

---

**From:** Randy Kauffman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2019 3:17:58 PM  
**To:** Mick Thomas  
**Cc:** Jason Risch; Michael Christian; Kristina Fugate  
**Subject:** Objection to the necessity of Mr. Risch's pending "decision"

Mr. Thomas,

We, Randy and Thana Kauffman officially and for the record object to Mr. Risch's PREHEARING ORDER dated April 23, 2019, Docket No. CC-2017-OGR-01-002. Mr. Risch insists on making a "decision" whether we the lessors are entitled to further documents from the lessees. However, Idaho Code 47-332. REPORTS TO ROYALTY OWNERS (4), Idaho Code 47-310. DEFINITIONS (6) "End purchaser" and (11) "Market value"; and, the IOGCC FINAL ORDER dated February 6, 2019 have made the need for a "decision" from Mr. Risch unnecessary.

The FINAL ORDER clearly states: "Idaho Code 47-332 (4)'s plain language provides that lessors are entitled to certain information. The statute first reflects this entitlement with the use of the word "must" to mandate that the lessee make available certain documents upon request." The FINAL ORDER also states: "Further, the statute goes on to articulate not only the specific examples of information subject to the mandate, but also "any other reports or records that the lessor may require to verify the gross production, disposition and market value." Furthermore, the FINAL ORDER states: "Reading together the required mandate to make documents available for the purpose of verifying gross production, disposition, and market value, the requirements for copies, and the lack of any mention of protective order or other restrictions on Lessor's entitlement, it is apparent that Idaho Code 47-332 (4)'s plain terms unambiguously mandate that the lessors are entitled to the information described in Idaho Code 47-332 (4)." Documents to verify market value are clearly included in this mandate.

Mr. Risch is clearly ignoring the directives of the FINAL ORDER which ensures we (lessor) receive all the information required to verify market value from Alta Mesa (lessee). Mr. Risch claims the issue is more "complicated" than he expected. However, the statute's language is unambiguous; therefore, Mr. Risch's "decision" is irrelevant. That "decision" has already been clearly mandated in the FINAL ORDER and Idaho Code.

We voiced our objections at our "unofficial" Prehearing Conference this morning May 14, 2019 and the Prehearing Conference on April 17, 2019.

Thank you,

Randy and Thana Kauffman

Sent from my iPhone