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1 forward to a civil hearing; however, if these 2 proceedings are interrupted, or parties are not treated 3 with respect, I may take action to regain order. This 4 may include asking those who are disruptive to leave
5 this courtroom. I don't anticipate that today, but I
6 want to share it. Shuffle papers carefully, and if you
$\rightarrow$ haven't done so already, please silence your cell phones.
9 My decision will be based on the information 10 provided in the record. The record will include 11 arguments provided today, as well as the agency record.
12 The agency record thus far consists of the following.
13 On June 24th, 2019 the application for spacing and
14 integration. July 3rd, 2019, Idaho Department of Lands
15 reply to the application. July 10th, 2019, the order
16 vacating the hearing, over setting the hearing date to
17 determine just and reasonable factors, and notice of
18 hearing, and setting filing deadlines. July 16th, the 9 applicant, AM Idaho, LLC notice of service. July 31st, 0 2019, the AM Idaho, LLC opening brief. July 31st, Idaho 1 Department of Lands opening brief. July 31st, the submission of nonconsenting owners, and CAIA regarding factors for establishing just and reasonable terms. August 14th, response of nonconsenting owners and CAIA regarding factors for establishing just and reasonable
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terms. Again, on August 14th, the applicant, AM Idaho, LLC response to the brief. And on August 21st, the applicant, AM Idaho, LLC replied to the brief. All of these documents are on the OGCC web page.

We'll proceed with the hearing as follows. I will first hear arguments from the applicant, AM Idaho, LLC. This will be followed by arguments from the uncommitted owners within the proposed units, or the their representation. Afterward, I will accept arguments from the Idaho Department of Lands. Again, I may ask clarifying questions of each party. Finally, I will accept testimony from members of the public.

For those people who would like to provide comment today, who are not uncommitted property owners, I'm going to limit your comments to five minutes. If you are a member of the public, or really for anybody who comes up and speaks, please write your name on the attendance sheet. And when you come up, I'll ask you and remind you to state your name and spell it. If you are here as a representative, please indicate your own name, as well as who you are representing. I may ask clarifying questions again when you speak.

So before we begin, are there any procedural questions before we begin?

Okay. Hearing none. Let's lead with
testimony. State and spell your name.
MR. CHRISTIAN: Mr. Hearing Officer, my name is Michael Christian, the last name is C-h-r-i-s-t-i-a-n. I'm the attorney for the applicant, Am Idaho, LLC. I'm happy to be here. I'll try to be brief. I don't think most of what I say, will be a surprise to you. I'm happy to answer any questions you have. had filed, AMI's position is that the focus should be on
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1 the purposes of Idaho's Oil and Gas Act, and admission
2 of the Oil and Gas Conservation Commission as defined
3 within the act, which is primarily to encourage
4 development, prevent waste, and protect correlative rights.
Economic terms of integration are largely defined in the statute, as you know. The bonuses to be the highest paid in the unit at the time of application. The royalty is defined as no less than one-eighth.
10 Presumably there will be evidence developed at the main hearing to determine whether or not to deviate from an eighth. There is also some flexibility regarding the risk penalty for a nonconsenting working interest owner. And presumably evidence will be developed at the main hearing to determine whether the request and percentage is reasonable.

The form of lease and joint operating agreement will presumably be evaluated. AMI has noted in its briefing that the AAPL Model Form 610 JOA has been widely adopted. And we noted that the Utah Supreme Court recently held that the form was reasonable as proposed by the operator, in part because it was materially in the same form as the JOA used by working interest owners, and the form that the operator had used for several years.

1 47-315(2). Considering the rights of the operator and voluntarily leased mineral interests behind it, who wish 3 for their minerals to be developed is also necessary in 4 determining what terms and conditions are just and 5 reasonable.

Opposing a set of terms and conditions, which effectively prevent that development, either by erecting a practical and absolute barrier, or by rendering operation of uneconomical is as unjust as would be an order allowing development without compensating unleased mineral interests at all. With respect to the point about potential environmental impacts of hydrocarbon development raised by the objective mineral interest owners, 47-315 makes it clear that the Commission has the authority to regulate operations, but those are covered in IDAPA 20.07.02, and also covered in the drill permit process.

Integration orders are focused on prevention of waste and protection of correlative rights, i.e., ensuring each mineral interest owner has the opportunity to receive their just share of production. Other states pool and processing orders are consistent with this conclusion. We attached as a sample to AMI's briefing, 4 as a sample of, again, when I was briefing, is a sample 25 of recent pooling from Arkansas as an illustration. AMI

Noneconomic items are the main subject of the discussion over just and reasonable terms, including such subjects as lease terms and surface occupancy. You'll note from the cases cited in AMI's briefing that the focus of courts is consistent with the focus of the act. What is just and reasonable is what affords an

The cases also make clear that the goal is not to place the operator and the unleased mineral interests in equal balance. The entire point of the integration process is to prevent tyranny of the minority by allowing the minority of the mineral interests in a spacing unit area to prevent development.

The focus of the act is on providing the opportunity of each owner in a pool to produce his just and equitable share of the oil and gas in the pool without waste. That's from 47-310(4). The act also says the duty to prevent waste is paramount. That's
24

1 has not found any indication in other states, commissions, or governing bodies become engaged in third party contracts, or valuations of non-mineral property interests. Certainly no other Commission has effectively given veto power to a non-mineral owner. Surface protections are already covered in the act referring to 47-334, and it certainly may be referenced in an integration order.

I take it that the objecting mineral interest
owners position appears to be without some radical change integration procedures are inherently unconstitutional, and would result in an unconstitutional taking. This is not what the federal court said. It said, this conclusion does not affect the hearing officer's ability to exclude irrelevant, or unnecessary testimony or evidence, or the commission's discretion to determine what factors should be considered when determining whether the terms and conditions of an integration order are just and reasonable. Rather it simply recognizes the due process requires a meaningful opportunity to be heard. And in these circumstances, the plaintiffs and other nonconsenting non-owners know the standard, which the hearing officer will apply in considering whether the integration order is just and reasonable.
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1 In other words, as you've stated here, and in your order setting this hearing, the hearing officer, merely needs to annunciate standards prior to the main hearing. And it steams to me in your order setting this hearing, you already did annunciate at least some standards.

Lastly, the idea that integration is an unconstitutional taking, has been roundly rejected by other courts in other states. In fact, in the prior lawsuit, CAIA dropped its takings claim. AMI has no issue with objecting mineral owners presenting evidence regarding harm specific to them, proposing terms and conditions narrowly tailored to address those specific proven impacts, if consistent with the purposes of the act, and the commissions authority under it. Some alleged or potential impacts are simply within the purview of other governmental bodies, with different missions and authority. And mineral interest owners are free to turn to them, again consistent with their own statutory purposes and authority.

The job of the Commission, as stated in the act, is to encourage development, prevent waste, and protect correlative rights, and to justly integrate mineral interests as necessary in pursuit of that 25 mission. Likewise, a venue exists for those who oppose

1 development in its entirety to pursue that policy goal, 2 and there will always be those who oppose development, 3 just as there are those who favor it. That venue is the 4 legislature. And AMI remains happy to debate policy 5 issues there.
6 Lastly, I would note the irony of the complaint in the mineral interest owners briefing about s the last application being for a smaller unit size, which was based on test information developed since the Fallon well was drilled. Given that it complained in the last hearing that the unit was too large, and not sufficiently drawn down to best encompass the pool. Now, that AMI has attempted to do that, the complaint comes from the other direction. I will leave it to you, who was the hearing officer in the main hearing, to draw your conclusions from that.

So with that, I'm done with my spoken comments. And answer any questions you may have.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I have a few questions I would like to ask. Some of the material you've already covered, but I would like to ask it regardless. Just for my information, you were talking about the standard form of the joint operation agreement. You said this was an industry standard. And just so I know, does that JOA
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1 also contain an AFE, which is the authority for expenditures.
factors in April in this matter relating to your
previous integration order application in 2016-004. I'm
not sure if you have it in front of you today. What is
your position on the factors that you previously
suggested?
MR. CHRISTIAN: I think it's appropriate, and you can define from my description of those factors, that the point was to focus the parties on facts specific to the proposed unit area at hand, and the proposed operations at hand. And I think there are appropriate reasons to consider some or all of those factors within the purview of you and the Commission.

Specifically, you must review and approve a form of lease to be used in the integration order. Some of those factors may bear on terms to be included or excluded from the form of lease. For example, we included language in the proposed form that if a parcel was below a certain size, there would be no drilling activity, or no surface operations on track, consistent with setbacks in the statute. It's just a practical

1 impossibility to engage in some things on a tract below a certain size. That's just one example. It's a long-winded way of saying, that those factors are appropriate to consider in conjunction with your, and
5 the Commission's mission and authority under the act.15

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. The next question, what types of activities do you think are included in the protection of correlative rights?

MR. CHRISTIAN: Well, the concept of correlative rights, as I think it's defined in the statute, has to do with ensuring that a mineral interest owner has at least the opportunity to receive their just and fair share of production. So in this case, for mineral interests owners to be integrated, one of the most obvious things it would include would be the amount of the royalty. It could also include the amount of the risk penalty, because that can impact what they ultimately receive.

For purposes of the operator, or the committed mineral interest, it's the same subject. It may include consideration of whether certain terms and conditions make it too difficult or uneconomic to produce, at least unfairly so for the operator. In the pursuit of some goal that is outside the concept of correlative rights, I'm not saying that very clearly. But correlative
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rights go both ways. And if the interests of the
unleased mineral interest owner is not paramount, then
there is that of the operator of the leased mineral.
Your job as the administrator, and the Commission's job is to balance them to ensure that everybody receives, or has the opportunity to receive their fair share of production.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. That leads
into my second question or third question. Is it
possible for the term "just and reasonable," is it possible for a term to be just and reasonable, if it is outside the terms described in Idaho Code.

MR. CHRISTIAN: My position would be that it's not. That again, as you've seen in AMI's briefing, this proceeding is occurring pursuant to the terms of the Oil and Gas Act. And the Oil and Gas Act has a very strong statement of public policy at the beginning of it, and it has terms set throughout it in pursuit of that stated public policy. So to my mind, a term or condition in an order that is contrary to that stated public policy, pursuant to which this proceeding is being held would not be just and reasonable.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. What if the circumstance comes up in this unit, that is not addressed by statute or rule?

1 2 every circumstance. I mean, you just can't do it. But, 3 if a circumstance arises, the act, itself, has, for
4 example, procedures that a member of the public, or a
5 mineral interest owner can resort to address it. I'm 6 not going to quote the section to you. But there is the
7 ability to make a complaint to the Commission about some
8 circumstance where, for example, a member of the public,
9 or an uncommitted mineral interest, or integrated
mineral interest owner thinks that the operator is
violating their obligations under the act. And the
Commission can then investigate that complaint, and take whatever action it needs to enforce the act.

So the short answer to your question is, there
are procedures in the act to address and deal with
unforeseen circumstances.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Okay.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Next I'm going to accept comment testimony from the uncommitted property owners. And while Mr. Piotrowski is getting ready, I will also say that when he is finished, I'm going to have a second call for any uncommitted property owners in the room if
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they are not represented by Mr. Piotrowski.
MR. PIOTROWSKI: Good morning, Mr. Hearing
Officer. I'm James Piotrowski, P-i-o-t-r-o-w-s-k-i, here representing Judith and Jimmie Hicks, Karen Oltman, Alan and Glenda Grace, Shady River, LLC, and Citizens Align for Integrity and Accountability.

We've submitted briefing in this matter. And I think to start with, I would point out, that if complying with the statute, and purely complying with the statute was adequate, we wouldn't be here today.
The District Court had in front of it, the entire statute. There was no claim in the case that the statute had been violated. And yet, the court found there was a due process violation. So clearly beyond merely complying with the statute is required to satisfy the constitutional obligations of an arm of state government. That shouldn't be surprising to anyone.

By deciding that the Commission cannot alter a bonus payment, cannot reduce a royalty payment below a certain level, the legislature was making, I think, a very clear point. And that point was that the Oil and Gas Commission was required to ensure the terms were 3 just and reasonable by looking to all of the terms of 24 the agreements, and all of the potential terms of the 25 agreements.

3 We often say that in litigation, the only tool a court has usually to award damages. Damages here are not available. That is not a tool that the Commission has to use. It can not decide that a bonus payment of a thousand dollars would make the lease more just and reasonable. It cannot decide that a royalty of 98 percent is just and reasonable.

The legislature has imposed limits on the financial terms that the Commission can address, and leaves to the Commission all of the other tools available to ensure that the terms of leases are just and reasonable. This is important for a very simple reason. As the Supreme Court has said over, and over, and over again, when addressing the compelled sell of minerals, the requirement of just and reasonable terms is coextensive with the substantive due process requirement.

In other words, the phrase "just and reasonable" is not a throwaway. It has meaning. If you take the phrase "just and reasonable" out of the Oil and Gas Commission Act, the act becomes unconstitutional. And so just and reasonable is meant to protect the constitutional rights, which we would argue are more
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important than correlative rights. And so if the
Commission focuses only on correlative rights as AMI suggests, it would be ignoring the United States Constitution.

So the direct challenge to the Commission, and to you, Mr. Hearing Officer, posed by the district court is to be the first to determine what is required for terms to be just and reasonable. And then it is not unusual for courts to allow executive branches to have that first shot, or legislative branches to have that first shot in defining the terms.

When faced by the possibility that the Commission might actually adopt a rule setting out just and reasonable terms, AMI had a lengthy list of factors. In fact, it had eight of them to be precise. And those factors, indeed, were reasonable. We've heard Mr. Christian now say, that he thinks, indeed, those factors are appropriate. He says that today, although no such admission was made in the briefing.

So as a starting point, the factors listed in the previous briefing to the Commission back in April, seem to be a point of agreement, at least between my clients and AMI, that those eight factors are eight that we should consider.

I think that makes your job fairly easy in

1 that you've got the agreement of at least many of the parties, not all of them by any means, but many of the parties that the factors, you know, one through eight seen at page 3 of my own submission to the Commission, but copied from the April briefing by AMI, are a good starting point.

Importantly, contrary to Mr. Christian saying this today, included in those factors were
considerations of third-party contract issues. I
believe that was set out in -- yeah, it was his third
factor, where he said whether existing regulatory zoning
or contract property restrictions in the proposed unit
area require the imposition of certain terms and
conditions in order to prevent harm or unreasonable impact to surface owners.

Now, harm, or unreasonable impact are not certainly defined. But certainly putting a homeowner in a position of violating the terms of their mortgage, violating the terms of their property insurance policy, or violating other terms of contracts that run with their property would be harm to them. So we can start with those eight factors as a beginning point for this case, and I would imagine for every future case as well.

This case raises some particular concerns that don't exist in all others, however. First, is the
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procedural due process concern that it is almost beyond question that any person whose property interests are affected by a decision of an element of state government are entitled to notice and an opportunity to be heard. And yet, when you look at the application, itself, it reveals that AMI wishes to extract hydrocarbons from property owners, who have not received notice of this procedure.
In 2016, when the previous application was before you for a decision, and then before the Commission, there was an administrative rule in place. The statute in this case says that integration units, spacing units rather should be defined in reference to the land management system.

The Commission had adopted a regulation that stated that statute would be interpreted as requiring that a spacing unit should be a section, a 640 acre section. That was why three years ago, AMI proposed a -- it was actually four quarter sections because of where the hydrocarbon pool was located, but suggested a slightly less than 640 acre unit, slightly less because a portion of the one of the quarter sections was cut off by the enumerator.

Today, they've redefined the pool. At the
24
25 time, in 2016, the pool was smaller than a full section.

Today, they've redefined the pool based on allegedly new data. The pool is larger than a quarter section, yet it is only a quarter section that the company proposes as a spacing unit.

And that requires that the Commission consider whether all of the affected households, or whether all
the affected property owners, the mineral rights property owners have received notice. There is no reason that a spacing unit now should be based on, or should encompass only a section, or even a quarter section. The regulation that required that is no longer effective. It went away earlier this year. And I believe it was on the list to not be reproposed.

So we have a requirement that the spacing unit be described with reference to the land property system, but no requirement that it be a quarter section, or a section. And certainly no requirement that the spacing unit be square when the hydrocarbon pool in question is over. To put it bluntly, Alta Mesa is trying to stick square blocks in round holes.

This presents a serious due process problem, because those people whose land overlies the round part of the unit, but don't overlie the square if I'm Alta Mesa have not received notice, haven't been given a meaningful opportunity to participate.
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Finally, we would point out, the procedural due process concerns are not where due process ends, but rather substantive due process applies here, also. In evaluating the systems requiring the sale of oil and gas interests, at prices established, either directly by the government, or established on the basis of factors set out in the statute. The Supreme Court has been very clear, these systems are permissible. These systems are permissible as long as the terms of sale that are
compelled by the government are based on just and reasonable terms. And in doing so, the courts have identified at least five specific factors overlapping somewhat, that ought to be considered.

The first of those -- and these from set out on page 6 of our submission. The first of those is the protection of reasonable market based investment expectations. Applying that in this case it's quite simple. When people bought property in the area of the proposed spacing unit, and in the area of the previously proposed spacing unit, they were buying primarily for two purposes. They were buying homes, or they were buying agricultural land. And ensuring that the market based expectations of those investments are protected is a critical part of finding just and reasonable terms.

Other courts have found that it is necessary

1 to establish terms sufficient to ensure confidence in
2 the financial integrity of all entities involved. And
3 that goes precisely to the point Mr. Christian made, which is that the interest of the operator must be addressed, the interest of the homeowners, the interest of the property owners, the industrial land developers, all of those interests must be addressed. And terms and conditions that make it impossible to successfully drill, may not be acceptable. But so are terms and conditions that would destroy the value of investments made by homeowners and landowners.

A third requirement was addressing the broad public interest involved. And the Idaho Legislature has
told us that the protection of correlative rights, and the reasonable development of hydrocarbons in Idaho are part of the broad public interests. But broad public interest go beyond just the act in consideration right now. Broad public interests in Idaho certainly include the protection of a reasonable property right expectations.

Almost nowhere more than in Idaho is a man's
21
22 home his castle, or a woman's home, or anyone's home.
23 We are a state that believes in property rights at a
24 level that most states don't. The broad public interest
25 involved here are not merely to increase hydrocarbon
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production. Those interests include personal autonomy, personal sovereignty, the freedom, as so many Idahoans pursue, the freedom to be left alone. A fourth
consideration that the courts have pointed to in
determining just and reasonable as a due process
element, are avoiding terms that are unjust,
unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential to one party over another.

What the industry proposes here are terms that would be preferential to AMI over the property owners.
The royalty they proposed is as low as it can possibly go. The bonus payment is quite small as to be de minimis. The Commission should be evaluating whether the terms proposed protect the operator over the landowners.

And a fifth term we've discovered in our research, is ensuring that the terms fairly compensate investors for the risks they have assumed. When an individual goes out to buy farmland, he can evaluate the condition of the land. He can determine the likely yield of that land. He can determine whether the land will grow appropriate graze and forbs for animals, for livestock.

What he cannot evaluate is the likelihood that 24 25 some operator drilling oil 500 yards away might engage
in some kind of conduct that creates pollution, creates contamination of that land. And so ensuring the terms that compensate the investors for the risks they have assumed is a critical part of this. A landowner assumes certain risks. An operator assumes other risks. And making sure that the operator remains responsible for the risks they have assumed, and that landowners remain responsible only for the risks they have assumed is a reasonable and just term.

As I started out saying, when the legislature decided that royalties and bonus payments were largely going to be set by external factors, they were leaving the Commission all of the other tools. The Commission should decide -- and as a result, we have one last set of factors that the Commission ought to be considering. The Commission ought to decide whether bonding requirements are appropriate in this case.

AMI has almost no market value at this point. This is a company that one good oil spill puts them out of business, and beyond the reach of creditors. So bonding to ensure reclamation and protection of nearby property owners is appropriate. Tracing requirements, the current proposal is for a square spacing unit over part of an oval hydrocarbon pool. And so using tracing methods to see whether, in fact, Alta Mesa ends up
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1 taking hydrocarbons from people outside of the spacing
2 unit is required to ensure that there is not, in fact, a
3 taking here that would violate the constitution.
Restrictions on operations such as requiring that appropriate means of moving any extracted hydrocarbons are in place before operations begin, before extraction operations begin. Restrictions on methods, restrictions on times and means, those are all within the Oil and Gas Commission's power as terms to be used to ensure just and reasonable terms in the integration.

Specific reclamation requirements would be appropriate. This is less of a problem in hydrocarbon mining, than other types of mining. But America is covered in thousands, tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands abandoned wells that have become dangerous. And ensuring that doesn't happen here in Idaho, and that doesn't happen to innocent property owners, who are forced into this process, is a just and reasonable term.

And finally, establishing specific disclosure requirements that would be specific to this proposal would also be appropriate. AMI is a company that has routinely and for years now fought every effort requiring them to disclose their production. If my clients are forced into, are integrated into an

1 operation here, they will be entitled to at least a one-eighth royalty. And yet, AMI can't be trusted to accurately and fully disclose how much oil and gas they've produced. They haven't been willing to tell the Commission. They certainly haven't been willing to tell us. They treat that as a trade secret. When, in fact, it is my clients' oil and gas that they are taking. So disclosure requirements to ensure that there is adequate protection for lease holders is another factor that should be addressed.

All of these things taken together should provide more than adequate basis for the Commission to establish what factors are appropriate for consideration in this case to ensure that the compelled leases are just and reasonable. Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. If you don't mind, I have some questions for you, Mr. Piotrowski?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Yes, absolutely.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Before I start with some questions, we will get a little housekeeping. There is a sign-in sheet floating around the room. Has anyone not signed it? Hands in the air. If you can please get it to those people, if you don't mind, just a small little break. Thank you.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay.
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1 THE HEARING OFFICER: You've elaborated on 2 some of this, but I want to ask some of these questions 3 just for clarity. Should the factors to determine just 4 and reasonable terms be contained within the act stated 5 purpose in Idaho Code 47-311, which is encourage and 6 promote development, prevent waste, and protect correlative rights?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: The Oil and Gas Conservation Act does not exist alone. There is a notion in American law, that the law forms a seamless web. I personally kind of take issue with that, it's not so seamless. But it expresses an important idea, which is that no piece of law stands alone. If the act, itself, was adequate, we wouldn't have a due process issue here at all. We wouldn't be having this hearing, in fact.

The statute must be construed, understood, and applied within the broader context of Idaho property rights, and within the context of the state and federal constitutional rights of all property owners. So staying within the four corners of the act is not going to be adequate.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Follow-up,

1 the factors that you've identified?

2

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Well, first of all, the act does clearly give the Commission the power to establish just and reasonable terms. And so within a certain range of reasonableness is a common term used, the Commission should exercise that authority as broadly as it feels is necessary. And administrative agencies in Idaho are given quite broad discretion in how to exercise their authority.

Again, though, the agency is never permitted, merely because it has statutory authority, to ignore constitutional requirements, or other requirements of law. And so what specific authority does it have within the four corners of the act is that authority to establish, and/or acquire the terms of leases to be just and reasonable. Beyond that, it necessarily has the obligation. And where it has the obligation, it necessarily has the authority to comply with constitutional norms.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. In your opening brief, you stated that all affected property interests need notice, and the opportunity to be heard. You've touched on this a little bit, but for clarity. Who do you argue should have notice?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: We believe it should be
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everybody who overlies the full extent of the identified hydrocarbon pool. We have an unusual case here. The act was written on the basis of similar acts across the west. Those acts in turn were primarily written in response to the challenges facing the oil industry, not just in the West, but also in the East. And they assume that oil fields will be quite extensive. I mean, west Texas is kind of the model for this legislation, where there are productive wells reaching into the same reservoirs across vast areas.

Here we have the unusual situation in which AMI has identified what it believes to be a relatively small pool of hydrocarbons. In this case, there can be no assumption that if the Commission establishes the spacing unit requested, that other subsequent spacing units, you know, will capture those other homeowners. If I own a home in west Texas, I can assume that one unit or another is going to include my property. Here that is not the case. Alta Mesa first determined, to the best of its ability, and based on the best science available at the time, it claimed that it had identified a pool. Today, it identifies a much smaller pool.

Now, really importantly is the fact that it doesn't say, that it's current description of the pool is actually the geographic limits of the pool. What it

1 says is the current pool definition is all the gas that 2 is easily and economically retrievable. We know, and the Commission certainly knows, that if you draw the oil and gas from the middle of a reservoir, the oil and gas from the edges of the reservoir migrates in. Which means, we think, and we'll be prepared to show at hearing, that, in fact, what Alta Mesa is proposing to do is to extract oil and gas from people, who are not part of this integration order. That would violate due process.

In only way to correct that is to identify the pool as broadly as possible, and to include everyone whose mineral interests that are included in that. That will exclude some of the people, who were in the proposed prior 624 acre unit, or whatever the size was. I forget the number. That will exclude many of them, but it would include a great deal more mineral owners that are included in Alta Mesa's current identification.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. A few more questions. When you say, "property rights," are you referring to mineral rights, surface rights, or something different?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: All the above. The idea that mineral rights are not property rights is, excuse my bluntness, bunkum. The idea that you don't have a
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property interest in minerals that are specifically 2 described as part of your property, is the worst kind of 3 legal sophistry. And I think that the court ultimately 4 had a little problem determining that the mineral rights 5 are part of that bundle of rights that make up property 6 in America. different types of rights, but it must protect all of them. And so protections that will ensure the integrity of surface rights will be different than protections that secure the integrity of mineral rights. The legislature of Idaho has determined that a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment are adequate to entirely protect the financial interests in mineral rights. But that does not address the other interests that fall along with it. And, indeed, the Oil and Gas Commission determining what interests, or what terms are just and reasonable should be considering the entire property right that's at stake.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, I'll have to ask.
20 21 When you agree that mineral rights, surface rights, and 22 something else were all property rights, you don't cite 23 any statute or sort of any legal grounds for that. Can 24 you provide any?
25 MR. PIOTROWSKI: In Idaho, mineral rights are

1 taxable. I mean, it can't get much clearer than that. I don't have the citation handy, but, indeed, mineral rights are taxable. They are separately devisable. They have all of the hallmarks of a property interest. They have a value that can be determined. They could be identified as a specific portion of the bundle of rights that constitutes property. They are transferrable, separate from the surface interests. They are sellable, buyable, leasable. And as I said, they are taxable.
o You can borrow money using mineral rights as collateral.
All of these are hallmarks of property.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. In your opening brief, you argued that an agency can fix a zone of reasonableness as long as the terms are not confiscatory. Now, zone and reasonableness normally involves pipeline rates. But I'm curious if you can define for me, what you mean by the therm "confiscatory"?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Confiscatory means that the transaction the state compels a person to enter into has zero or negative value to that person.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So you asked for a factor to ensure that compelled leases will not result in financial losses to those whose properties rights are integrated. What would the burden of proof be on the
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loss of property values?
MR. PIOTROWSKI: We are dealing with a
proceeding that is not as formal as court proceedings.
So we generally haven't engaged in clearly delineating
burdens of proof. In the prior proceedings of the Oil and Gas Commission, bluntly the burden of proof has been whatever was necessary to convince the Commission.

If there was to be a burden of proof applied, it probably ought to be a preponderance of the evidence, and it needs to be applied to all aspects of the process. There should be no presumption that a requested spacing unit is appropriate. There should be no presumption that a requested integration order on specific terms is just and reasonable.

If there is to be a defined burden of proof, Alta Mesa should be held to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that indeed it has proposed terms that are just and reasonable. And if the Commission cannot find, cannot determine by a preponderance of the evidence that the terms should be just and reasonable, the application should be denied.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you think that financial loss is always possible with or without an integration unit?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Well, yes, it's kind of

1 a -- it's a very broad question. Financial loss is 2 always possible. I own a home, for instance, and I'm 3 looking very carefully at what will happen in the next 4 recession. Will I lose value? So there is a difficulty 5 in this process in predicting future events. But we 6 have the tools to do that, and we do that on a regular 7 basis. and deciding that it's worth at least a one-eighth royalty. The legislature has engaged in precisely that process. We don't know what is going to happen to gas prices tomorrow. They literally could skyrocket. We could see doubling, tripling, quadrupling of the value of natural gas within the next year, and nobody would be all that shocked, a little bit surprised.

We could also see, though, the present value of those hydrocarbons plummet. I would say each of those outcomes is about equally likely at the moment. That's just my off-the-top guess. But that means, we need to address those outcomes. If a vast increase in the price of hydrocarbons, for instance, yields a windfall for the operator, that's not particular just and reasonable for the people who actually own that gas. If on the other hand, if all of the market risk is assessed to one party, or the other, for instance, to
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1 the operator, rather than the landowners. But that would also not be just and reasonable.

So we make our best conclusions based on the data, knowledge, and information we have available at the moment. And decide, okay. What's the likely outcome? What are the most likely outcomes of this process, and how likely are they? An outcome that is only ten percent likely to occur, should be valued or weighted differently than one that is 90 percent likely to occur. And so that's the process that the legislature left to the Commission and the Department of Lands in determining just and reasonable terms.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Going back to the property values, how would you determine that an increase or decrease in property values were related to the integration?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: We have and hope to present what we think is compelling evidence, that, indeed, where oil and gas exploration occurs, there will be effects on property values. And those studies that have been done take into account other reasons for changes in property values. The property market is complex, but it is not so complex that we can't separate out different
24 effects. That would be like saying that, well, you 25 bought a house in 2010 at the bottom of the recession.

1 Y
2 a
30
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5

Normally, if I don't wish to smear my brain on the highway, I wear a helmet when I ride my motorcycle. That's the risk analysis that I perform. If I don't want to take motorcycle at all. That's the risk assessment that I perform. And we are used to making decisions about what risks are acceptable to us, and what risks aren't. And every one of us is different in that regard.

What integration does, is it says to a homeowner, your risk assessment is irrelevant. We're going to force you to do this, even though you think it is too risky, and payoff is too small. In doing that, we need to recognize the various levels of risk aversion that people have. The people who sign leases with AMI's land men, they have a much lower risk aversion. And
yet, the process, if it weren't for the requirement of 2 just and reasonable terms, the process set out by statute would necessarily allow the least risk averse 55 percent to set terms. And so we should be considering that in the process as we move forward.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. You refer to statutes were insufficient to determine just and reasonable. In 2017, the legislature enacted comprehensive legislation with more specific terms and conditions of how royalties are paid. Would these new more specific terms provide more specificity to establish just and reasonable terms?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: I'm sorry. Is the question, do they provide more specificity?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes.
MR. PIOTROWSKI: I don't think they do. The basic command from the legislature remains that the Commission, and the Department shall ensure that the terms of the leases are just and reasonable. An integration order is entered only on terms that are just and reasonable.

Had the legislature meant, we want you to enter into integration orders on terms that comply with the statute, they certainly could have done so. And they have done so many times in other settings. Instead

1 they required that the agency determine that the terms of the integration order be just and reasonable. That
3 implies discretion, but it also implies a duty to
actually determine what those terms are. The
5 legislature didn't make that decision. They left it to 6 the agencies.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Last question. Other than the requirement for an integration order to be upon terms that are just and reasonable, what legal authority do you rely on to assert the Commission has jurisdiction to do the following: address contractual agreements, including mortgages between private parties; potentially award damages to private property owners; or compensate property owners for financial losses in their home value that is not associated with any physical occupation. I'm asking you to clarify the authority that you think the Commission has.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: The primary authority is that obligation to ensure the terms are just and reasonable. That's the primary authority. Written into the entire fabric of Idaho law is the simple notion that all
22 agencies will comply with existing law. I think it's
23 important to note that under the Idaho Administrative
24 Procedure Act, judicial review is extremely limited on
25 facts, but wide open on the law. What that indicates to

1 me is that, following the law, and by that I mean, the law written broadly, is assumed of every agency. The agency will establish the facts, and they won't be second guessed, except in very unusual circumstances. However, the agency can't be second guessed on the law.

And that, in addition, imposes an obligation on the agencies to do their best to comply with the law, with all of the law. Not merely the organic statute, not merely the specific statute applicable in a certain situation, but rather all of them. No agency means explicit statutory authority to follow the law. That's assumed.

Here we have cited to, what we think are specifically the requirements in the due process clause. We have tried to develop factors that would reflect both the requirements of the statute, which does limit the Commission in its authority to set financial terms of leases. But it doesn't limit it to set other types of terms. And I think that the importance of doing that is apparent in the submission by the applicant here. They didn't merely take a form agreement, and say, here we go. This one's been approved by the courts. They took a form agreement, and they modified it. And they said, we're going to strike out this, we wouldn't have that, we'll strike out these other sections. And all of that
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certainly implies from AMI that they believe that the Commission has the authority to modify those terms. And I think that's on one point that we're in agreement, or at least as stated so far in this proceeding we're in agreement between the parties.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.
Folks, I'm going to take a ten-minute recess, followed by testimony from additional uncommitted
property owners in the unit. And then the Idaho
Department of Lands. And then finally the public comments. Let's take ten minutes right now.
(Recess.)
THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Everyone, it's been ten minutes, a little over. Thank you, Mr. Christian. Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, for your testimony so far. Do we have any uncommitted property owners in this proposed unit, who would like to provide testimony at this time?

Okay. Great. Next will be testimony provided by the Idaho Department of Lands.

MS. VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer. Joy Vega, V-e-g-a, Deputy Attorney General appearing on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands.

Recently I was thinking about this statutory phrase "just and reasonable," and what its application
should be in determining the terms of this particular integration order, under Idaho Code, Section 47-320(1). And it dawned on me that the starting point for determining that phrase, must be the same as any other tribunal starting point, when administering the statute, which is the plain meaning of the words.

The general rules of statutory construction are first, that a statute must be construed and the person submits plain, usual, and ordinary meaning. And second that the whole provision must be looked at considering the meaning of each word, so as to not render any other word superfluous or redundant.

This phrase "just and reasonable" has been, and during this hearing will continue to be used, and presented almost like a standalone elevated requirement of a statute. However, it is just three words out of 167 words that make up section 320 , subsection 1 . And subsection one is only the first of seven subsections in 47-320.

So the first big question that perhaps you
21 will be deciding is, what do those three words mean? So
22 I looked them up in my Black's Law Dictionary, and this
23 is what I learned "just" is an adjective. And it means
24 legal rights, lawful, or equitable. "Reasonable" is
25 also an adjective. And it means, fair, proper, or
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1 moderate under the circumstances. And while the definition of "and" seems obvious. When it is used in a 3 statute it is typically given a conjunctive meaning, 4 which requires both items, so both "just" and 5 "reasonable" to exist.
6 Consequently, in considering each proposed 7 term and condition discussed today, or that you might be s considering after this hearing, you likely want to start with whether it is legally right and proper, and whether the proposed term is truly related to the integration of all tracks or interests within the proposed spacing unit.

In its opening brief, the Idaho Department of Lands primarily focused its argument on the just component of just and reasonable. And listed a number of statutes within the Oil and Gas Conservation Act, as well as a number of rules, within the rules governing conservation and oil, and natural gas in the state of Idaho, which is at IDAPA 20.07.02, that would render just and reasonable terms in this integration order.

That being said, several of the authorities listed in IDL's opening brief are really applicable to the second phase of developing an oil and gas operation, which is the application for a permit to drill a well.

Idaho Code Section, 47-316, 317, and 318 deal
with the drilling application, drilling location, and well spacing. These statutes and related rules include additional notice requirements of the applicant, or the department, and additional opportunities for public comment, as well as the opportunities for comment of other state agencies. Which leads us, or, you know, is a component of what is the Department's jurisdiction in this case, what are the Department's authorities, what is the commissions authorities. And the careful dance between agencies to not overlap, and try to do responsibilities of other state agencies that are charged with different protections of human health and environmental regulation.

It is really within these drilling statutes and regulations that the environmental and human health protections provided for by the Idaho Legislature are found. The first phase of integration, which is what we're discussing today, and what the next evidentiary hearing will be about, is focusing on ensuring the orderly development of a proposed operation, while compensating every mineral interest owner within that spacing unit.

The Department is primarily concerned with the terms of the integration order being lawful, so that the department is able to carry out it's only statutory
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regulatory duties as the operation progresses. Other than the recommendations presented in the Department's opening brief, the Department doesn't really have any additional suggestions for what just and reasonable terms should be.

And unless you have any questions from me this morning still, yes, the Department will rest on its written presentation and the opening brief.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I don't have any questions for you right now.

MS. VEGA: May I. I would actually like to comment, and perhaps correct the record on a couple of things. Mr. Piotrowski was talking about shoving a square peg into a round hole. And I just wanted to bring into the record the fact that Idaho Code 47-317(3), and subsections A and B actually govern the sizing of units right. So subsection B for gas wells requires that well be in a unit that is either 160 acres, or 640 acres.

Subsection A is specific to oil wells. And it limits it to a minimum of a 40 acre tract, or a combination of tracts. So I thought that clarification was important, because the evidence that will be presented at the next hearing by Alta Mesa to what's the 25 correct spacing unit to be integrated, does actually
have statutory borders and boundaries. And frankly, they are all squares. So if the pool is round, we're still looking at a square unit.

That was my last comment. Thank you.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
All right. Folks, I think that enables, or it shows everyone has provided testimony, who is a party, or is a representative of a party within the integrating unit. Thank you all the parties for your comments and your civil actions today. I would invite members at large of the public who would like to come up and provide testimony. I have our sign-in sheet that I pushed on all of you at the beginning.

I'm going to go through here. Some of you have noted that you would like to provide oral testimony. I'm going to limit that to five minutes. And if you are not on here, and you do want to provide testimony, and I don't call your name, you'll get your chance at the end. All right. I want everyone to come up and speak, and be able to have the right. All right?

So we'll start today, as I start at the top.
Ms. Shelley Brock, if you would like to come up, you are welcome to.

MS. BROCK: My name is Shelley Brock,
S-h-e-l-l-e-y, B-r-o-c-k. And I'm a longtime Eagle
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1 resident, and I'm the president of CAIA. I didn't realize we were going to have an opportunity to speak, so I didn't really prepare anything. But I do have just a few comments I want to make based on what I heard said earlier by the two attorneys.

I wanted to say that I noticed in
Mr. Christian's brief, he mentioned that there was
no -- basically in so many words, that there was no guarantee that just and reasonable had to be equally
fair for both the property owner and the operator. And another point that he made by showing integration applications from a couple of other states, was that just because this industry frequently gets away with operations like this in other states, that he feels they should be allowed to do that. We feel like, of course, it's a huge violation of private property rights. And I think that our attorney very adequately expressed why we feel that way.

Mr. Christian also mentioned the word
20 "tyranny," which I thought was interesting. He
21 mentioned -- I don't have this word for word, but he
22 said that the point of forced pooling was, I believe, to
23 prevent tyranny by minority of mineral owners preventing
24 development of the others. We, of course, see that as
25 quite the opposite. We believe that it's tyranny for

Idaho property owners to be forced to give up the oil and gas that they own under their homes for a pittance against their will, with inadequate payment to compensate them for the risks that they are being exposed to. So I just wanted to make that.

Another thing Mr. Christian mentioned, that if we wanted some of these factors that we submitted in the form of a letter earlier, a couple months ago, before the April -- I think it was the April 23rd
meeting -- that we should go in front of the legislature. But we pushed very hard to get those terms in the form of rulemaking. I know you had almost 60 letters submitted, I believe. And I think all of those, if not all of those, were people who had a lot of requirements that they thought would make it just and reasonable. And they really wanted as we did, as CAIA did, to get it in front of the rulemaking panel, which would put it in front of the legislature. The Commission rejected that idea, and opted for this hearing instead. So I just wanted to point that out. We did attempt to go through the legislature.

Mr. Christian also defined correlative rights as being that mineral owners should be entitled to receive a just and fair share of the royalties. But I think everybody in this room is aware of the class
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1 action suit against Alta Mesa, AMI, and other entities,
2 related entities going on now here in Payette County.
3 This is a bunch of mineral owners, who are very upset.
4 They have fought for years to get accurate and complete
5 production records, as you know. I know that the
Commission, and you, Mick, have been personally involved
in attempting to hold them accountable for that.
Those people are furious at the lack of
cooperation they've gotten. They feel like they've been getting ripped off for years. And the legislation that we helped to promote in 2017 House Bill 301, everyone thought that was going to ensure that honest and fair reporting was going to happen. And I watched you guys chase your tails trying to make them cough up these production records now for the last couple of years, and so I feel for you. I see that you are not getting the cooperation you need. And so why should these people, who never wanted to sign a lease, now be forced into a lease. When even those people who voluntarily signed, and are pro drilling, have not been getting fairly paid.

One last thing. I know that we've talked about the oil and gas migrating essentially from outside of this integrated, this new 160 acres. We have testimony by some people who were approached by Alta Mesa's land man over the last couple years. "The land
man killed them. They better sign a lease, or their oil and gas was going to be absorbed by the well." So we have even have their own land man admitting to that. And so I just wanted to clarify those facts for you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. MS. BROCK: Okay.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, on the list Shelley was the only one who signed up to provide oral testimony. Is there anyone else here who would like to provide oral testimony at this time?

Thank you. It's now 10:36, 10:37 on Monday, September 9th. This hearing is concluded.
(Hearing concluded at 10:30 a.m.)
(Signature waived.)
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