



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Marvin E. Blum** Gary V. Post* John R. Hunter° Steven W. Novak* Len Woodard*
Amanda L. Holliday** Lora G. Davis* Edward K. Clark° Catherine R. Moon*
Laurel Stephenson* Laura L. Haley* Amy E. Ott* Rachel W. Saltsman
Christine S. Wakeman Kandice R. Damiano* Kerri G. Nipp Julie A. Plemons
Anna K. Selby Kelsey A. Brock Kent H. McMahan,* Senior Counsel

ESTATE PLANNING FOR MINERAL ASSETS

**Financial Planning Association of Dallas/Fort Worth
June 17, 2014**

by Marvin E. Blum

© 2014, The Blum Firm, P.C.



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Marvin E. Blum** Gary V. Post* John R. Hunter° Steven W. Novak* Len Woodard*
Amanda L. Holliday** Lora G. Davis* Edward K. Clark° Catherine R. Moon*
Laurel Stephenson* Laura L. Haley* Amy E. Ott Rachel W. Saltsman
Christine S. Wakeman Kandice R. Damiano Kerri G. Nipp Julie A. Plemons
Anna K. Selby Kelsey A. Brock Kent H. McMahan,* Senior Counsel

Marvin E. Blum

Attorney and CPA

The Blum Firm, P.C., Fort Worth, Texas

The Blum Firm, P.C., established by Marvin Blum over 30-years ago, has law offices in Fort Worth, Dallas, Austin, and Houston and specializes in the areas of estate planning and probate, asset protection planning, planning for closely-held businesses, tax planning, tax controversy, and charitable planning. The company has grown to be the largest group of estate planning attorneys in the State of Texas.

Mr. Blum is known for creating customized, cutting-edge estate plans, now serving hundreds of high net worth families, several with a net worth exceeding \$1 billion. Mr. Blum was chosen as one of the “Nation’s Top 100 Attorneys” by New York’s *Worth* magazine, and was also named one of the Top 100 *Super Lawyers* in Texas by *Texas Monthly* magazine. He is a highly sought-after speaker and lecturer among his peers, having served as a national commentator for *The Wall Street Journal* and *The New York Times*, and has recently been named to the Editorial Advisory Committee for *Trusts & Estates Magazine*.

Mr. Blum is dedicated to his community and currently serves as Secretary/Treasurer and one of three Board members (along with Emmitt and Pat Smith) of the Pat & Emmitt Smith Charities, a public charity devoted to creating opportunities for disadvantaged children. Mr. Blum is in his 35th year as Treasurer of the Fort Worth Symphony and served as Presiding Chair for numerous terms of The Multicultural Alliance, formerly The National Conference of Christians and Jews, a service organization fighting bias, bigotry and racism. Mr. Blum has recently joined the Texas Cultural Trust Board of Directors to help raise public and legislative awareness of the importance of the arts in Texas.

Mr. Blum, an attorney and Certified Public Accountant, is Board Certified in Estate Planning & Probate Law and is a Fellow of the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel. He earned his BBA (Highest Honors) in Accounting from the University of Texas in 1974, where he graduated first in his class and was named Ernst & Ernst Outstanding Student in Accounting. Mr. Blum received his law degree (High Honors) from the University of Texas School of Law in 1978, where he graduated second in his class and was named the Prentice-Hall Outstanding Student in Taxation. Mr. Blum and his wife, Laurie, reside in Fort Worth, Texas.

ESTATE PLANNING FOR MINERAL ASSETS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONSEQUENCES OF DOING NO PLANNING..... 1

FIRST LAYER OF PLANNING – A FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP 1

SECOND LAYER OF PLANNING – A GRANTOR TRUST FOR THE CHILDREN 4

THIRD LAYER OF PLANNING – A 678 TRUST 6

HAPPY ENDING AFTER SUCCESSFUL ESTATE PLANNING 11

CHARITABLE PLANNING..... 14



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Marvin E. Blum** Gary V. Post* John R. Hunter° Steven W. Novak* Len Woodard*
Amanda L. Holliday** Lora G. Davis* Edward K. Clark° Catherine R. Moon**
Laurel Stephenson* Laura L. Haley* Amy E. Ott* Rachel W. Saltsman
Christine S. Wakeman Kandice R. Damiano* Kerri G. Nipp Julie A. Plemons
Anna K. Selby Kelsey A. Brock Kent H. McMahan,* Senior Counsel

ESTATE PLANNING FOR MINERAL ASSETS

June 17, 2014

by Marvin E. Blum

For many Texans, oil and gas interests comprise at least a portion of their net wealth, and with new developments in production technology, mineral owners have seen and will likely continue to see the value of their mineral interests increase. In the estate planning world, it is important to have the tools necessary to provide mineral-owning clients with an efficient estate plan. This planning often includes a transfer of the mineral interests, whether through a gift or through a sale, to pockets that are protected from estate tax. Given the potential for significant growth in mineral assets, the importance of planning is undeniable, and within the context of federal estate tax planning, the effects of poor (or a lack of) planning can be disastrous.

CONSEQUENCES OF DOING NO PLANNING

William and Anna had a very large estate and owned a significant amount of mineral interests. Although they had a high net worth on paper (\$75 million in mineral assets and \$10 million of other assets), their estate was very illiquid. When they both unexpectedly died in an accident, the IRS sent their children a tax bill for \$30 million (\$85 million less \$10 million in exemptions¹, x 40%). The children had no means to pay this large bill and had to resort to selling off a substantial portion of the minerals to pay the tax. William and Anna would have been horrified to know that the wealth that they had worked hard to build had to be sold to pay a tax bill rather than it passing to their children and grandchildren as they intended.

Now, let's **rewind the clock** and show what would have happened with proper planning...

William and Anna came to me several years ago to help prepare an estate plan. Along with the approximately \$75 million of mineral assets, they owned a home, bank accounts, and other personal assets valued at approximately \$10 million. Instead of allowing William and Anna to continue holding the minerals in their individual names, we completed several layers of planning with them. Below is a discussion of the different planning layers of William's and Anna's estate plan.

FIRST LAYER OF PLANNING – A FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

A. Benefits of a Family Limited Partnership. The first step in the planning process was to have William and Anna transfer their mineral interests to a family limited partnership ("FLP"). An FLP provides liability protection and creditor protection, and through the use of valuation discounts, it also helps facilitate the shifting of wealth outside the estate.

¹ The exemption amount is actually \$5,340,000 for each. For simplicity, a total of \$10 million is used.

It is essential to the successful implementation of a partnership that “personal use” assets not be contributed to the partnership. In other words, clients should not contribute their homes, cars, or financial assets that they plan to use in the near future such as personal bank accounts. The IRS and the courts may ignore the partnership and the benefits could be lost if these kinds of personal use assets are contributed.

As mentioned above, one of the advantages of an FLP is creditor protection it provides to the assets it holds. If assets are held by the FLP, then the client owns a limited partnership interest instead of the underlying assets. Under Texas law, the creditor’s rights as to a limited partnership interest are severely limited; the creditor can only obtain a charging order against the limited partnership interest. The charging order entitles the creditor to receive a share of the distributions from the FLP if and when distributions are made. The creditor cannot force a distribution nor can it vote the FLP interest. The FLP would likely be structured so that distributions are made in the sole discretion of the general partner, an LLC.

The FLP structure can also reduce estate tax liability by providing valuation discounts for gifts to trusts. Limited partnership interests are less marketable than assets held outright or assets traded on an exchange, such as stock of public companies or bonds. By virtue of the partnership form and standard restrictions in partnership agreements, a partnership interest is worth less than the underlying assets of the partnership. Discounts for lack of marketability and lack of control are routinely recognized by the courts when the partnership is formed and maintained properly. These discounts can result in estate tax savings upon death, or gift tax savings during life, when transferring the limited partnership interests to the next generation.

For example, if a partnership is formed and funded with \$10,000,000 in investment assets, the limited partnership interests associated with such assets might be valued at only \$6,000,000 (representing a 40% discount for lack of marketability and lack of control). As a result, holding the assets in a limited partnership rather than holding them outright would result in an estate tax savings of approximately \$1,600,000 using the current estate tax rate of 40%. Clients can gift limited partnership interests to their children in a more tax-efficient manner, removing such interests and the future appreciation of the interests from their estate.


B. Potential Trap: Passive Income. It is important to note that placing certain mineral interests in an FLP (or any other type of liability limiting entity) may affect whether the taxpayer can deduct net losses against ordinary income. A working interest is not considered a “passive activity” for purposes of Internal Revenue Code Section 469 if the interest is held directly or in an entity that does not limit liability. Therefore, placing a working interest into an FLP would cause the income and losses generated by the interest to be passive *unless* the taxpayer materially participates under the passive loss rules. If there is no material participation, then the taxpayer may only offset the passive losses against passive income. Ultimately, the decision of whether to use a liability limiting entity should be made on a client-by-client basis.

C. William and Anna Formed an FLP. In this case, William and Anna formed W&A Family Partnership, LP (the FLP) and W&A Management, LLC, a limited liability company (an “LLC”) to serve as the general partner of the FLP. William and Anna are named as the initial

limited partners of the FLP. An LLC that is created to act as general partner can be a non-equity general partner, owning 0% of the FLP. The LLC can therefore be capitalized with only \$1,000.

William and Anna then transferred their mineral interests to the FLP. Because mineral interests are real property, transferring the interests requires a mineral deed. The deed was filed with the county clerk in the county where the minerals are located—just as you would file any other real property deed.

The following chart illustrates the ownership structure for William’s and Anna’s mineral interests after transferring the interests to their new FLP.



D. Valuing Minerals. The overall benefit of a transfer of mineral interests can be significantly affected by the timing of the transfer. Shifting mineral interests outside of the client’s estate prior to any production can result in greater estate tax savings. This is due to the fact that non-producing minerals are valued at deeply discounted numbers because their production value is unproven. Generally, non-producing minerals are either valued at a multiple of the lease bonus or the value is determined through the use of comparable properties. Producing minerals, however, are generally valued at 3-5 times the annual revenue generated. Therefore, clients can get more bang for their buck by gifting or selling minerals before the minerals begin producing.

SECOND LAYER OF PLANNING – A GRANTOR TRUST FOR THE CHILDREN


A. Basic Structure. We then worked with William and Anna to create an Intentionally Defective Grantor Trust (“IDGT”) to benefit William’s and Anna’s children. Assets held in IDGTs are outside of the client’s estate for estate tax purposes, and they can be structured to avoid estate tax at the deaths of the clients’ children and grandchildren as well. Provisions are included in these trusts to make the trusts “grantor” trusts.

When a trust is structured as a Grantor Trust, the grantors (the clients) remain liable for the income tax attributable to the trust. Therefore, the clients pay the trust’s income taxes out of their own funds, which reduces their estate. The IRS has ruled that this payment of the trust’s income taxes is not treated as a gift to the trust. In addition, transactions between the clients and the trust are ignored for income tax purposes. Therefore, the clients can **sell** low basis assets to the trust without triggering a gain.

The IDGT can be funded by the clients making a gift to the trust (known as a “seed gift”) and using a portion of each spouse’s \$5,340,000 lifetime gift tax exemption and generation-skipping transfer (“GST”) tax exemption. As beneficiaries, the clients’ children and their descendants would be entitled to distributions from the IDGT as necessary for their health, education, maintenance, and support. At a child’s death, he or she can be given a power of appointment to direct the disposition of remaining trust assets. If the child fails to exercise that power, the assets remain in similar trusts for the benefit of that child’s descendants. The assets in an IDGT can pass free of estate taxes from generation to generation so long as the assets remain in trust (subject to a mandatory termination under state law approximately 90-100 years from the date of creation) by allocating the clients’ GST tax exemption to his or her contributions to the IDGT. The assets in the IDGT would also be protected from the children’s creditors and divorcing spouses.

B. William’s and Anna’s IDGT. William and Anna created an IDGT (the “Children’s Trust”), and William and Anna each used a portion of his or her \$5,340,000 lifetime gift tax exemption and GST tax exemption to make a “seed gift” of 1/6th of the FLP (assuming \$75,000,000 in FLP underlying assets, if the FLP units qualify for a 35% valuation discount, the value of 1/6th of the FLP is \$8,125,000, resulting in a gift of \$4,062,500 from each of William and Anna), thereby funding the Children’s Trust. The seed gift provided the Children’s Trust with sufficient equity so that it could be used to support some subsequent **sales** of FLP units to the trust (discussed below). A typical seed gift is an amount equal to 10% or more of the anticipated sale transaction. As a result of the gifting, the gifted FLP interests and any further appreciation thereof are removed from William’s and Anna’s estate.

The following chart is updated to reflect the ownership structure after funding the Children’s Trust with a portion of the FLP interest.



C. Alternative Sale Option. After gifting FLP interests to the Children's Trust, William and Anna could have sold their remaining 5/6th FLP interests to the Children's Trust in exchange for a promissory note. As mentioned above, because the Children's Trust is drafted as a Grantor Trust, William and Anna are considered to be the owners of the trust for income tax purposes but not for estate tax purposes. The IRS would therefore ignore any transactions between William and Anna and the trust for income tax purposes, and sales to the trust would not trigger any income tax gain to William and Anna.

Under this option, William and Anna would have then sold their remaining interests in the FLP to the Children's Trust and, in exchange, received a promissory note from the trust with a principal amount equal to the fair market value of the assets sold. As previously discussed, the fair market value of the FLP interests would be calculated after considering discounts for lack of marketability and lack of control. The promissory note would be structured as a 9-year note with interest at the mid-term AFR, which is currently 1.91% for transactions occurring in June 2014. Of course, this technique works best with assets that are anticipated to appreciate at a rate higher than the interest rate on the promissory note.

The law is still uncertain whether the unrealized gain on the sale to the trust would be immediately recognized if the seller (William or Anna) were to die during the term of the promissory note, so it is recommended to avoid making a promissory note with an excessively long term—a 9-year note is typical.

Although this approach is effective in transferring value outside of the estate, many clients are hesitant to utilize this approach due to the loss of access to the funds generated by the mineral interests. A sale to an IDGT would effectively cut off William's and Anna's ability to access and benefit from the mineral interests. Their interest in the minerals would be limited to their promissory note, reduced by the income taxes they pay on behalf of the Children's Trust. In order to transfer their minerals outside of their estates without sacrificing the ability to access the mineral interests, William and Anna proceeded with an alternate plan to sell their FLP interests to a newly-created 678 Trust, as discussed below.

D. Estate Freeze Planning. The sale option described above is known as "estate freeze planning" because it effectively freezes the size of the estate at the current discounted value and shifts future appreciation into a pocket not subject to estate tax. Estate freeze planning is typically done by **selling** assets to a Grantor Trust in exchange for a promissory note with the promissory note "frozen" and the assets growing in a Grantor Trust outside of the estate. Mineral assets are excellent candidates for estate freeze planning because:

- They produce cash flow, which is useful in sale transactions when it comes time to make note payments; and
- In spite of the fact that minerals are a depleting asset, mineral appraisals tend to put conservative values on minerals, leaving a lot of upside if the minerals produce good revenue over the years.

THIRD LAYER OF PLANNING – A 678 TRUST

A 678 Trust is a unique vehicle that combines asset protection, estate tax savings associated with the "estate freeze" techniques, *and the clients' continued ability to benefit* from assets they have built up over the years. Therefore, 678 Trusts are ideal for individuals who need to reduce their estate tax exposure but who are not in a position to part with their assets. The 678 Trust is named after the Internal Revenue Code Section upon which it is based, which controls who will be treated as the owner of the trust for income tax purposes.

A. Structure of a 678 Trust. A 678 Trust is established by an outside party—the client's parents, sibling, or close friend—with a gift of \$5,000. **This is the only gift that should ever be made to the 678 Trust.** It is important that the \$5,000 contribution to the 678 Trust be a true gift and that the person making the gift receives no *quid pro quo* payments or benefits as a result of making the gift.

The Trust is structured as a "Crummey" trust, so the beneficiary has a period of time to withdraw the \$5,000 gift. If the beneficiaries (the clients) do not demand the gift, their withdrawal right lapses after a certain period of time (e.g., thirty days). In order for the 678 Trust technique to work as intended, it is crucial that the beneficiaries not be given a withdrawal right exercisable with regard to any other trust at any earlier point in the year of the gift.

Because the clients are the primary beneficiaries of the 678 Trust, they can receive distributions for health, education, maintenance, and support purposes. The clients can also be named as the trustees. The Trust is structured initially as a "non-grantor" or "complex"

trust for income tax purposes. Therefore, at inception, the 678 Trust is a separate taxpayer for income tax purposes. However, as mentioned above, the 678 Trust also includes a Crummey withdrawal right for the client. When the clients allow the withdrawal right over the initial \$5,000 contribution to lapse, the 678 Trust becomes a Grantor Trust as to the clients (under the authority of Section 678 of the Internal Revenue Code). Thus, all income tax effects of the 678 Trust from that point forward are the responsibility of the clients.

As a result of being treated as the owners of the 678 Trust for income tax purposes, the clients will be responsible for paying the income tax on the income generated by the trust's assets during their lifetimes. Assets outside of the 678 Trust can be used to pay the income taxes, allowing the trust assets to grow without being depleted by income taxes. This also allows the clients to "spend down" assets that would otherwise be includable in his or her estate and subject to estate taxes at death. If the time came that the clients were unable to pay the income taxes out of his or her own assets, the 678 Trust could make a distribution to the client in the amount of the income taxes under the health, education, maintenance, and support standard.

B. Benefits of a 678 Trust. As discussed above, the assets owned by the 678 Trust will not be subject to estate taxes at the clients' deaths. While a client is living, he or she will continue to have access to the funds for health, education, maintenance, and support purposes and can serve as trustee of the 678 Trust.

In addition, the assets owned by the 678 Trust will not be subject to the claims of the clients' creditors. Texas law provides that a trust that contains "spendthrift" language that is created by a third party will not be subject to the creditors of the trust beneficiary. This is true even if the trust is structured as a Crummey trust and the beneficiary is given a right of withdrawal over the trust assets. Section 112.035 of the Texas Trust Code specifically states that a trust beneficiary is not treated as a settlor of a trust merely because of a lapse of withdrawal rights, provided that the withdrawal right does not exceed the greater of the amount specified in Section 2041(b)(2) or 2514(e) of the Code or Section 2503(b) of the Code (the "5 and 5 rule"). As a result, the lapse of a withdrawal right will not cause the 678 Trust assets to be subject to the reach of a beneficiary's creditors. This very clear legislation makes Texas particularly well suited for 678 Trust planning.

Section 112.035 of the Texas Trust Code also provides that a trust beneficiary is not treated as a settlor of a trust merely because the beneficiary has the power to consume or distribute trust property to or for the benefit of himself or herself as long as the power is limited by an ascertainable standard (such as health, education, maintenance, and support). Therefore, a beneficiary's creditors will not be able to reach the trust's assets if the beneficiary is also named as the trustee, so long as the trustee-beneficiary's distribution standard is limited to health, education, maintenance, and support.

C. Shifting Assets to a 678 Trust. When clients have existing assets that have appreciation potential or that are valued at a discount (FLP interests), selling the assets to the 678 Trust in exchange for a promissory note can be a very useful planning technique. For the reasons discussed below, it is important that the sale be structured so that it will be respected by the IRS as a *bona fide* sale under Section 2036 of the Internal Revenue Code. The 678 Trust needs to

have sufficient substance to support the sale, which can be problematic if the 678 Trust is new and has not yet built up significant value.

To remedy this situation, the 678 Trust can have other trusts or individuals (other than the clients) pledge assets to guarantee the promissory note owing to the clients. The assets pledged should equal at least 10% to 20% of the size of the promissory note (the higher, the better). If no other trusts or individuals are available to guarantee the promissory note, the client can create a separate trust for his or her children and make a gift to it (as already discussed above with the creation of William's and Anna's Children's Trust). The new trust can then provide a guarantee to the 678 Trust in exchange for a guarantee fee. To supercharge the new trust, it can be structured as a Grantor Trust with respect to the client for income tax purposes and as a GST-exempt dynasty trust.

It is important when the clients transact with the 678 Trust that the transaction be structured at fair market value, and that **no gifts be made to the 678 Trust beyond the initial \$5,000 gift contributed by a third party**. Any additional gifts could alter the income tax and estate tax characteristics of the 678 Trust. Furthermore, if the clients are treated as having made a gift to the 678 Trust, then the trust's assets will be subject to estate taxes at the clients' deaths.

In order to guard against any loan that the clients make to the 678 Trust being treated as a gift, the interest rate on the loan should be at least equal to the applicable federal rate in effect at the time the loan is made. Additionally, when assets are sold to the 678 Trust, the sales price must be equal to the fair market value of the asset.

Sale documents can also include adjustment clauses, where the 678 Trust and the client agree that, if the fair market value of the assets sold to the 678 Trust is ever determined to be different than that agreed upon by the trust and the client, the sales price will be adjusted to reflect the differently determined fair market value. This adjustment clause could help avoid the argument that the client made a gift to the 678 Trust if the sales price were determined to be lower than the fair market value of the assets.

In addition, it is advisable to have the assets sold to the 678 Trust professionally appraised. The appraiser should be advised that the value sought should be on the mid-range of the scale of reasonableness. If the appraisal is too aggressive and results in a value lower than that reasonably determined by the IRS, it is possible that the client will be treated as having made a gift to the 678 Trust equal to the difference between the appraised value and the IRS-determined value.

The 678 Trust can also allow the clients to exercise a special power of appointment ("SPOA") over the trust assets during life or at death. An inter vivos SPOA can give the client-beneficiary the power to provide for trust property to pass to individuals or charitable organizations during the client's life. As a result, if the client is treated as having made a gift to the 678 Trust, the gift will be incomplete from a gift tax perspective and no gift tax will be due at that time.

Note: Although the gift will be incomplete for gift tax purposes, the gift will still cause all of the trust assets to be included in the client's estate at death because the client will have made a gift to a trust of which he or she is a beneficiary. As a result, the tax will not be avoided by virtue of the gift being treated as incomplete; it will merely be postponed until the client's death.

A testamentary SPOA can give the client-beneficiary the power to control how the property will be distributed at his or her death and also can give the client-beneficiary flexibility to modify the terms of the trust on his or her death to account for a change in circumstances or a change in the law. The SPOA can be so broad as to allow the client to exercise it in favor of anyone (including other individuals, trusts, and charitable organizations) other than the client, the client's estate, the client's creditors, or the creditors of the client's estate.

D. Results of 678 Trust Planning. The 678 Trust should be structured as a GST-exempt dynasty trust. When the initial gift is made to the 678 Trust, the third party who made the gift should allocate GST exemption to the 678 Trust, which will allow it to pass to future generations free of transfer taxes. As a result, the assets owned by the 678 Trust should not be subject to estate tax at the deaths of the client or the client's children. In addition, the 678 Trust should contain a spendthrift provision, in which case the trust assets should be protected from the client's creditors.

Furthermore, assets in the 678 Trust do not constitute marital property, protecting the assets if a beneficiary of the 678 Trust gets a divorce. As a result, it is often possible for a client's child to **avoid needing a prenuptial agreement** when the child marries, as the child's assets will be owned by the 678 Trust and not by the child.

With regard to assets sold to the 678 Trust, the value of the assets owned by the client is **frozen** at the value of the promissory note the client received in the sale. The client can spend down these assets by paying the income tax liability generated by the 678 Trust's assets and allow the assets owned by the 678 Trust to grow without being depleted by income taxes.

The trustee of the 678 Trust can distribute trust assets to the clients and their issue for health, education, maintenance, and support needs. The 678 Trust can be drafted to, upon the clients' deaths, pour into an existing trust created for the child's benefit or divide into separate trusts for their children, and those trusts will be considered complex trusts (rather than Grantor Trusts) for income tax purposes.

E. Reporting Requirements. The creator of the 678 Trust should file a Form 709 gift tax return reporting the \$5,000 gift to the 678 Trust and allocating GST exemption to the gift. The gift tax return will be due on April 15th of the year following the year in which the \$5,000 gift is made.

When the clients transact with the 678 Trust, they should file gift tax returns also, disclosing the sale or loan in order to start the running of the **3-year statute of limitations** within which the IRS can challenge the valuation of the assets. Again, the gift tax return will be due on April 15th of the year following the year in which the transaction takes place.


F. William and Anna's 678 Trust. Jim, William's brother, created a 678 Trust to benefit William and Anna and their descendants (the "Family Trust") and funded the Family Trust with a \$5,000 gift. The Family Trust provides that William and Anna have a withdrawal right over contributions to the trust. William and Anna received notice of the withdrawal right and declined to withdraw the \$5,000 contribution, allowing the withdrawal right to lapse after the thirty-day withdrawal period.

William and Anna then sold their remaining 5/6th FLP interest and all of their LLC interest in W&A Management, LLC to the Family Trust for \$40,625,000 (\$75,000,000 less 35% discount x 5/6 = \$40,625,000). William and Anna each received a 9-year promissory note for \$20.3 million in return, plus interest at the mid-term applicable federal rate (1.91% for June 2014). The Children's Trust had sufficient assets to pledge as the guarantor of 20% of the promissory note amounts and so guaranty agreements were executed. In return for the guaranties, the Family Trust executed guaranty fee agreements agreeing to pay the Children's Trust annual fees equal to 3% of the amount guaranteed. The annual guarantee fees are \$243,750 for guaranteeing 20% of the promissory notes (\$40,625,000 x 20% x 3%).

Jim, the creator of the Family Trust, filed a gift tax return reporting the \$5,000 gift to the Family Trust and allocating \$5,000 of his GST exemption to the Family Trust making the Family Trust fully-exempt from GST tax. William and Anna filed gift tax returns disclosing the sale to the Family Trust which started the 3-year period within which the IRS can challenge the valuation of the assets sold to the Family Trust.

William and Anna are liable for the income taxes generated by the Family Trust income. As they receive payments on the promissory note, they use those funds to pay income taxes and cover their living expenses. Once the promissory note has been paid in full, William and Anna, as beneficiaries of the Family Trust, may, if necessary, receive distributions of trust income or principal for health, education, maintenance, and support. Their children and grandchildren can also receive distributions. At William's and Anna's deaths, the Family Trust assets are protected from estate tax.

The illustration on the following page shows William's and Anna's current ownership structure for their mineral interests.



HAPPY ENDING AFTER SUCCESSFUL ESTATE PLANNING

Thankfully, William and Anna chose to engage in active estate planning. As a result of the various layers of planning performed, William and Anna have significantly reduced the size of their taxable estate. Immediately following the sale to the Family Trust, William and Anna saved \$10.5 million in federal estate tax from valuation discounts alone ($(\$75,000,000 \times 35\%) \times 40\%$).² As the promissory note payments are consumed, the estate tax savings will be even greater.

William and Anna will continue to receive interest payments on the promissory note owned by the Family Trust and will receive principal payments on or before nine years. They will continue to pay the income tax on income generated by the Children's Trust and the Family Trust, which will help to further deplete their taxable estate. As trustees and beneficiaries of the Family Trust, they also have access to the Family Trust assets if necessary for their health, education, support or maintenance. Additionally, William and Anna continue to participate in the management of the FLP through their ownership of the LLC general partner. William and Anna can continue to spend down the assets that will be subject to federal estate tax, while allowing their mineral interests to appreciate outside of their estates.

² Assuming a 35% discount for lack of marketability and lack of control.

The Children's Trust owns 1/6th of the FLP and will benefit from the future appreciation of 1/6th of the FLP assets. The Children's Trust receives an annual guaranty fee from the Family Trust. The assets within this Children's Trust are protected from creditors, and the trust itself does not have to pay income tax as long as the grantor status of the trust is maintained.


The Family Trust owns 5/6th of the FLP and will benefit from the future appreciation of 5/6th of the FLP assets. The Family Trust makes principal and interest payments on the promissory note payable to William and Anna, as well as guarantee fee payments to the Children's Trust. The assets within the Family Trust are protected from creditors. Like the Children's Trust, the Family Trust will not have to pay income tax on trust income. In addition, both the Family Trust and the Children's Trust will be protected from estate tax at the deaths of William and Anna, their children, and possibly their grandchildren.

Assuming that William and Anna do not unexpectedly die before the promissory notes are paid in full (2020) and assuming assets in their estate have been spent down to cover living expenses and pay income taxes, **their estate tax will be zero.** (Their lifestyle expenses are approximately \$2 million per year.) Had William and Anna not engaged in active estate planning, approximately **\$30 million in estate tax would have been due.** If William and Anna want to accelerate the results and get to a zero estate tax sooner, they can engage in more sales or do some charitable planning.


Note that William's and Anna's estate tax would be even more than \$30 million if they do no planning, they continue to invest and do deals, and their estate continues to grow. However, if they create this new structure and do all of their future deals and investments in the FLP, then all of the growth is outside of their estate.

In order to visualize the techniques used for William's and Anna's planning, consider the two illustrations on the following page. The assets on the left side of the "Tax Fence" are included in your taxable estate at death and are generally subject to your creditors. In contrast, the assets on the right side of the Tax Fence are not subject to estate tax and cannot be reached by your creditors.

“Tax Fence” Without Planning



“Tax Fence” With Planning



*Assets on this side of the tax fence are used to pay income tax generated by assets held outside the estate.

CHARITABLE PLANNING

If William and Anna had wanted to incorporate charitable giving into their estate plan, there are a number of planning opportunities available. On the simplest end of the spectrum is to make an outright gift of mineral assets to a charity and take a deduction for the fair market value of the gifted minerals.

A. Potential Trap: Partial Interest Rule. The partial interest rule provides that a charitable deduction is generally not allowed for a charitable contribution of any interest in property that constitutes less than the donor's entire interest in that property. There is, however, an exception if the donor gifts an undivided portion of the donor's entire interest in the property. It is important to note that partitioning the surface and the minerals prior to making the charitable contribution will not avoid the application of this rule.

B. Utilizing a Charitable Lead Trust. An additional option, on the more sophisticated end of the spectrum, is to utilize a charitable technique that works well for mineral interests—a Charitable Lead Trust (or "CLT"). A CLT is a trust that makes an annual payout, either a fixed amount (a "CLAT") or a variable amount (a "CLUT"), to a charity for a fixed term of years such as 10, 15, or 20. At the end of the term, the trust assets pass to the donor's family, typically to the donor's children.

Note: Within the context of mineral interests, it is generally more advisable to use a CLUT rather than a CLAT. Because the CLAT guarantees a fixed payout amount, declining production due to depletion (or other factors) can cause adverse consequences. A CLUT, on the other hand, uses a variable amount based on a fixed percentage of trust asset values each year, which provides a layer of protection against asset depletion.

C. Benefits of a CLT. The CLT removes assets from the donor's estate so that the donor avoids estate tax on the assets, but, when the term ends, the assets pass to the donor's children. With careful planning, a CLT can be structured so there is no estate or gift tax on the portion of the assets passing to the children at the donor's death.

The best time to create a CLT is when interest rates and asset prices are low. Currently, interest rates are at historic lows which reduces the present value of the remainder interest that passes to the children and makes it easier to avoid paying gift tax on this amount. In addition, when asset prices are low, the assets have more potential to appreciate, which also increases the amount that later passes to the children.

The income tax consequences of a CLT depend on whether the CLT is structured as a Grantor Trust or a non-grantor trust. If the CLT is a Grantor Trust, the donor receives an income tax charitable contribution deduction when the CLT is created, but pays income tax each year on the trust's entire taxable income (with no deduction for the amount passing to charity each year). If the CLT is a non-grantor trust, the donor receives no upfront income tax deduction, but the CLT gets a deduction each year for the amount passing to charity.

D. Suppose William and Anna Used a CLT. William and Anna are involved in charitable activities and give approximately \$100,000 per year to their favorite charities. If William and Anna have a net income before taxes (“NIBT”) of \$3,829,249, they will be over the 3% cutback threshold of \$300,000. Because the cutback is capped at 80% of the deduction, if William and Anna gift \$100,000 to the charity, they will be able to deduct \$20,000 (20%). As a result, William and Anna will pay \$31,680 in taxes on the \$80,000 (80%) they were unable to deduct due to the cutback (assuming 39.6% tax bracket). Thus, if William and Anna give the charity \$100,000 outright every year for ten years, the cutback will cost them an additional \$316,800 in taxes.

Suppose instead that William and Anna decide to create a CLT which allows the charity to receive an annuity for ten years, naming their children as remainder beneficiaries. They gift a portion of the working interest worth \$1,808,000 ($\$18,080,000 \times 10\%$) to the CLT. Assuming the working interest continues to produce income and the CLT plays out 5.531% of its initial assets per year to the charity, the charity will receive an annuity payment of \$100,000 per year. At the end of the ten-year term, the charity will have received \$1 million.

Note: With William and Anna gifting a portion of their working interest to the CLT, a charitable deduction equal to the fair market value of the assets would be allowed. The same would be true if they gift an undivided one-half interest of both the minerals and the surface of a property to a CLT. However, if William and Anna gifted the surface of the property to the CLT while retaining the mineral rights or made a gift of the minerals and retained the surface, there would not be a charitable deduction allowed.

Because William and Anna gifted a working interest, income produced from the interest will be considered UBTI and will be subject to the 3% cutback and 50% limitation on charitable deductions. The 3% cutback threshold for trusts is \$11,950. Therefore, by way of comparison, assuming the trust has a NIBT of \$382,925 (which represents 10% of William’s and Anna’s total NIBT prior to the 10% gift to the CLT), the 3% cutback amount will be \$11,129. Comparing this cutback amount to the \$80,000 cutback amount applicable to William and Anna as individuals, use of the CLT would reduce the cutback by \$68,871, resulting in a \$27,273 tax benefit. Over ten years, the tax savings will be \$272,728.

Moreover, suppose in Year One the CLT has an adjusted gross income of \$384,924. The 50% limitation amounts to \$192,462. The 3% cutback amount would be \$11,189.22, which means that with a charitable annuity of \$100,000, the CLT could actually take a charitable deduction of \$88,811. If the CLT earns \$1,840,321 over the next nine years, the charitable deductions taken by the CLT will amount to \$830,549 over ten years.

If William and Anna keep the working interest in their own name and gifted \$100,000 outright every year for ten years, the total amount of charitable deductions they will be able to take would be \$200,000. Therefore, using the CLT would allow a \$630,549 increase in allowed deductions, which would result in a tax benefit of \$249,697.

Additionally, if William and Anna gift 10% of their mineral interest rather than of their working interest, the tax savings would be even greater. Because income from mineral

interests is not treated as UBTI, the CLT would have no 3% cutback or 50% limitation and could deduct 100% of the \$100,000 charitable annuity each year. Over ten years, this would be a \$1,000,000 deduction, which is \$80,000 more than the deduction available to William and Anna as individuals making the same gifts. In sum, this would save \$347,200 in taxes (assuming the trustee materially participates in the mineral interest so as to avoid the additional 3.8% net investment income tax).

The following table illustrates the results of using a CLT:

	<u>Without a CLT</u>	<u>With a CLT (Working Interest)</u>	<u>With a CLT (Mineral Interest)</u>
Charitable Deduction Over Ten Years:	\$200,000	\$830,549	\$1,000,000
Income Tax Savings:	\$79,200	\$328,897.40	\$396,000
Amount Passing to Charity:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000

Note: This illustration does not take into account the additional estate tax benefits of charitable giving.