason for which "is the increase in federal income taxes. These taxes have increased much more rapidly than domestic gross revenues."

The Domestic Tax Burden
27 Major Oil Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Gross Revenues</td>
<td>31,885</td>
<td>29,957</td>
<td>27,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Domestic Taxes</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Burden:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax/Revenue Ratio</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIRINC said that as a final step in seeking to determine the equity of the oil industry's tax burden, it was compared with the tax burden on all mining and manufacturing, and on all business corporations in general (with the elimination of the beverage, tobacco and communications industries since "it was not possible to determine how much of their heavy excise taxes—which do not form part of the tax burden, as defined in this study—were included in their gross revenues and tax payments"). The findings of this comparison is shown in the accompanying chart.

Another substantiation of PIRINC's general conclusion about petroleum industry's relatively higher total domestic tax burden is shown by comparing tax payments and Value-Added, which refers to the net value of goods created within a given industry as opposed to Sales Value, which also includes the cumulative net values created at the various previous stages of production. "Like gross revenue, Value-Added is the proper means of measuring an industry's contribution to the economy," the study says.

This comparison showed that the petroleum industry's estimated total domestic tax payment of $2 billion for 1963 was equal to 15.6 percent of the total officially reported Value-Added by the domestic oil and gas producing and refining industry for that year, the study reported. By comparison, the total domestic taxes of $243 billion imposed upon U. S. mining and manufacturing industry as a whole were equal to only 12 percent of total Value-Added by that sector of the economy.

"Thus," the study concluded, "the tax burden per dollar of value added was one-third higher for the petroleum industry than for mining and manufacturing industries as a whole."

 Comparative Revenue and Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twenty-Seven Oil Companies</th>
<th>All Business Corporations</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (1965)</td>
<td>28,957</td>
<td>995,752</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes (1965)</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>45,999</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (1964)</td>
<td>27,130</td>
<td>991,546</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes (1964)</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>42,748</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIRINC concluded its study with a clarifying statement concerning the analysis of tax burden of the U. S. oil industry. "It may be worthwhile," the study said, "to point out a frequent error made in analyzing the tax burden of the U. S. oil industry. The published annual reports of most oil companies show net earnings only on a global basis. However, the federal income tax liability, as reported in Form 11-K, applies almost exclusively to the domestic earnings. Though it is obviously misleading to relate global earnings to U. S. income taxes, thereby ignoring the large amount of income taxes paid abroad, this is frequently done in calculations of the oil industry's tax burden."

AGENDA

Meeting
May 15, 1968

204 Arizona State Office Bldg.,
1624 W. Adams, Phoenix

9:30 a.m. Call to order, business meeting

1) Approval of minutes of meeting of April 24, 1968
2) Executive Secretary's Report
3) Geologist's Report
4) Old business
5) New business
6) Adjourn

10:00 a.m. Hearing: Case 30, Texaco Inc., request for unorthodox gas well location

11:00 a.m. Hearing: Case 31, to amend Rule 105.B to allow administrative approval of unorthodox location of re-classified existing wells. Note: addition to amendment
Minutes of Meeting
April 24, 1968

Present:
Mr. Lucien B. Owens, Chairman  
Mr. George T. Siler, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Ralph W. Bilby, Member  
Mr. John Bannister, Executive Secretary  
Mr. J.R. Scurllock, Geologist  
Mr. William Pyle, University of Arizona  
Mr. R.A. Reed, Yuma, Arizona  
Mr. Loy Turveyville, Phoenix, Arizona  
Mr. Alfred L. Morgan, Yuma, Arizona  
Mr. Harold Ciss, Senator, Yuma, Arizona  
Mr. C. Thomas Hollenshead, El Paso Natural Gas Co.  
Mr. James R. Pickett, Phoenix  
Mr. James C. Vandiver, Farmington, N.M.

Absent:
Mr. Lynn Lockhart, Member  
Mr. Kenneth C. Bentson, Member

Meeting called to order at 9:30 a.m. at the Sheraton Hotel, Yuma, Arizona.

Mr. Bilby moved, Mr. Siler seconded, that the minutes of meeting of February 21, 1968 be approved; so ordered.

Mr. Bilby moved, Mr. Siler seconded, that the action in issuing Order 30A, Case 28, Union Pro Tunc, was in line and as issued is approved; so ordered.

Mr. Bilby moved that a temporary order for thirty days be granted to Texaco Inc. to allow it to produce helium from its #1 Navajo Z well, which is in unorthodox gas well location.

The executive secretary was directed to set up for May 5, 1968 the necessary hearing to formally approve this unorthodox location and a hearing to amend the rules and regulations to allow administrative action in approving unorthodox locations of re-classified wells.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

The public interest portion of the meeting convened at 10:05 a.m. to present a pictorial report on Dineh bi Keyah Field, Dr. Pyle's presentation on oil and gas possibilities in southwest Arizona, and Mr. C.T. Hollenshead's presentation on the activities of El Paso Natural Gas Company in Yuma County, and for open discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

APPROVED May 15, 1968

By:  
Lucien B. Owens, Chairman
May 9, 1968

Memo to: Commissioners
From: John Bannister, Executive Secretary
Re: Report of Activity

I am sure that each of you have seen the recent publicity concerning the proposed rule of Bureau of Mines, Department of Interior, affecting the sales of helium.

Briefly, the proposed rule states that a distributor (as distinguished from Arizona producers) must physically take from the Division of Helium in Amarillo an amount of helium equal to the amount sold to a consumer who is using this helium in any venture in which federal funds or government agencies are in any way involved. This would apply to anyone using helium in excess of one MCF per month.

The distributor furnishing this helium must report monthly to the Bureau of Mines and show that he has taken into his system a like amount of gas from the Helium Division.

Traditionally, the federal government through its helium program has supplied all government agencies with their helium requirements. This accounts for approximately 80% of the existing market. It has been estimated that this proposed rule would result in the Bureau of Mines acquiring an addition 15-18% of the existing market. If carried to the ultimate this could make Arizona’s producers dealing in essentially a waste product in that a distributor could not afford to buy a like amount at the government price ($35.00 per MCF).

As you may know, Kerr-McGee has recently dropped its price from $28.00 per MCF. (The effect of this is to lower the wellhead price from $1.062 to $0.668 for State royalty purposes.)

Kerr-McGee, Cities Service, Phillips, Kansas Helium Corporation, and Air Reduction, the five largest private producers, would be affected by the propose rule and are protesting its adoption.

Air Reduction called upon this office to secure our support. After discussion of this problem with the Governor, I drew up a letter to
Secretary Udall expressing the State of Arizona's opposition to the adoption of the proposed rule in that it would have great effect on our own helium industry, as well as cause smaller tax and royalty revenues. I also cited the effect this would have on the Navajo Reservation and on our general exploration picture.

I have been advised by Air Reduction that its plant being built near Tec Nos Pos, in the extreme northeast corner of our State, should be on stream by the 10th or 15th of this month. Air Reduction further advised its prime interest is liquid helium and should reserves in this area be proven, it is their intent that this "pilot" plant end in the construction of the largest helium liquidation plant in the United States. This of course would be of great benefit not only to the Indians but also to the State.

Arizona Helium Corporation has again advised this office that it anticipates to be on stream at its plant near Navajo by the 15th of this month. As you recall production has been delay from the middle of February to the middle of March to the middle of April, and now to the middle of May.

Arizona Helium Corporation is now in the process of merging Apache Drilling Company, and there are rumors that it will also merge with Eastern Petroleum Company. Arizona Helium is engaged in several joint ventures with Eastern. I have had no confirmation nor denial of the rumored merger between Arizona Helium and Eastern.

Oil Discovery Corporation, which recently drilled a failure southwest of Flagstaff, has announced its intention to drill another well in the Sedona area, pending the settlement of a disagreement among its stockholders. This disagreement concerns its syndicate (investors) relationship with the regular stockholders. The syndicate represents groups of California investors who form syndicates to buy stock within the State of Arizona.

Rumors

The rumor factory is rather active at this time. It is rumored that the Navajos are not going to issue leases bid upon at the last sale in February. It is possible that this is an attempt of the Navajos to fight back at increased company pressure to get prices on the Reservation as well as royalty more in line and reflecting a truer picture of values.

It is rumored that Skelly Oil Company recently obtained a seismic exploration permit on the Reservation. The Indians reportedly are charging $500.00 per section, as well as immediate posting with the Indians all seismic information gained. Apparently Skelly warned that if this were done they would back off the Reservation and never again come one. It is reported that the Indian's attorney advised them to drop the requirement for the immediate filing of this information, but apparently the $500.00 per section is to be enforced.

There is also a rumor that a refinery now located at Eagle Springs (northeast New Mexico) may be brought into northern Arizona. I have no further information.
The adopted procedure for capacity tests for gas well has been printed and distributed. So far, all comments received have been favorable.

Kerr-McGee questioned the intent of the Commission in its proposed rule change, Case 31. I do not know at this time whether they will appear in opposition to our proposed change which will allow the Commission to administratively approve an unorthodox well in the case of a well being re-classified. I believe that my explanation has satisfied Kerr-McGee that all parties who might be involved would be amply protected.

Case 30 and Case 31, as you are aware, will be heard before the Commission at 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. respectively. I do not contemplate that either hearing will be complicated or long-drawn out. They will be conducted in our own hearing room.

You will recall that the operators of certain wells were given to the last of May in which to commence operations or plug the wells. These operators are Harold Ferring, two wells in the Holbrook area; James Potter, one well in the Flagstaff area; C & J Drilling Company, one well near Congress Junction; and J.M. Frazer, one well in Cochise County. To date I have heard nothing from any of these operators.

Consequently, as of this writing we should look forward to having one hearing wherein all these operators are called upon to show cause why these wells should not be ordered plugged. This of course would be at the June meeting.
NOTICE OF HEARING

CASE No. 31

Notice is hereby given that the OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION, STATE OF ARIZONA, will hold a hearing May 15, 1968 at 11:00 a.m. in its office, Room 204, 1624 W. Adams, Phoenix, Arizona, to consider amendment to Rule 105.B. by adding thereto the following:

"In the event of change of classification of an existing well due to its re-completion or due to change in the nature of the product being produced or due to change of the gas-oil ratio, an unorthodox location may be administratively approved upon proper application with supporting AND PROOF OF NOTICE TO ADJOINING LEASE OWNERS data, and without the above specified ten days notice and hearing."

OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF ARIZONA

ATTEST

(Original signed: John Bannister)  
Lucien E. Owens, Chairman

Executive Secretary
ROCKY MOUNTAIN MINERAL LAW FOUNDATION
FOURTEENTH ANNUAL INSTITUTE
Flagstaff, Arizona
July 11-13, 1968

TOO BUSY TO TAKE A VACATION?
...YOUR FAMILY ISN'T!

KEEP UP WITH DEVELOPMENTS
IN NATURAL RESOURCES LAW
AND GIVE YOUR FAMILY
A VACATION IN THE
SCENIC WONDERLAND
OF THE SOUTHWEST

Flagstaff, Arizona, was chosen as the site of the Fourteenth Annual Institute of the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation because it offers unparalleled opportunities for you to combine your continuing legal education and a real vacation with your family. Flagstaff is known as "The City of Seven Wonders" because the San Francisco Peaks, Grand Canyon, Oak Creek Canyon, Walnut Canyon, Wupatki, Meteor Crater and Sunset Crater are in the immediate vicinity.

Flagstaff is also within an easy day's drive from Lake Powell, Las Vegas, Monument Valley, Petrified Forest, Bryce Canyon and Zion National Monument. It is situated in wooded, mountainous country and is pleasantly cool in July. Accommodations are outstanding - over 30 first class motels - 12 of them within walking distance from the beautiful campus of Northern Arizona University where the Institute will be held. If you prefer the outdoor life, the campgrounds in Oak Creek Canyon are as beautiful as any in the West.

The program is excellent, featuring prominent experts chosen with an eye to scholarly ability, practical experience and ability to communicate. You can't afford not to attend!

For further information contact:

Richard H. Bate
Executive Director
Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302
ROCKY MOUNTAIN MINERAL LAW FOUNDATION
FOURTEENTH ANNUAL INSTITUTE
Flagstaff, Arizona

General Session
Thursday, July 11, 1968

9:30 A.M. John A. Carver, Jr.; Commissioner
Federal Power Commission
"Regional Water Policy"

11:00 A.M. George Munroe; Pres., Phelps Dodge Corp.
"Legal-Economic Problems of Mining
on Public Land"

2:00 P.M. Lu. Fausto E. Miranda; Baker,
Botts, Miranda, Santamarina & Steta
"Mineral Exploration in Mexico"

3:00 P.M. Owen Olpin; O'Neilven & Meyers
"Geothermal Problems"

4:00 P.M. Seymour S. Bernfeld; AMAX, Inc.
"Pitfalls of Hard Rock Mineral
Acquisitions under the High Seas"

Split Session
Friday, July 12, 1968

OIL AND GAS
9:00 A.M. Vernon Turner; Tenneco Oil Co.
"Royalty Payment Delays"

10:00 A.M. Douglas Henriquez; BLM, Wash.
"Public Land Oil & Gas Leasing -
Administrative Changes in the BLM"

11:00 A.M. Robert Krueger; Nomsanan, Waters
Scott, Krueger & Riordan
"Cutter Continental Shelf Leasing"

2:00 P.M. Henry F. Coffer; CER Geonuclear
"Nuclear Explosions as an Aid to
Oil & Gas Recovery"

3:00 P.M. Ben Howell; El Paso Nat. Gas Co.
"Gasbussy Project-Legal Problems"

4:00 P.M. James Sperling; Modrail, Seymour,
Sperling, Roehl & Harris
"A Second Look at the Oil and Gas
Lease"

MINING
9:00 A.M. Robert E. Campbell, Jr.; Parsons,
Behlo, Evans & Latimer
"Mineral Condensation Cases-Trial"

10:00 A.M. R. Timothy Robberson; Superior Oil Co.
"Mining Joint Operating Agreements"

11:00 A.M. Edward S. Berger; Whitehill, Feldman,
Scott & Berger
"Indian Land Titles"

2:00 P.M. George Reeves; Twitty, Sievright &
Mills
"Abandonment vs. Relocation"

3:00 P.M. Kent Shearer; Neslen & Mook
"Federal Land Grants to the States"

4:00 P.M. Don H. Sherwood; Dawson, Nagel,
Sherman & Howard
"Is What was Once Public Land Now
Government Land?"

WATER LAW SECTION
9:00 A.M. Raphael J. Moses, Esq.
"Basic Groundwater Problems"

10:00 A.M. F. Harlan Flint, Jr.; Asst.
Attorney General-New Mexico
"Basic Groundwater Problems-
Non Tributary Sources"

11:00 A.M. Gary Wideman; University of Denver
"Basic Groundwater Problems -
Tributary Sources"

LANDSHE'S SECTION
9:00 A.M. H. Stanley Dempsey; Climax
Holobdenus Company
"Basic Problems in Locating Claims"

10:00 A.M. R. Lewis Brown; Anaconda Company
"Field Record Checks - Where & When"

11:00 A.M. Robert E. Holt; President
Holt, Inc.
"When to See your Attorney & Why"
The Foundation has 300 first class motel rooms reserved for the Institute in Flagstaff. Please make your reservations through the Fdn. offices by June 28, including a $20 deposit and informing us of:

1. Type of accommodations required: (Single) □ (Double) □ (Other) □

2. Date of arrival: ____________________  Length of stay: ____________________  No. in party: ____________________

Air service to Flagstaff is via Frontier Airlines from Denver, Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Salt Lake City; rail service is via Santa Fe Railway and bus service is via Greyhound and Continental Trailways. Airport facilities for private aircraft and rental cars are available at Flagstaff.

Flagstaff is the center of the outstanding scenic attractions of the Southwest and you should plan to drive to the Institute and bring your family for a reception if at all possible.
THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN
MINERAL LAW FOUNDATION

Attorney's Sustaining Membership Program

Since 1962, the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation has annually offered to individual attorneys, law firms and corporate legal departments the opportunity to become Sustaining Members of the Foundation. The benefits of this program are such that no lawyer who either plans to attend the annual Institute or to order a volume of the annual Institute proceedings should pass up this opportunity without serious consideration.

The following pages explain these benefits in detail, but an example of the savings available through this plan will illustrate the point. If a law office or corporate law department consists of two lawyers who plan to attend the annual Institute and the office is not a sustaining member, the total registration fee for the annual Institute will be $80.00. If the office is a sustaining member, the total registration fee is $50.00, and the firm will be listed as a sustaining member in the volume of the Institute proceedings for that year.

I urge you to take this opportunity to become a sustaining member by completing the application form at the end of this folder and mailing it, along with your check, to the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation.

Richard H. Bate
Executive Director
ATTORNEY'S SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP PLAN  
The Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation

WHAT IS THE FOUNDATION?

The Foundation is an educational, nonprofit corporation. It was organized in 1965 as a cooperative project of law schools, bar associations, mineral associations and in-
curred industries for the purpose of stimulating research and the continuing study of mineral law and its development. The Foundation now represents 53 law schools, the
Mineral and Natural Resources Section of the American Bar Association, 9 state bar
associations and 11 industry associations.

WHAT DOES THE FOUNDATION MEAN TO YOU AS AN ATTORNEY?

- Annual Institute: The Foundation annually presents three day institutes de-
signed to educational and event law, mining law, water law, and allied subjects which is designed to enhance the professional skills of the registrant. The speakers at these institutes are outstanding authorities in the field of natural resources law.
- Publications: The proceedings of each Annual Institute are compiled and made available to the public. The American Law Review—written by leading authorities in the field of mining law—has become the standard reference work in the field.
- Research Center: The Mineral Law Research Center of the Rocky Mountain
Mineral Law Foundation was organized to collect, index, and make available subject-
linked research materials in the area of mineral law. All materials in the Research Cen-
ter are available to member attorneys or firms for the cost of reproduction.

WHY SHOULD YOU BECOME A FOUNDATION MEMBER?

- It enables you to continue your legal education in the field of min-
eral law.
- It enable you—and any member of your law firm— to attend the annual institutes without payment of the registration fee and the annual institute volume (for that year) as a sustaining member.
- It entitles you and your firm to the use of all Research Center materials for the cost of reproduction, and various Foundation publications, such as the Rocky Mountain Miner-
al Law Review, are available to members at a reduced price.
- The membership fee is tax-deductible.

WHAT IS THE COST OF MEMBERSHIP?

- Individual attorneys: $ 100.00
- Law firms of three or fewer partners or associates: $ 160.00
- Law firms of four through nine partners or associates: $ 200.00
- Law firms of ten or more partners or associates: $ 300.00

HOW DO I BECOME A SUSTAINING MEMBER OF THE FOUNDATION?

Simply complete the attached application form for the current calendar year and transmit it, together with your check for the appropriate amount, to the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation.

Application for Sustaining Membership

The Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation
Fleming Law Building
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Date

I (We) hereby apply for a Sustaining Membership in The Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation.
My (Our) check in the amount of $ __________ is enclosed for membership dues for the calendar year 1986, in the amount of:

Individual attorney

Law firms of three or fewer partners or associates

Law firms of four through nine partners or associates

Law firms of ten or more partners or associates

I understand that an individual Sustaining Membership entitles me to attend this year's Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Institute without payment of the Institute registration fee and that a firm Sustaining Membership entitles any or all partners or associates in one firm to attend said institute without payment of the registration fee.

Name

Firm

Address

City

State

Authorized signature
MEMBERS
OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN MINERAL LAW FOUNDATION

Law Schools
University of Arizona
University of Colorado
California University
University of Denver
University of Idaho
University of Kansas
University of Montana
University of Nebraska
University of New Mexico
University of North Dakota
University of Oklahoma
University of South Dakota
Stanford University
University of Utah
University of Wyoming

Bar Associations
American — Natural Resources
Arizona
Colorado
Idaho
Montana
Nebraska
New Mexico
South Dakota
Utah
Wyoming

Mining Associations
American Mining Congress
Arizona Mining Association
Colorado Mining Assn.
Idaho Mining Assn.
New Mexico Mining Assn.
Utah Mining Assn.
Wyoming Mining Assn.

Oil & Gas Associations
American Association of PetroleumLandmen
New Mexico Oil & Gas Assn.
Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Assn.
North Dakota Oil & Gas Assn.
# Monthly Financial Report

**Classifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Appropriated Receipts</th>
<th>Unappropriated Receipts</th>
<th>Total All Receipts Year to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit to Drill</td>
<td>345.75</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>345.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Expenditure</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel State</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel out of State</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Fixed Charges</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum N. Arizona</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz. Bu Mines, UofA</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,491.75</td>
<td>3,205.00</td>
<td>386.72</td>
<td>3,571.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfers In**

| Balances Brought Forward | 11,235.25 | **XXX**XX |

**Totals - Month and Year to Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,765.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form is a Post Auditor**

**To be filed with the Post Auditor by the 15th of each month**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMS PAID YEAR TO DATE</th>
<th>OBJECT CODE NO.</th>
<th>DISTRIBUTION OF EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>CLAIMS PAID MONTH OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28,150.00</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Salaries, wages: employees</td>
<td>Apr 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,375.00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Per diem: board members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993.57</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,350.81</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Telephone, telegraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,660.91</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Travel-state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,815.37</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Travel-out of state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,612.36</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.02</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Name/repair to office equip., furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,280.00</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Legal Advt., notary, court, recording fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380.25</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Transportation of things (well samples)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,778.44</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Miscellaneous (blueprint service, Ariz. Bu Min.)</td>
<td>6,31 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Museum of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,046.05</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,608.99</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Scientific supplies; drafting, correlated lab</td>
<td>42 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.81</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.08</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,800.00</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Rent, office equip. copy machine</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Subscriptions/organizations dues</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,894.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>