

From: [Rick Michael](#)
To: [Oil and Gas Conservation Rulemaking](#)
Subject: oil and gas
Date: Sunday, July 31, 2016 07:33:27 AM
Attachments: [oil and gas.docx](#)

I have attached my comments.

Rick Michael

Washington County

7-19-2016

I am displeased about some of the changes proposed to the oil and gas rules. Specifically the 300 ft. setbacks, the amount of the bond, and the lack of power to negotiate if you are a surface owner only. I also am disappointed that most local regulatory control has been taken away from the cities and counties.

I am troubled by the 300 foot setbacks (the distance from an occupied structure or a domestic water well) that have been set for oil and gas processing facilities, tank battery farms and now oil and gas wells. If you own your land and minerals you have some power to negotiate where this equipment will be placed on your property. If you are a **surface owner only**, you have next to no power to negotiate. If you are unable to reach a "good faith" negotiation with the company, they can pay the \$5,000 bond and come on your land. For the protection of the surface owner Idaho should adopt a minimum 500 foot setback for the oil and gas processing facilities, tank battery farm and oil and gas wells. Surrounding states (Wyoming, North Dakota and Colorado) with much more experience in oil and gas development have recently increased their setbacks to 500 feet and greater. The surface use bond also needs to be \$10,000 so there will be a greater incentive for a "good faith" negotiation and provide adequate funds in case they are needed for reclamation.

Gas and Oil is a potential revenue producing resource for the state but we must be careful. Idaho's most important resource is water and if it is contaminated money cannot fix it.

Rick Michael

Weiser, ID