2016-05-03 15:51:57 Kansas Corporation Commission /s/ Amy L. Green

From: John McCannon
To: Cyndee Maine

 Subject:
 FW: Docket No: 16-CONS-3866-CUNI

 Date:
 Tuesday, May 03, 2016 3:41:21 PM

From: Chris Sanderson [mailto:chrissandersonbeads@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2016 12:16 PM

To: Stan Smith; John McCannon; Lane R. Palmateer

Cc: Scotty Huntington

Subject: Docket No: 16-CONS-3866-CUNI

To Whom it May Concern,

I am unable to attend or call in via phone as I will be traveling on Thursday May 5, 2016 at the time of the pre-hearing conference.

I understand that things will move forward because the operator has a majority of landowners approval. I simply wanted to state my opinion and reserve my right to protect my interests. I was informed that I could do this in writing (for the record) and never intended to start any legal proceedings.

If it is of any value, here is my opinion on the matter but I do not wish to legally protest at this time.

I understand none of my interest in the existing wells we be changed and that any future infill wells will be the same interest I have today. However, by forming or allowing to be formed ATU will greatly reduce the need to drill any future wells or replace the existing aging gas wells in the future. Once the unitization of the proposed ATU is formed, then it is most likely any new wells on the fore mentioned tracts would be "ATU" wells and NOT the replacement of aging/declining wells. It has been proven since ATU wells are in production in the Stevens county area that the "new ATU" wells are more productive than existing gas wells within the ATU due to the fact they are new wells and not corroded or obstruct the flows of gas. As the new well comes on line and starts its life cycle it reduces the production from the existing wells. This in effect reduces my current production as well as my royalty check. Even though I would have an interest in the higher producing new ATU well, it most likely will not be producing enough to offset the 75% reduction in my new diluted alternative tract. It seems that the land owners involved will loose and the operator benefits in many ways including not having to replace failing gas wells in the future to "hold the original Oil & Gas Lease." In addition the operator most likely benefits in only needing enough personnel on hand to take care of and maintain the new ATU wells, that will eventually through attrition, replace aging wells at a pace of 1 ATU well to 3 existing wells.

It's an unfortunate situation and one that I think many landowners did not fully understand what could happen when they signed the original documents.

Thank you for your interest in this matter,

Christine Sanderson 141 Gulf Avenue Nokomis, FL 34275 419-270-7023