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person with a virtual component via Zoom. This hearing is being recorded on Zoom as required by IDAPA 04.11.01.651. We also have a back-up recording device recording the hearing.

Those of you on Zoom, please mute your
microphones until you are called on. Please speak loudly and clearly when it is your turn. If there is a disturbance, you'll be reminded to mute your microphone.
If the disturbance continues, you may be muted and/or
disconnected.
For those appearing in person, it is important you identify yourself by stating your name for the record before you speak.

If you are here as a representative, please
indicate your own name; as well as who you are representing.

I may ask clarifying questions while you speak.

When you come up, if you're in person, I move the podium right here so folks on Zoom could maybe see.

It looks like we've lost the video again; so
I'll bring that back. You could be speaking to someone other than me. Let's see if I can do that. There you go.

As my January 31, 2023 Notice indicates, this
hearing was noticed to address the scope of factors to determine just or reasonable terms to be determined just and reasonable.

The purpose of this hearing is not to address what terms are, in fact, just and reasonable. That is a question for a future evidentiary hearing held at a later date.

I have allowed briefing and submittal of affidavits on the issues of the scope of factors used to determine just and reasonable and the hearing was noticed to take only argument.

I want to, again, clarify that the deadline for uncommitted owners to respond to the application has not passed. They can still participate in future evidentiary hearings on the integration application. Witnesses and evidence may be submitted at the future evidentiary hearing.

With that, I'd like to first take appearances.
Mr. Christian, will you please identify
yourself and who you represent for the record?
MR. CHRISTIAN: Michael Christian here for the applicant, Snake River Oil and Gas, Mr. Administrator.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you.
Mr. Becker, could you please identify yourself and who you represent? You don't have to stand up, if
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you don't want to.
MR. BECKER: Kahle Becker representing Jordan
Gross, Dana Gross and Little Buddy Farm, LLC.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you.
Mr. Piotrowski, can you please identify
yourself and who you represent?
MR. PIOTROWSKI: James Piotrowski on behalf of
Joey Ishida, Brenda Ishida, Juanita Lopez, Sarah
Weatherspoon, David George, Jessica Ishida Sanchez, Juan
o Sanchez, Jr., Gary Hale, Ryan Gentry, Mark Vidlak, and
Mary Ann Miller; as well as Citizens Allied for
Integrity and Accountability.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
Piotrowski.
Ms. Winters, can you please identify yourself and who you represent?

MS. WINTERS: Good morning, Mr. Hearing Officer. My name's J.J. Winters, Deputy Attorney
General and appearing on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you.
Are there any other uncommitted mineral
interest owners in the proposed unit that plan on
participating today? All right.
Next, I'd like to insure all parties
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understand what documents are in the record.
Documents in the record are Docket No.
CC-2023-OGR-01-001 are on the OGCC website at:
Ogcc.idaho.gov/administrative-hearings.
I also have a copy of listed documents for the record orally.
January 23, 2023, Application of Integration with Exhibits A through L.

January 23, 2023, Idaho Department of Lands
Acknowledgment of Application.
January 30, '23, the Affidavit of Publication
or Notes of Intent and Certified Mailing Receipts.
January 31st, 2023, Order Vacating Hearing and
Notice of Hearing to determine Just and Reasonable
Factors.
February 1st, '23, Affidavit of Publication.
February 9, '23, Comments from Mary Ann
Miller.
February 17, '23, Kahle Becker on behalf of
20 Jordan A. and Dana C. Gross and Little Buddy Farms, LLC,
21 Notice of Appearance and Motion to Continue.
February 17, '23, the Applicant Response to
23 Motion to Continue.
24 February 21, '23, Comment from Sarah
25 Weatherspoon.

February 21, '23, Kahle Becker Motion to Continue, Reply Brief.

February 22, '23, James Piotrowski on behalf of Citizens Allied for Integrity and Accountability;
Joey Ishida, Brenda Ishida, Juanita Lopez, Sarah
Weatherspoon, David George, Jessica Ishida Sanchez, Juan
Sanchez, Jr., Gary Hale, Ryan Gentry, Mark Vidlak, and
Mary Ann Miller. And a Brief of Nonconsenting Owners in
Support of Motion to Continue.
February 22, '23, the Order Continuing the
Opening Brief deadline.
February 24, '23, the Applicant E-mail
Response. Newly Leased Mineral Interest Owners.
February 28, '23, the Idaho Department of
Lands Opening Brief.
February 28, '23, James Piotrowski Opening Brief.

March 1st, '23, the Applicant Opening Brief.
March 1st, '23, the Applicant Motion of
Applicant Per Order Determining CAIA is not a Party.
March 1st, '23, Kahle Becker Opening Brief.
March 6, '23, Kahle Becker Response Brief and
3 Motion for Disqualification.
March 8th, '23, the Applicant Response Brief.
March 10th, '23, the Applicant Opposition to
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1 This oral argument will be before our just and reasonable section of this hearing.

And I'll allow everyone to speak for up to five minutes.

Mr. Becker, since you filed the Motion, I'll give you -- it's your Motion, so you can begin, if you'd
like. You're welcome to walk up.
MR. BECKER: Thank you, Your Honor.
This is Kahle Becker for the Grosses and Little Buddy Farm.

As the Hearing Officer pointed out, we filed a
Motion for Disqualification.
Our concern is that the State is an interested and perhaps adverse party due to its ownership and management of a Trust resource for the State of Idaho. Namely, the navigable Payette River, which cuts across the middle of the proposed integration unit.

I've requested, pursuant to Idaho's Public
Records Request laws, copies of documents related to any
lease or any sort of financial arrangement that has been entered into between the State and the Applicant.

Since this Integration Order looks to the type of arrangements that have been entered into between other integrated parties, who chose to be integrated voluntarily, I think the State's lease is certainly
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1 something that would impact the determination of some of the issues that are put forth by the Advocate here.

So, I'm still waiting for a response to my
public records request; but out of an abundance of caution, we felt that it would be best to have a new Hearing Officer appointed in this particular situation so that the public can have confidence that the person who's deciding their case has not negotiated a financial arrangement with the Applicant that actually puts them
in an adverse situation to other parties who are being compelled to be integrated in this particular unit.

Again, our concern is simply public confidence in the process and insuring that all parties have due process and that this is a completely transparent process for the citizens in the State of Idaho. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Mr. Christian, you did file a response brief to this. If you would like to provide any testimony at this time, you're welcome to.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator.
Briefly, I've really already pointed out in
the brief the two main points.
One: Our view is that the Motion is untimely.

1 It was filed beyond 14 days after you appeared on the
scene as the Hearing Officer via your January 31st
Notice of Hearing and was not filed promptly following
the availability of the facts on which it relies.
I'm not going to go through every detail of
that, but it's in my briefing.
I think it's also -- it's meritless on the
substance. The point made in the Motion itself in the
briefs submitted by the Grosses was that there is a
conflict of interest because you oversee the leasing of
State minerals, which isn't the case. A completely
different person within the Department of Lands under a
different supervisor is responsible for State leasing.
So, there's a division of interest. And there hasn't
been any evidence provided that you have any personal animus or bias.

And, finally, you -- you are not a generic
Hearing Officer to be disqualified and replaced. The
Statute specifically provides that the Administrator of
the oil and gas program is to decide integration
applications.
So, for those reasons -- and, again, as is set
forth in our briefing -- we would request that you deny the Motion for Disqualification.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
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1 Christian.
Are there any other parties who would like to
offer argument on this?
MR. PIOTROWSKI: Mr. Thomas, I'd like to be heard on this.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Go ahead.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you. In addition to
the grounds that go to disqualification in the Gross's
Motion, there is even a larger and more substantial
basis for disqualification of the Hearing Officer in the
case. It has nothing to do with personal animus or
bias. Mr. Christian's vote is on the wrong issue.
What it has to do with is institutional bias.
The Oil and Gas Commission, which is a part of the Department of Lands, of which you are the Administrator, have a compulsion, a statutory compulsion to encourage the rapid development of oil and gas resources. This is your job as a matter of Idaho law.

To then have you sit as the Hearing Officer
over the terms of your wish how those items will be divided, creates the tremendous appearance -- at least the appearance; and the likely actuality of institutional bias.

You cannot tell us what is just and reasonable
when your job is to drill, baby, drill.
You cannot tell us that you have taken
appropriate depth to insure the right of all interested
parties when your statutory command is to get the hydrocarbons out.
And as a result, this process is fundamentally unfair, fundamentally violates due process of law and fundamentally represents the wrong decision-maker of this case.

If the appearance of impartiality matters, then the decision-maker should not be an entity who's
statutorily commanded to approve integration and drilling and extraction.

It should, instead, be a neutral third-party who understands that these are merely business decisions to be made.
And, yet, this system, which include the party
that's -- that works for an interested party, isn't
accomplishing that.
I believe we should find a neutral Hearing
Officer for these cases starting with this one and going forward.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
Piotrowski.
Ms. Vega, do you have any argument at this
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time?
MS. VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Just a reminder, I'm just observing this morning. I don't intend to participate.
5 But maybe Ms. Winters has some comments on
6 behalf of the Department of Lands.
7 HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Ms. Vega.
I misread the script at the bottom of the picture. I
apologize.
Ms. Winters, do you have any comments at this time?
MS. WINTERS: Briefly, Mr. Hearing Officer.
As you indicated, the Department of Lands filed an
opening brief in the Just and Reasonable, but did not
necessarily address the Motion to Disqualify.
After reading the briefing and considering the
filings, the Department would just like to make a
statement on the record that it is disappointed in the
accusatory tone in which some of the briefing has been written.

It is unfortunate that the Department has to defend the integrity of the Department and the Oil and Gas Commission; both of which are separate legal entities created by Statute.
Although the Oil and Gas Commission is housed

1 within the Idaho Department of Lands, these matters
2 remain separate.
3 My client, Mr. Thumb, (Phonetic) and I'm sure
4 Mr . Thomas, take great care to place the required
5 screens between them.
6 Neither entity created the statutory
7 arrangement but all take it very seriously and will
8 continue to follow the law as it is written.
9 Mr. Thomas, with his experience in the oil and
10 gas industry, is a preferred Hearing Officer for the
11 very reason of his experience.
12 To imply that either the Department or the
13 State or any member of the Commission is anything but
14 fair and impartial is unfortunate.
15 It is the Department's vote that this hearing
16 and any upcoming hearings and briefings be conducted
17 with professionalism and respect. Thank you.
18 HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Ms.
19 Winters.
20
21 p
22
23 if you would like.
24 MR. BECKER: I just want to address the
25 timeliness here.

1 As the Hearing Officer is aware, the Statute
2 gave some extremely tight time frames here. And the
3 Statute for disqualification also does have some time
4 frames, but it also has a general provision regarding
5 discovery of factors that may indicate potential grounds
for disqualification; such as, those as you've indicated here.

I think what's lost in Mr. Christian's
arguments is the fact that the average citizen who
0 receives this giant packet of information for an
Applicant, to extract hydrocarbons that have sat under the earth for hundreds of thousands of years, millions of years; all the sudden it's placed on this fast track "you've got to get it done right now."
This is a big deal to these people who are all of the sudden forced with the prospect of staring at a drill rig for the next -- or drilling operation for the next 30 years. To consider terms of leases that are in fine print and dozens of pages long, this is a lot for someone to digest.
In this situation, Mr. Christian points out dates at which his Applicant did certain things.

It then takes time for things to get mailed out to the parties who are being told that they're about
25 to be integrated under terms that Mr. Christian's
clients think are fair without providing much information for the people to be integrated to consider.

In this particular case, my client went to his
long-time attorney. And after dealing with that, a
replacement attorney within that office, then all of the
sudden was informed that, in fact, his long-time
attorney represented Mr. Christian's client. And so, that created a bit of a delay.

My client then searched out another attorney
who had some experience in mineral extraction underneath Idaho's ground, some experience in administrative law practice and we were able to connect and sign an engagement letter.
There's a lot to digest and consider in a short amount of time. And realizing that: Hey, there's navigable waterway that traverses this unit and look
into the statutes and rules that then allow one to
realize that the State potentially has an interest -- a
monetary interest, as well as a regulatory interest in
this particular integration unit.
I think it requires a lot of connecting the
dots that, frankly, the average attorney wouldn't have
put together.
Here I was able to connect those dots. I did so in as quick as time as reasonably possible. I am
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still waiting for actual leases or documentation as to what the financial arrangement is between the Department of Lands and Snake River Oil and Gas. I still don't have those documents because of the time frames under the Public Records Request Act.

So, we have moved diligently here. I
immediately notified the Hearing Officer once I
connected those dots here.
And -- and, frankly, with all due respect, to
the Department of Lands, I think it's something that
should have been pointed out in their opening brief.
Again, in the interest of full disclosure
here, that they're not simply a regulatory function, but
they are an interested party in this particular
situation.
So, again, I'm not trying to be accusatory
here; but, you know, this is government works fast when
it's transparent and the people understand how their
decisions are being made by the elected officials and
those that are paid for with tax dollars.
And so, again, we're interested in
transparency. We're seeking transparency through a
Public Records Request.
We feel that having an independent Hearing
25 Officer in this situation is going to provide that
confidence that the government is working for all of these people; and not simply the Applicant. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Becker.
After the arguments I've heard, I am deciding
not to disqualify myself as the Hearing Officer.
I'll just tell you this orally. The Gross's
cite that the navigable waterways and the integration
unit means that I am not a disinterested party.
I do not supervise or administer the oil and gas mineral leases in the Department -- for the
Department of Lands in the State. That is a different division entirely.

I don't have any knowledge about what those specifically lease terms are.

There are no facts indicating that I am bias, prejudice interest or substantial prior involvement in the matter other than as a presiding Officer.

The request also appears to be untimely as my employment and job titles were included on the Notice of Hearing issued well over 14 days before the Motion and the Grosses do not indicate what new facts were discovered later.

The Notice of Hearing was issued January 31st and the Gross's attorney appeared on February 17, '23.
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1 Finally, Idaho Code 47-328, Sub 3, Sub D
expressly provides that the Administrator shall hear the application and make a decision.

In the event I decided to hire a Hearing
Officer, I am still statutorily asked as the
Administrator to issue the order.
While I am -- finally, while I am ruling on
this Motion orally now, I will follow up with a written
decision stating the facts and reasons for my
determination pursuant to Idaho Code 67-5252, Sub 3.
All right.
Switching gears. Let's turn to the hearing
topic of the scope of factors used to determine just and reasonable.

The purpose of this hearing is not to address which terms are, in fact, just and reasonable. That is a question for a future evidentiary hearing at a later date.
I have allowed briefing and submittal of affidavits on the issues of the scope of factors used to determine just and reasonable in the hearing, as noticed, state only argument.
So, we'll proceed with oral arguments at this hearing.
25 I will first hear arguments from the

Applicant, Snake River.
This will be followed by arguments from Mr. Piotrowski.
This will be followed with arguments by Mr.
Becker.
Afterward, I accept -- I will accept arguments
from the Idaho Department of Lands.
Then other uncommitted owners, if they are present.

Then Snake River will have an opportunity for rebuttal.

Arguments for each party will be limited to 10 minutes.
After argument is complete, I will accept public comments. I will limit these comments to five minutes. I'll first take public comment from those appearing in person; and then I'll take comment from anyone on Zoom.
So, with that, I would invite Mr. Christian to provide argument at this time.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator.
You have the Applicants' proposed factors for
consideration. We set them forth both in the
application and I think they're listed in the briefing.
As you're aware, the Administrator's found
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1 those factors to be appropriate in three previous
integration proceedings.
The Applicant has indicated that it's not
aware of any circumstances in Section 24 that would make
5 it any different from any other previous integration;
6 such that those factors should be changed or not used.
Neither of the groups objecting mineral owners
have offered any evidence that Section 24 is different 9 in any way.

I'm not going to spend further time repeating my briefing on that subject or your previous orders back to you.

But as you've previously found, the factors
are within the authority of the Commission. They do not
impose burdens, conditions or restrictions in excess of
or inconsistent with existing statutory provisions; and
they comply with Commission rules.
And, finally, they're consistent with the
purposes of the Act, which is to encourage development, protect correlative rights and prevent waste.
As you've noted per your Notice of Hearing,
22 the purpose of this proceeding is for the parties to
23 propose factors to be considered in the later merits
24 hearing in determining just and reasonable terms of
25 integration.

It's concerned with balancing correlative
rights and preventing waste and encouraging the development of oil and gas resources in the State of Idaho while doing so.

Working interest owners and committed royalty owners have entirely different interests in regulated utilities.

You know, one is interested in earning a fair, but essentially guaranteed, rate of return on invested
capital while occupying government sanctioned monopoly
position.
The other is interested in maximizing
efficient production in the non-monopoly position while
balancing the correlative rights of others.
Several of the issues that are argued, particularly by Grosses are, again, irrelevant for the purposes of this proceeding.

The Statute does not permit discovery in integration proceedings. This is recognized in both DAPA and the HE's rules that discovery's allowed only when permitted by the Statute and that's not the case here.

There is no due process requirement of discovery in every administrative proceeding.

The driver's license case -- suspension case
25 cited by the Grosses is not relevant. It does not say
that discovery was required in every administrative proceeding and it involved a scheme or issuance of subpoenas that was already allowed as part of the defined due process. This is true on a number of points.
But if the Grosses think that this should be
changed for integration -- or anybody else does -- they
need to take it up with the Legislature.
Hundreds of owners have voluntarily leased;
and millions have around the country. And markets have
been established without such process, without the
operating of providing unfettered access to its books and records.
Likewise, if the Grosses -- or any other party
-- think that the rates set for deemed lease owners --
which, by the way, is both equal to the prevailing rate
in Section 24 in the basin, generally; and consistent
with the rate set by Statute in other states -- if they
think that it needs to be different, again, they need to
take it up with the Legislature.
If they think that there is evidence that market -- the market for lease royalty rates is
different than Snake River has suggested, they can
24 present that evidence at the merits hearing when it's
25 scheduled.
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1 This is not the time and place for arguing
2 about specific terms and conditions in integration;
3 whether it's bonding levels or prohibition of surface
4 use or prohibition of flurring or limitation to a single
5 well or compensation beyond what the integration Statute
6 provides for. Those are not factors to consider their outcomes.
The factors that the Applicant has proposed
for consideration already allow for a party to present
evidence on those subjects and make the case for why
circumstances, whatever they may be of Section 24, where
the proposed operations relative to their property calls
for changed terms and conditions.
Regarding the -- I'll say one more thing.
What the Grosses seem to argue is that a market -- they
argue repeatedly that Snake River wants to impose
submarket rates, but they seem to be arguing if the
market is a rate and provisions that provide maximal
protections to uncommitted mineral owners and a royalty
that's based on externalities other than the value of
the oil and gas produced. But that's not a market
value.
Regarding the items that are attached to the
24 Gross's briefing, the article advocating for higher
25 royalty rates in State leases doesn't have anything to

1 do with royalty rates for integrated owners. It doesn't
2 contradict the market evidence already presented by the
3 Applicant.
4 Secondly, the lobbying information about the
5 \$250, the Idaho Petroleum Marketers Association gave to
6 Representative Boyle's campaign, is irrelevant to the
7 selection of factors to be considered.
8 In any case, the Petroleum Marketers
9 Association is not the gas industry. It's the trade
10 group that represents gas station owners. So, whatever
11 the Grosses think it might show, it doesn't.
12 Lastly, the December 22, 2022 production
13 report -- that I think they've attached to one of their
14 last briefs -- you know, really in the Applicants' view
15 should be a cause for celebration. There were
16 abnormally high prices for a very short period; and as a
17 result, royalty owners are going to receive bigger
18 checks; and the State is going to receive more severance
19 taxes because the Applicant generated more revenue.
20 That is the way it works.
21 But that single report is not evidence that
22 Snake River has done or will do anything unfair toward
23 the owners.
24
25 opposing owners raise repeatedly are not issues for you
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1 to decide or that you even have the authority to decide.
But I will point out what they are arguing for
is far in excess of what Judge Winmill ordered in the
CAIA versus Schultz case. And I would argue that we are
here because this process is already far in excess of
what he ordered. He ordered only that the Department
specify factors before the merits hearing so the parties
would know what types of evidence to bring. He
specifically found that the process would not be delayed
10 because that was all in his ordering. That hasn't
11 turned out to be the case.
The objecting owners are receiving more
process than that; several rounds of briefing, oral argument.

In other words, up to three or four
opportunities to be heard and to tell you what they
think the factors ought to be.
Of course they are entitled to be heard. This
doesn't mean that they're entitled to turn every
proceeding into a full-blown lawsuit.
No other State does it that way. In other
States, more limited processes have been upheld against
challenges for many decades.
I am not going to repeat from my briefing
again why the factors that the Applicant has proposed
are appropriate because you've already issued multiple orders under similar circumstances and I think your reasoning in those orders is sound.

So, with that, I'm happy to stand for
questions. Otherwise, I will speak in rebuttal.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
Christian. I reserve the right to ask questions later during your rebuttal. I don't have any questions at this time.

Mr. Piotrowski, I invite you to provide any arguments you would like.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.
After just being lectured that it was not the time and place to discuss what's actually just and reasonable, Mr. Christian spent a lot of time discussing what's just and reasonable. And I wish we would have a little more consistency in the position taken by all parties in this process.

Because, for instance, the purpose we are here for today is to determine what would be necessary for you, the Hearing Officer, to set terms that are just and 2 reasonable.

I would start that, number one, is the ability to not integrate. If Snake River Oil and Gas is 5 guaranteed integration, then this process cannot yield
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just and reasonable terms.
If there is no option to not integrate, then
we're here spinning our wheels because you're going to
4 integrate. And that violates due process. It violates
5 notions of fairness and it absolutely violates the idea
6 that the terms must be just and reasonable.
7 Because if there are not any just and
s reasonable terms, you don't have the option to say, no,
don't integrate, which means you are required to assume
that there are just and reasonable terms.
That's a rigged process. That is not a
reasonable process. It is the fact story process, I
realize. But it is a rigged process.
As a Hearing Officer, under the Idaho
Administrative Procedures Act, you are required to
follow the law; not just the Statute that sets up your
position; you are required to follow the law as it
relates to this matter.
And in this matter, it is possible that
integration is not warranted at all; but, yet, that is
not an option available to you.
I would suggest either you make that option
available to you or admit that you can't set just and
reasonable terms. That's number one.
Two is: You need to have the power to adjust

1 the royalty rate. This is a financial transaction.
2 Snake River Oil and Gas is in the business to make
3 money, period, end of sentence, done.
4 They are not performing a public service.
5 They are not interested in the right of mineral owners.
6 They are in this to make money.
7 And the suggestion that we will not address
8 the royalty rate at all means that this cannot be a
9 process for setting just and reasonable terms.
10 Because the most important just and reasonable 11 terms in any compelled sale are what's being sold and 12 what's being paid for. And, yet, you've had the ability
13 to adjust royalty rates taken away from you.
14 So, again, Mr. Hearing Officer, either write a
15 decision that says you can't set just and reasonable
16 rates because your hands have been tied; or adjust the
17 royalty rate. Find authority to adjust the royalty
18 rate.
In a prior case, you concluded that you had
20 some power to adjust royalty rate in the leases; a power
21 you have not ever exercised, a power that we don't think
22 exists. Because in a lease -- a lease, by definition,
23 is a transaction between two individuals.
Now, if you can adjust private contracts, that
25 would be an interesting outcome. Private contracts are
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1 already executed. I don't think you can do that.
2 Your power sets terms for those who will be
3 offered leases, those who will be deem leased and those
4 who will have other interests; but you cannot compel
5 people to enter into leases. You can only deem them leased.

Third, is you really ought to be limiting integration. The pool that are disclosed -- the pools of hydrocarbons that are disclosed by the application.
10 You can't possibly know what are just and reasonable
11 term if we're talking about a pool in 10B; but you also
12 integrate the interest in a pool in 10D, which is
13 totally separate, doesn't -- may not even exist. If it
14 does exist, we don't know about it. We don't know its
15 size, we don't know its value.
16 So, on the third -- or fourth thing --
17 depending on how you count these -- what you want to do
18 is insure that integration is limited to what we
19 absolutely know about today.
20 Integrating unknown interests would be
21 literally impossible to set just and reasonable terms.
22 But if there is -- I don't know -- 50,000 feet
23 deep, there is a massive pool of crude oil, well, the
24 terms for that lease, the terms for that integration
25 would be vastly different from the terms of a small pool

1 of natural gas at 5,000 feet.
To accomplish this, you should require full disclosure by both the Department of Lands and Snake
River Oil and Gas of all information in their possession
that would be likely to be relevant here.
That would include the extent of the pool, the likelihood of recovery, forecasts or predictions of market rate in the future.
While you can call it discovery, you can also just call it the Hearing Officer exercising his
authority to insure that the proceeding is fair and
reasonable by ordering Snake River Oil and Gas to disclose all of that information.
I'll call it discovery. Since Mr. Christian
has pointedly repeatedly told us there is no discovery allowed, let's call it compelled disclosure.
Next, you should consider all possible methods of extraction and drilling. The fact is that what happens in these cases -- as the Hearing Officer well knows -- is that integration is granted and then a well permit is submitted and the opportunity for real public input in the well permit process is extremely limited; and, yet, that is precisely where the rubber meet the road.

Rather than relying on a less open, less

1 public process that is not accompanied by due process, let's discuss methods of drilling and extraction, here and now, in this proceeding and those terms as part of the integration order.

Another factor you must draft is preventing the confiscatory taping and protecting property owners from the bad business decisions of their neighbors.

The equal fiction that this is fundamentally
some kind of a democratic process is just that of
fiction. Once 55 percent of people have leased,
everybody else is stuck.
There is no other method. There's no other process, that I'm aware of, in the American economy where I am stuck buying into the bad business decisions of my next door neighbor.

Yes, the action of a neighbor can affect
property values on the margins. If my neighbor sells
his half-million-dollar house for $\$ 100,000$, I cannot be
compelled to sell my similar house for $\$ 100,000$; and if
I were, that would be neither just nor reasonable.
Next is, I think the Hearing Officer really
ought to address finding and appointing a neutral
decision-maker.
Idaho law is very clear that where the
25 decision-maker has some interest, has the appearance of
impropriety -- not the reality -- just the appearance --
that that decision-maker should step aside.
3 You asked if there was a statutory requirement that the Administrator do this, that has not stopped the Idaho Supreme Court from ordering disqualification of similar cases.
Now, I'm not re-arguing this qualification Motion, but I am suggesting that one of the factors for insuring the terms are just and reasonable, it is a decision that should be made by somebody who is not employed by any division of any property.

Because -- no offense to you -- but the fact is you are employed by a property owner in this State. And in terms of setting up just and reasonable factors, one of the things you could do is say that the remaining proceeding will be conducted before a true neutral.

I want to respond to something that Mr .
Christian said.
This process that we're following is not the result of the decision in CAIA v Schultz. CAIA v Schultz did -- in that case, the federal judge did what federal judges do. He decided a narrow issue and declined to decide any other issue.

The narrow issue he decided was that, in the absence of prior disclosure of what just and reasonable

Page 37
1 means, it violated due process to lead to a decision in
2 that case. That's all he decided. He didn't decide
3 anything else. He didn't decide a process that was
4 otherwise constitutional. What he decided was the
5 process was unconstitutional for this reason.
Everything after that comes from your bosses, the Oil and Gas Commission. The Oil and Gas Commission charged you with determining in each case what were the
factors that would be considered in that case.
And when Mr. Christian objects that you should
stop doing that and just keep using the same factors in every case, he is asking that you violate the command given to you by your employer.

I would suggest -- after 30 -- nearly 30 years
as an employment lawyer -- that you decline that invitation.

What we need here is a process where it is possible to decide against integration.

It is possible to adjust the royalty rate
based on the individual factors that might make a different royalty rate more just, more reasonable.
You should be able to adjust the bonus payment again, so that you can determine whether those factors require something different.

You should limit integration; and in the

1 process of doing this, it's going to be necessary to require full disclosure of all the information the parties have.
If Snake River Oil and Gas, for instance, is aware that there is not one pool in the Department, but two and they don't -- or three or four -- and they don't disclose that to objecting owners, nonconsenting owners, then we are fundamentally engaging in dishonesty, injustice and unreasonable if you then integrate all of that interest.

The fact is the Statute here does not allow you to do what the Statute tells you to do to determine what is just and reasonable.

And so it is well past time for somebody to simply admit that you can't set just and reasonable terms if you can't change the price.

This is an economic financial transaction, among other things; and if you can't change the price, you can't be just and reasonable. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I do have one or two questions for you, if you don't mind.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Absolutely.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: First one, just for
clarity, Snake River Oil and Gas and the Department have

1 proposed using the same factors used in the past three integrations; specifically, Docket No. CC-2022-OGR-01-001, 002, and Docket No. 2021-OGR-01-02.

Do you agree with these factors; and if not, what's your alternative proposal?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: My alternative proposal is set out in the brief. Those factors were inappropriate in those cases.
They are even more inappropriate in this case.
Exactly how and to what extent they're inappropriate, we
don't know because Snake River Oil and Gas is permitted,
by your agency, to not disclose what it knows about my clients' property.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
Piotrowski. One more question.
Are the 11 property owners mentioned in your brief members of CAIA?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: To my knowledge, they are.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Okay. Do you have additional clients in this unit that are also CAIA members?

MR. PIOTROWSKI: I don't know that. I don't
23 have additional clients in this unit. I don't -- you
24 know, I can tell you that. I don't know whether CAIA 25 has additional members in this unit.

1 HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Piotrowski. Those are all the questions I have at this
3 time.
4 All right. Mr. Becker.
5 MR. BECKER: Kahle Becker on behalf of the 6 Grosses and Little Buddy Farm, LLC.
7 I want to correct something that Mr. Christian said. This is a State sanctioned monopoly. There's one
9 Applicant. There's no one else here who's applying to
10 integrate this property. There's no other operator in
11 the entire basin here who's taking the oil and gas from
12 underneath these people's property.
So, this is a take-it-or-leave-it deal by one
14 Applicant. And we're being told to go to the
15 Legislature and change the law. Unfortunately, it seems
16 like Snake River Oil and Gas, an out-of-state company,
17 has a close relationship with the legislators than my
18 clients do, than the constituents that they represent 19 do.

This impacts surface owners in the State of Idaho who vote for their representatives. Snake River Oil and Gas can't vote. Its Board of Directors, its corporate headquarters aren't in Idaho. The money they make is sent out of Idaho and we're left with the mess to clean up afterwards.
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There was a promise that this was going to be a boom for small town in Idaho in the Payette/Weiser River area. What have they got? Submarket royalties, the risk of having to clean up a mess whenever this company leaves. They want something better.

My clients are not opposed to oil and gas
leasing. They're not opposed to oil and gas
integration. They want to be treated fairly with
dignity and with respect. I think that's for everyone
in this basin who's now faced with the process of being
forced to sell their oil and gas underneath their
property to one, one Applicant here.
We're being told that this is a wildcat operation. It's highly risky. $\$ 9$ million a month? I
don't know if anyone else in this room is making
$\$ 9$ million a month. I certainly am not. But $\$ 9$ million a month is a good chunk of change.

And how much of that is staying in Idaho? We don't know. We don't know because the Applicant won't tell us. We have a Statute that their industry wrote that they believe doesn't allow us to even find out.

We don't know what their corporate structure is, how they're using wholly-owned subsidiaries or closely-related entities to do business like a ${ }^{\wedge}$ shell game and inflate the amount of their overhead so that
people's royalties are artificially deflated.
Not only it's $1 / 8$ th over $\mathrm{a}^{\wedge}$ raw number. It's $1 / 8$ th of what? How do we even know what $1 / 8$ th is? You're going to take garbage in and put garbage out, that's what this process is here.
6 And so, yes, I understand the Department's put 7 between a rock and a hard place. It didn't write this 8 Statute. Legislators did with the behest to the oil and gas industry. So, we're stuck with it. And I believe it's wholly unconstitutional.

And a factor that this Hearing Officer said that would be considered is an administrative order cannot violate constitution or statutory provisions.
Well, this entire statutory scheme violates the State constitution and the Federal constitution.

And we've already had one court case take a bite out of a denial of due process; and perhaps we may need another one here to set this case back -- this type of proceeding back on the tracks.

The concerns in this particular situation are, yes, right out of the gate, there's a denial of a right 2 to discovery.

So, the Applicant doesn't tell us who works
2 for it. Doesn't tell us how much money it's making.
25 Doesn't tell us what its costs are. And we're just
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supposed to come in and propose fair and reasonable factors in the dark.

Yet, the Statute has an opportunity for this
Hearing Officer to put it back on the tracks. Idaho
Code 47-320, Sub 1 requires that the integration order proposed be on terms that are just and reasonable.

Just is what's morally right. Is it morally right for this out-of-state company to come in here and drill, baby, drill in people's yards?

They get to sit and look at a view of the
hills, the farms; and now all the sudden they've got a
flare that they're looking at.
Well, the Applicant, itself, says: Well, the price of that is whatever royalties they pay.
Well, again, back to Mr. Piotrowski, just because someone else signed on to a bad deal doesn't
mean everyone else has to get a bad deal. The price
that's paid needs to reflect market realities here.
Yes, Snake River is absolutely entitled to
make a reasonable rate of return on its investment. I
don't doubt they spent a ton of money going out there
thumping around hoping for what kind of gas is located
where; but at some point, this is no longer a wildcat operation.
They're here to stay and they're here to make

1 a ton of money. And the less they leave in Idaho, the
2 better for their out-of-state company profits.
3 So, tell us how much you're making. Show us
4 the records. Let us understand exactly how much money's
5 going out of state and how the wholly-owned subsidiaries
6 and related entities are being controlled and how much
7 they're making.
8 Let the citizens of Idaho know if they are
9 being treated reasonably because, not only does the
10 integration order need to be just, morally right, it
11 needs to be reasonable. Reasonable -- I've pointed out,
12 it looks to -- the reasonable rate of return, the
13 investment-backed expectations; Snake River Oil and Gas
14 has that; my clients have that; other people who might
15 be integrated down the road have that type of
16 expectation, as well; that they're treated reasonably.
17 That they're not forced to sell their house
18 for submarket rates. That they're not forced to go
19 clean up a drill rig that's been left there after some
20 company decides to go bankrupt and forfeit its -- what
21 is it -- 16 or $\$ 6,000$ statutory bond. That's not
22 reasonable.
2330 years from now, $\$ 16,000$ is probably going
24 to buy a loaf of bread.
25 We need to have fair and reasonable rates and
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1 bonds that prepare for the eventuality that mineral and
2 gas extraction company cleans up its mess when it's 3 done.
4 Now, I understand the Hearing Officer's hands
5 are tied with the Statute that's unconstitutional that
6 prohibits discovery.
However, the Hearing Officer is empowered to
issue subpoenas. It is empowered to issue orders to
insure that the terms are just and reasonable.
And so, what I would propose is that in
briefing that line be set to require a list of documents and areas of inquiry that we think need to be disclosed; and then the Hearing Officer can decide based on that what information it will compel the Applicant to
disclose to the objecting parties with sufficient time
that they can hire their own expert witnesses. They can
hire their own accountants to go through and propose
what is actually a just and reasonable term.
I also think that the terms of the lease right
now are proposed on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Again,
Snake River Oil and Gas is working with the Legislature right now to make it even a more take-it-or-leave-it deal. And if that goes through while these proceedings are in place, that Statute, I think, will also be
challenged because it's even more unconstitutional than
the one we're already working with here.
But those are the factors that I think we need to consider here; our citizens of the State of Idaho getting a good deal. And right now, we just don't know.

We know Snake River Oil and Gas is making a ton of money and they're proposing four to five new wells in this area.

This is not a wildcat play anymore. They're here to make money and they want to do it as cheaply as they possibly can. It's time to put this train back on the tracks and make sure that the citizens of Idaho are actually making out all right as they were promised whenever the first gas was discovered here. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
Becker. I've got a few questions for you.
MR. BECKER: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: First, you just mentioned earlier in your argument $\$ 9$ million a month.
Can you tell me exactly what you're referring to there and what your source was?

MR. BECKER: Mr. Christian cited the
Department's website that had their production reports.
3 I looked at the latest one that was filed, which was
24 December, and it showed $\$ 9$ million.
25 I think if you added up the numbers on the --
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I believe it was the last three of 20 pages, they go 2 well by well. Some information is redacted. We don't 3 know why.

But the final report there said $\$ 9$ million,
approximately. And so, you know, it looks to be in the $\$ 110$ million a year range.

I didn't hear any rebuttals from Mr. Christian taking issue with that number. So, it sounds like it's accurate. That sounds like that's the value of the gas that they sold.

But how that's then split out with cost of production and overhead and other things that they take out before they pay royalties -- and, frankly, the total amount of royalties that stay here in the State of Idaho, we don't know.

I don't even know how much the Department of Lands is getting right now under the terms of the lease that it entered into.

So, you know, we hope to flush all that out and make sure the people are being treated just and reasonable.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
Becker. One more question.
In the opening brief, you shared some items
25 that could be seen as factors or terms and you just
spoke to that a little bit already.
But, for clarity, can you please tell me which
of these are actual factors versus terms that you would
request at the evidentiary hearing?
MR. BECKER: I'm looking back through my brief here.
What I'm saying is that I think the terms that
the Hearing Officer has used in the past, the eight
terms that have been cited in Mr. Christian's briefing
and in prior orders, are certainly things to consider.
But I worry that they are being used to arbitrarily narrow issues and that they should be viewed as more expansive. Specifically, just and reasonable.

That is not statutorily limited. It is a
broad and open-ended inquiry that really takes this
Hearing Officer sitting as a court of equity over a
State sanctioned monopoly.
So, what I would propose is that things to be considered are: Overall, are things just and reasonable?

And the starting point of that is who's making what and where's the money going?

And so, you know, can that fit within these eight factors; arguably, I would say overall, we've got the requirement of this Statute that must be interpreted
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consistent with Idaho constitution and the Federal constitution.
So, once we have information, perhaps additional factors come to light.

But right now simply saying: Well, we got these eight factors that we've used in the past, I don't even know what we're here arguing about yet because I
can't get any information out of the Applicant here
other than what it voluntarily chooses to provide, which
is self-serving statements that say "in my experience,
these things aren't reasonable."
Well, to any lawyer who's been in a court, the reasonable -- what is reasonable in terms of relevant discovery is things that could lead to the discovery of relevant information at trial.

Mr. Christian's client is saying: Oh, this isn't relevant. You don't need to consider it.

So, I'm saying at the outset here, let's take
a step back. Let's require some additional financial
disclosures. And then maybe we need to revisit these terms here.

But, off the bat is, are our citizens of Idaho
23 being treated justly and reasonably? That ought to be condition number one.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.

Becker.
Are there any other uncommitted mineral interest owners in the spacing unit that would like to provide argument today? All right. Thank you.

At this time, I'll invite the Department of
Lands to provide argument. Ms. Winters.
MS. WINTERS: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.
Beyond what the Department provided in its briefing
regarding just and reasonable factors, the Department
has nothing to add.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you, Ms. Winters.
I'll allow Snake River to offer your rebuttal at this time.
MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. Speaking first to Mr. Piotrowski's points.
The assertion that integration is guaranteed, of course, ignores the fact that we can't even get to where we are today without having engaged in a lengthy resume of efforts and having achieved voluntary leases with a significant majority of the mineral owners in the section.
And beyond that, we have to show, you know, as
24 part of our application, that we had an adequate resume
25 of efforts to attempt in good faith to lease those

1 integration, which is to deal with the effects of the
2 adverse effects of a rule of capture.
3 And, you know, the incentives in the Statute
4 are not to incentivize mineral interest owners to hold
5 out for the best deal possible by integration;
6 otherwise, no development would ever occur because
7 everyone would hold out.
8 There is a balancing again going on with the
9 correlative rights between those mineral interest owners
10 who have committed to development through leasing and
1 the operator. And, again, we don't get there until a
12 significant majority of people in the unit have made the
decision that they don't want to do it at all. There's a balancing of those interests and the interest of those uncommitted owners.

The purpose of the proceeding is not to maximize the return to one side or the other.

To Mr. Piotrowski's point that you haven't exercised the authority to adjust the lease rate in prior proceedings is because there hasn't been any evidence offered to you to do so.

The evidence that's been offered has consistently been, you know, what the market royalty rates for leases in the area has been for some time.

You know, we hope that we have greater success
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uncommitted owners who are now subject to integration.
We have to show that we've complied with fairly extensive notice requirements and all the other requirements of the Statute for an integration application. So, it is not accurate to say that integration is guaranteed. There's a significant amount of effort and clearing of bars that occurs before we even get to this point.
With respect to the argument about the ability to adjust royalty, I mean, this exists. Mr. Piotrowski acknowledges the Statute says for -- you know, the option under the Statute to elect to lease, the royalty is set at a minimum of $1 / 8$ th.

The objecting mineral owners are perfectly within their rights to come to the merits hearing and provide evidence that the royalty rate for the lease election should be higher; for example, because they think that the fair market royalty rate in the area is no longer $1 / 8$ th. It's something different.

You know, the deemed lease rate of $1 / 8$ th is set in Statute as it is in many other states with 2 integration or compulsory pooling statutes.

And, of course, you know, there's -- there's
24 reasons for that, that this all -- again, this all goes
25 back to, you know, the purposes for spacing an

1 Again, if participants in the process think 2 that the process should be different, then they need to take it up with the Legislature.
With respect to Mr. Piotrowski's argument
about changing the Hearing Officer, of course, that would directly violate the Act.
7 As you've already noted, you're required to 8 make the decision in this case. Even if you hire or
9 appoint a Hearing Officer, they would issue a
recommended decision and you're required to make the
ultimate -- or issue the order, finally. So, a term or
condition that exceeds or violates the terms of the Act
is, by definition, unreasonable.
Lastly, you know, to Mr. Piotrowski's point
that I have mischaracterized CAIA versus Schultz, what
Judge Winmill ordered in that case, I quoted his
language in my briefing. That's exactly what he
ordered.
And, you know, there's -- there is the
opportunity for mineral interest owners to provide
evidence, additional evidence and there has been in
every previous integration proceeding to provide evidence to support terms and conditions that they think should be different from what the Applicant proposes.
That remains true in this case.
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1 and investing in capital and competing against it and,
2 you know, working to develop their own gas resources and
3 compete for leases and do all those things.
4 You know, we are -- the integration proceeding
5 is, again, a balancing of the correlative rights of
6 committed mineral interest owners and uncommitted
7 mineral interest owners.
8 Because of spacing requirements that have come
9 about here -- as well as virtually everywhere else in
10 the producing world -- to deal with and mitigate the
effects of the rule of capture, it's not possible to
develop without having some system in place that allows
development to go forward if the majority of the mineral
interest owners have made the decision that it should
happen. So, we're not in a monopolist position.
I'm not going to respond to all of the things
about sub-royalty rates and cleaning up a mess and shell
games and things other than to say it's just evidence-
free. There has been no evidence supplied to you to
support any of those things. And it's unfortunate.
Lastly, Mr. Becker said that the Grosses are
not against oil and gas development or integration.
They simply wish to be treated fairly.
And that's precisely what the Applicant is proposing and what the Statute, frankly, provides for.
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Objecting mineral interest owners will have
the opportunity to present evidence to apply the factors; and if they choose not to do so, that's their option.

Well, I guess to Mr. Piotrowski's argument that our suggestion is not simply that we should just use the same factors every single time, we haven't come in here and suggested that to you.
We, in our application, provided you with
reasons why those factors were -- if they were
appropriate before our appropriate now.
And we know of no different circumstances in
Section 24 that should compel you to use different factors for consideration.
And, again, if the objecting mineral owners
wanted to present evidence to you of circumstances in
Section 24 that would compel the use of different
factors, they were welcome to do so here today and they didn't.

Moving on to Mr. Becker's comments. I mean, honestly, his argument sounded more like a political stunt speech than a legal argument.
You know, we do not -- the Applicant does not 4 occupy a monopoly position. There is nothing that
25 prevents any other operator from coming into this State

1 on to any public comments for those folks who have shown 2 up in person. And there's no one to provide comments, I think, via Zoom.

So, if there's anyone in the room that would
like to provide public comment at this time, please walk up.

MR. DICK ALTACAR: (Phonetic) Do I have to walk up or can I talk real loud? I'm hard of hearing.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: State your name for me, please.

MR. DICK ALTACAR: Dick and Sue Altacar.
We're in this district.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Okay.
MR. DICK ALTACAR: How long has this oil company's track record with your Department been? And how many years experience do you have dealing with them? Can you answer that for me?

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Certainly. That's fine. This current operator acquired operations I think in early 2021. We've been dealing with them since that time. I've been in my role for a little over
five-and-a-half years.
And so, I hope that answers your question.
MR. DICK ALTACAR: I mean, if there's
disapproval with them, you would have record of that and
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you're keeping all that in record.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Yeah. The website has all the comments and stuff that's been provided.

MR. DICK ALTACAR: Thank you.
5 HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Are there any other 6 comments?

Go ahead.
MS. JOANNE HIGBEE: I'm going to stand here
because it's easier.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: You can even sit, if you'd like.

MS. JOANNE HIGBEE: Okay. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Joanne, just a
moment. Can everybody hear Joanne when she's talking?
Okay.
Go ahead.
MS. JOANNE HIGBEE: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: For the record, say your name. We all kind of know you, but I want everybody to know you.

MS. JOANNE HIGBEE: My name is Joanne Higbee.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you.
MS. JOANNE HIGBEE: I own property in
Section 13 and 14.
So, I guess my only comment is when I read Ms.

1 Winters' Department of Lands statement, number C said
that the royalty should be similar to those in the
section or those nearby. Did I understand that
correctly?
Because I'd like to know the mechanism you
have for acquiring that information on nearby sections
to make sure it is correct.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: All right. Thank you
for that comment. We're not going to -- this isn't a Q-and-A back and forth with the parties. So, I hope you know that she's not going to provide an answer to that.
But that's a fine comment.
MS. JOANNE HIGBEE: Well, if there is not -if the Department doesn't have a database or a mechanism in place, it would seem appropriate that they create one so that if there is a higher royalty paid in a nearby section that you adjust offers accordingly.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Are there any other comments at this time?
MS. LORI RYANS: I will.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Go ahead.
MS. LORI RYANS: My husband and I just bought our property out on --

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: And your name,
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please?
MS. LORI RYANS: Lori Ryans. My husband,
Kevin and I, just bought our property out on northwest
fourth this last July. And so it appears in the letters
-- I have no background in understanding of how all this
oil leasing works -- but it appears from what we've
gotten the letters that to drill they need 160 -acre
portion of land. Is that correct? Is that why we're
all being integrated forcibly or willingly into a
160-acre unit?
I'll go on with my comments. I might be
wrong. I might not be. Since it's not a back and forth --

That just seems -- I could care less about the money and the royalties and trying to get more. It's this being forced into 160 -acre units so that they're able to drill these gas wells.
We're right bordering the parcel that it would happen on. And to have to look out at these gas wells, not knowing how close they're going to be to our property line, how many of them there's going to be on that parcel next to us, it does not seem right that you could force property owners into a situation like this where they have no choice and you're amassing this 160-acre parcel so that the drilling that can happen,

1 whether somebody wants to be a part of that or not.
I could see if everybody was willing to pull
their property together to do this thing. That's one
thing.
But when you have property owners who aren't
wanting to do that, then it just really seems unfair and
unjust to me that that would happen. And it will
negatively affect the value of our property.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you. I can
share that for gas in Idaho, standard spacing is
160 acres or a 640 -acre unit.
There are options if the geology presents
itself to custom size a unit, depending on the size --
the estimated size of the pool that will be drained.
So, if the pool, for example, covers
300 acres, okay, then that unit is still going to be
square, right, or geographically it's going to have to
be obviously over 300 acres so that it could fully cover
all of that pool.
That's a little bit of information I can
provide. Right. I can't ask these folks to testify
back to you. But I'm happy to provide some answers to your questions.

So, that is also a Statute; 160 or 640.
MS. LORI RYANS: It seems like maybe that
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original amount, the thought would have been that somebody -- the person wanting to enter into the lease would have had a piece of property that large. And so, then if they did, it's really not affecting the other 5 landowners around them if they have that 160 acres or 640 acres.

But when they have a smaller acreage and then you're trying to get all the other smaller acreages around them to make up this amount, then I think it's kind of defeating the purpose, or whatever, of keeping those wells away from the property owners who have no interest in that who don't want to look at them, who don't want that noise and activity right next to them or to see the flames. We can see a flame from where we are already, but...

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you. MS. LORI RYANS: Thank you. Appreciate the time.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Are there any other comments today?

MR. SCOTT: I would like to ask a question.
I'm Murray (Phonetic) Scott. I'm representing Mary Ann Miller.
The 160 -acre parcels that they're drilling in,
25 if you are the property owner of the property that is

1 designated, do you have the absolute right to say: No,
2 you cannot drill on my property? Do you have -- is
3 there an option on that at all?
4 And can that parcel, that 160 acres that we're
5 talking about, could it be into one corner and then you
frack over to the area that you're dealing in? Are
7 those things that are possible?
I haven't heard anything of the possibilities
of where the locations of anything would be and how it
would affect the property owners in the area. I'm just asking a question.

HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Yeah. I can give you a little bit of information on that.

To my knowledge -- and as I've been previously asked -- I know what the operator's done so far. And there hasn't been any unagreed between a surface owner and the operator to drill, to put a well pad on.
They have volunteered a surface use agreement with the surface owners where all of the pads are.

So, there's the information I have for you there.

And in some orders that I've given, that's a requirement that there has to be a voluntary agreement between the surface use. Right?

We also have guidelines in Statute that set --

1 that put setbacks from the unit boundary to the well.
Right. So that it's ideally impossible, if not very difficult, to get real close to that unit and then by -you know, take any hydrocarbons from outside the unit, as you're referring to.

Also, regarding fracturing; so far in Western
Idaho, there hasn't been any hydraulic fracturing.
And, as a geologist, I can say that that would
be highly unlikely. Because of the way the geology is
10 here and the formation, it's not conducive to hydraulic
fracturing. You'd basically get a wellbore full of
beach sand probably. That's a little bit of an
exaggeration. There's no real need to fracture sandstone with the porosity that we have here in
Southwest Idaho. So, it's just not -- the geology in
this area is not conducive to it. In fact, it would
probably be deleterious. All right.
MR. SCOTT: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Thank you. Any other comments?

MS. LORI RYANS: Can I ask a question?
HEARING OFFICER THOMAS: Okay.
MS. LORI RYANS: So, then you were talking about setback. Is there a distance from one property
25 owner to the next that they must keep their wells away
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