THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

Kansas Corporation Commission

Before Commissioners:

Shari Feist Albrecht, Chair Jay Scott Emler Dwight D. Keen NOV 1 9 2018

Office of General Counsel

In the Matter of the Application of Brian L. Birk) DOCKET No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC Merritt #10 dba Birk Petroleum for a Permit to Authorize the) & DOCKET No. 19-CONS-3107-CUIC Merritt #5 Disposal of Saltwater into the Merritt #5 and the) CONSERVATION DIVISION Merritt #10, located in Coffey County, Kansas) License NO. 31280

PROTESTANT'S MOTION TO DENY THE PERMITS TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF SALTWATER IN DOCKETS No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt#10) and No. 19-CONS-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) LOCATED IN COFFEY COUNTY, KANSAS, AND CLOSE THE DOCKET IN BOTH MATTERS

Protestant Susan Royd-Sykes comes before the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas (Commission) and files the following Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt#5) located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters

on the grounds that legally improper ex parte communications have taken place between Operator Birk and presiding prehearing officer, Michael J. Duenes, and that failure to properly docket or properly serve has taken place on the parts of Birk and Duenes.

In support of her motion, Protestant Royd-Sykes provides the following:

Initial history of the Merritt #10 and #5 docket matters:

1. Notice was filed Aug. 23, 2018 by Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum in the Coffey County Republican Newspaper for "Application for a permit to authorize the disposal of saltwater into the Merritt #5 and Merritt #10, located in Coffey County, Kansas..." Per the Commission's Order Setting Procedural Schedule, on August 31, 2018, Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum (Operator) filed an application to authorize the injection of saltwater into the Kansas City formation at its Merritt # 10 well in Coffey County, Kansas.

2. Protestant followed suit and filed a singular letter of protest on Aug. 27, 2018 regarding both the Merritt #5 and Merritt #10 and followed this protest by filing a singular request for hearing on Sept. 12, 2018, for both the Merritt #5 and Merritt #10 wells.

Although the published notice referred to application for both wells, after the filing of Protestant's joint Protests and joint Requests for Hearings, at the point in which Commission staff docketed the Merritt #5 and Merritt #10 matters, Commission staff docketed these wells separately as Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5).

3. On Oct. 2, 2018, the Commission followed the separate docketing by filing two separate orders, Order Designating Prehearing Officer and Setting Prehearing Conference for Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) which also set a Prehearing Conference Call for that Docket at 9:30am on Oct. 25, 2018; and Order Designating Prehearing Officer and Setting Prehearing Conference for No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) which also set a Prehearing Conference Call for that Docket at 10:30am on Oct. 25, 2018. Both of these Orders also determined that the prehearing officer in both of these matters "shall be Michael J. Duenes, Assistant General Counsel, Kansas Corporation Commission, 1500 SW Arrowhead Road, Topeka, KS....." (see Commission Docket for Oct. 2, 2018, Order Designating Prehearing Officer and Setting Prehearing Conference for Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) Pg. 2, A and Oct. 2, 2018 Order Designating Prehearing Officer and Setting Prehearing Conference for Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) Pg. 2, A and Oct. 2, 2018 Order Designating Prehearing Officer and Setting Prehearing Of

Occurrence of ex parte communications, improper handling:

On Monday, Oct. 22, 2018 at 1:34pm Protestant received a group e-mail from Prehearing Officer Duenes regarding Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) and stating that Birk had had e-mail communications with Duenes on two dates: Oct. 18 and 19, 2018. In his e-mail, Duenes notes that "as far as I can tell you did not send the same emails to Commission Conservation Staff (i.e. Lauren Wright; although it appears you mailed your attachments to Renee Stucky, and the Protestant in this matter, Susan Royd-Sykes...... I have not forwarded your attachments to Staff or Ms. Royd-Sykes at this point, I have not passed them along to the Commission for their Consideration.... as the Prehearing Officer, I would ask that you not communicate with me unless you also include in your communications all the parties to the docket." (exhibit 1 Duenes' group e-mail notice of ex-parte communications)

For the record Royd-Sykes states that Birk did not serve copies of those Oct. 18 and 19, 2018 e-mails on her. Since Birk did not provide or serve these e-mails on any parties to the proceedings except for presiding officer Duenes, under both K.S.A. 77-525 and K.S.A. 77-545 which define and govern ex parte communications, these e-mails must be considered ex parte communications and handled as such. She also states that Duenes did not attach copies to the group e-mail, nor did he file them in either of the Merritt #10 or #5 well dockets, nor did he serve them on her.

<u>K.S.A. 77-525</u> Ex parte communications designates that a) A presiding officer serving in an adjudicative proceeding may not communicate, directly or indirectly, regarding any issue in the proceeding while the proceeding is pending, with any party or participant, with any person who has a direct or indirect interest in the outcome of the proceeding or with any person who has served in an investigatory or prosecutorial capacity or presided at a previous state of the proceeding, without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication.

<u>K.S.A. 77-545</u> (b)(1) addresses commission procedure more specifically and states that "after the commission has determined and announced that a hearing should be held, and prior to the issuance of a final order, no parties to the proceeding, or their counsel, shall discuss the merits of the matter or proceeding with the presiding officer unless reasonable notice is given to all parties who have appeared to enable the parties to be present at the conference.

(2) After the commission has determined and announced that a hearing should be held, prior to the issuance of a final order, copies of any written communications from any party regarding the proceeding that are *directed to the presiding officer shall be served upon all parties of record and proof of service shall be furnished to the commission*. Communications requested by members of the commission staff from any party and any written communications received by members of the commission staff from any party shall be made a part of the file and the docket and shall be made available to all persons who desire to use them, provided that all commission requests for information from a part shall be served upon all parties of record.

(d) All letters and written communications that are received by the presiding officer from members of the general public, and that are in the nature of ex parte communications, shall be made a part of the file in the docket and shall be made available to all persons who desire to see them. The deposit of such written communications and letters in the file shall not make them a part of the official record of the case."

In review of those governing statues, logic then follows, that because of their ex parte nature these e-mails from Birk to Duenes, should have:

- 1) never have taken place
- 2) been served on Royd-Sykes by operator Birk
- 3) been served on Royd-Sykes by prehearing officer Duenes
- 4) been filed in the public docket for the Merritt #10 well by prehearing officer Duenes
- 5) been considered only docketed information and as part of the official record in the Merritt #10 well docket

Further, in his group e-mail regarding these ex parte communications from Birk, Duenes fails to state to Birk that these sorts of ex parte communications between a party (Birk) and the presiding prehearing officer are, by Kansas statutory law, considered illegal. Rather, Duenes only addresses the issue with Birk by stating, "as the Prehearing Officer, I would <u>ask</u> that you not communicate with me unless you also include in your communications all the parties to the docket."

For the record, Royd-Sykes again states that through the date and time of this filing neither Duenes or Birk has served any copies of these ex parte e-mail copies on her, nor has Duenes filed them in the docket records.

Additionally, regarding the related Docket No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) that even though Birk did not file similar ex parte communication with Duenes or similar documents in the Merritt #5 docket, because both the Merritt #10 and Merritt #5 wells were originally published together in the legally required public notice, because both of the pre-hearing conference calls were merged and because the subsequent hearing date and pre-hearing deadlines were set to be simultaneous for both the Merritt #10 and #5 dockets, these ex parte e-mails from Birk to Duenes reflect on the Merritt #5 application and docket as well.

The reflection created from these ex parte e-mails and their related failure of legal docketing and legal service serve to color the actions of the operator, the presiding officer and

the application process of both dockets, including the Merritt #5 well, with the red flag of legal impropriety that cannot be supported in the hearing of these matters and cannot be supported under Kansas law. Under the "fruit of the poisonous tree" legal metaphor regarding evidence that is obtained illegally, the logic is that if the source (the "tree") of the evidence or evidence itself is tainted, then anything gained (the "fruit") from it is tainted as well.

For the record, Royd-Sykes states that if the Commission chooses to deny her Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters, at the very least, the Commission must require presiding prehearing officer Duenes to recuse himself and the Commission should appoint a replacement pre-hearing officer to be installed. (The "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine was established in 1920 by the decision in Silverthorne Lumber Co. v. United States, and the phrase was coined by Justice Frankfurter in his 1939 opinion in Nardone v. United States.)

Prehearing conference calls:

1. At 9:25 am on Oct. 25, 2018, Royd-Sykes dialed in to the call que line to wait for the 9:30am Oct. 25, 2018 Prehearing Conference Call for Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) to begin.

2. While on hold in the call que, Royd-Sykes googled up the Commission website docket for the Merritt #10 well and discovered that documents entitled "Birk Petroleum's response to letter of protest filed by Ms. Susan Royd-Sykes. Oct. 25, 2018" had been filed into the docket. (She then also checked Docket No. 19-CONS-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) for similar documents but found none listed.) With regard to Birk's "response" found on the Merritt #10 docket, Royd-Sykes obviously did not have time to download or review those documents before the 9:30am call began. (exhibits 2, 3 – docket fronticepieces)

For the record, Royd-Sykes states for that through the time and date of this filing, Birk did not and has not served any such "response" documents on her.

3. During the 9:30am Oct. 25, 2018 Prehearing Conference Call for Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10), presiding prehearing officer Duenes called the conference call to order, took note of parties present, asked staff's opinion regarding notice being proper. Duenes then pointed out that the second Merritt call for No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) was set to follow at 10:30amn, that staff had a Commission Business Meeting at 10:00 am and asked if it would it be possible to combine the second Merritt Prehearing Call with this one for the purposes of scheduling. All parties agreed to combine the calls.

Then, rather than follow the general format of past conference calls in which Royd-Sykes has participated – which has been for the presiding officer to ask if there are any procedural matters to discuss before moving on to the matter of scheduling deadlines and the setting of a hearing date -- Duenes quickly and directly moved on to the matter of scheduling.

At that point, Royd-Sykes made several attempts to interject and say that she had procedural matters to discuss before moving on related to ex parte e-mails and failure of service on the part of the operator. Rather than just regroup to address these procedural issues, Duenes threatened to end the call if Royd-Sykes did not "stop speaking over him" as she was being forced to do in order to be heard. Royd-Sykes then stated that she felt the threat was an effort to sidestep discussion of these procedural issues and that she objected to moving on to scheduling before the issues of the ex parte e-mails, Birk's "response" and related issues of non-service were addressed.

Commission staff member Lauren Wright then interjected that staff had received a packet of "response" documents from Birk and had docketed them as such. Duenes then did back up and address the e-mails to the extent that he had received them, noticed the parties via e-mail, noted that he had not shared them with staff and did not know if they were the same as the "response" documents that Birk had filed.

Royd-Sykes then asked if staff was going to require Birk to utilize proper, legal service requirements in the future. Neither staff nor Birk responded. Royd-Sykes added that she would be filing a motion regarding these issues.

4. Parties then proceeded to work out a schedule for both dockets to have the same procedural deadline dates and to have both dockets heard at the same time and date of Jan. 24, 2019, 10:00 a.m. Duenes further determined that the hearings should be held at the Commission office at 266 Main, Suite 220, Wichita, Kansas 67202. Royd-Sykes asked for explanation of the location change (all hearings that Royd-Sykes has been involved with to date have been held in Topeka), explained that she has limited distance driving ability and that Wichita is twice as far for her to travel. Royd-Sykes stated she would file a motion asking for Topeka to be the hearing site.

5. In concluding the call, Duenes also noted that Royd-Sykes "had experience in settling these matters prior to the need for a hearing" and encouraged the parties to consider settlement. Royd-Sykes stated that she would consider settlement, but that Birk would need to present a workable offer.

For the record, Royd-Sykes states, that as of the time and date of this filing, Birk has not approached her with any type of settlement offer.

Protestant's document review:

1. After close of the merged Oct. 25, 2018 Prehearing Conference Calls for Dockets No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt #10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5), Protestant Royd-Sykes filed a KORA request with the Commission for copies of the ex parte e-mails from Birk to Duenes and for any other such communications between Birk and Commission staff. Royd-Sykes also went back to the Commission docket listing and downloaded Birk's "response" documents listed for the Merritt #10 and reviewed them. (exhibit 4 KORA request)

2. On Oct. 30, 2018, in response to her KORA request, Royd-Sykes received copies of Birk's Oct. 18 and 19 ex parte e-mails to Duenes which she immediately compared to Birk's "response" documents filed in the Merritt #10 docket, and found, that with the exception of e-mail headings and Duenes group e-mail notice regarding the ex parte communication which were included in the KORA, but not on Birk's "response" docket filing, the e-mails and the "response" documents filed in the docket do appear to be the same. (exhibit 5 Birk's filed "response" documents) (exhibit 6 KORA completion)

Upon review and comparison of both groups of documents, it is Birk's attached letter to Duenes (dated Oct. 10, 2018), that, since it was included in the original ex parte e-mail

communications with Duenes, and referring back to the "fruit of the poisonous tree" discussion, only serves to run up incredibly large red flags of impropriety. The tone and attitude of the closing line of Birk's letter implies that Birk believes that ex parte communications with the presiding hearing officer are acceptable practice, and that the application will, no doubt, be approved: "I look forward to the approval of the applicant wells and a quick resolution to this issue." (exhibit 7 Birk's ex parte letter to Duenes)

Royd-Sykes must reiterate her contention that if Commission chooses to deny her motion to deny her Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters, at the very least, the Commission must require presiding prehearing officer Duenes to recuse himself and the Commission should appoint a replacement pre-hearing officer to be installed.

In conclusion:

1. Ex parte communications via e-mail raising the red flag of legal impropriety took place on two occasions, Oct. 18 and 19, 2018, between the Operator Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum and the presiding prehearing officer in both of these Merritt well matters, Michael J. Duenes.

Birk failed to serve these ex parte e-mails on Protestant Royd-Sykes at the time they were sent to Duenes and has not served them on Royd-Sykes as of the time of this filing.

Further, Duenes, as presiding prehearing officer, was required by law to post the e-mails into the docket which he did not do (sending out a group e-mail stating that the ex parte communications had happened without the e-mails themselves attached, does not meet the legal posting criteria required by law. Duenes should, at the least, be required to recuse himself from both Merritt well dockets and the Commission should appoint a replacement presiding prehearing officer.

2. As ex parte communications with the presiding prehearing officer, by law, these e-mails must be excluded from the official record of the Merritt dockets; further, because the Birk's response documents filed in the docket appear to be copies of those ex parte e-mails, which, as of the time of this filing, Birk has failed to provide service of his "response" documents on Royd-Sykes, these Birk "response" documents should not be considered part of the official record of either of the Merritt dockets.

3. This oil industry-related application process established by Kansas statutory law and, by Kansas law, also designated to be overseen by the Commission whose mission statement declares that "the mission of the Kansas Corporation Commission is to serve the people of Kansas by regulating the State's energy infrastructure, oil and gas production, and commercial trucking to ensure public safety" must be above any red flag raising implications of illegal impropriety that could lead one to think that collusion is taking place between oil operators and Commission staff, especially a presiding prehearing officer. How can anyone possibly dismiss such red flags when the closing paragraph of Operator Birk's letter ex parte e-mailed letter states *"Ilook forward to the approval of the applicant wells and a quick resolution to this issue"* and whose tone and attitude imply that ex parte communications are acceptable practice in these application matters, and that the application will, no doubt, be approved?

Wherefore, Protestant Royd-Sykes, now comes before the Commission and asks that the Commission grant her Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters, on the grounds stated above that legally improper ex parte communications have taken place between operator Birk and presiding prehearing officer Michael J. Duenes, that Birk and Duenes have both failed to legally serve or docket documents related to both of these dockets, and that these actions have worked together to raise red flags of collusion that cannot be allowed to color these legally set forth processes.

Susan Royd-Sykes 504 S. 6th St. Burlington, KS 66839

VERIFICATION

STATE OF KANSAS ss.) County of Coffey ١

Susan Royd-Sykes, of lawful age, being first duly sworn upon oath, deposes and states: that she is responsible for the testimony to which this verification is attached, that she has read the above and foregoing and that the statements therein contained are true and correct according to her knowledge, information and belief.

	GLENDA THWEATT State of Kansas (My Appt. Exp. 4/15/20
--	--

SUDANT

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 16th day of November, 2018.

My appointment expires: 4/15/2020

Allend

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 16th day of November, 2018, the above PROTESTANT'S MOTION TO DENY THE PERMITS TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF SALTWATER IN DOCKETS No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt#10) and No. 19-CONS-3107-CUIC (Merritt #5) LOCATED IN COFFEY COUNTY, KANSAS, AND CLOSE THE DOCKET IN BOTH MATTERS was electronically served (with hard copies following in the US Mail) on:

Lynn Retz and Michael Duenes **KCC Litigation Department** 1500 SW Arrowhead Rd. Topeka, KS 66604-4027

Kansas Corporation Commission **Conservation Division Staff** 266 N. Main St., Ste. 220

and via hard copy through the US Mail on:

Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum 874 12th Rd. Burlington, KS 66839

UNALA Sefler

Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters

(exhibit 1 Duenes' e-mail notice of ex-parte communications)



RE: Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC

i message	
Michael Duenes <m.duenes@kcc.ks.gov> To: Brian Birk <blbpetro@gmail.com>, Lauren Wright <l.wright@kcc.ks.gov> Cc: "moondrummer88@gmail.com" <moondrummer88@gmail.com></moondrummer88@gmail.com></l.wright@kcc.ks.gov></blbpetro@gmail.com></m.duenes@kcc.ks.gov>	Mon, Oct 22, 2018 at 1:34 PM

Mr. Birk,

You sent separate emails with attachments to me on October 18th and 19th. As far as I can tell, you did not send the same emails to Commission Conservation Staff (i.e., Lauren Wright; although it appears you mailed your attachments to Rene Stucky), and the Protestant in this matter, Susan Royd-Sykes.

Although the Commission has not yet determined and announced that a hearing should be held in this matter, as the Prehearing Officer, I would ask that you not communicate with me unless you also include in your communications all the parties to the docket. I have not forwarded your attachments to Staff or Ms. Royd-Sykes at this point. I have also not passed them along to the Commission for their consideration.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to let me know, and again, make sure you communicate with all of the emails listed on this email.

Yours,

Michael J. Duenes, Assistant General Counsel

Office of General Counsel

Kansas Corporation Commission

1500 SW Arrowhead Road | Topeka, KS | 66604-4027

Phone (785) 271-3181 | http://kcc.ks.gov/

Fax (785) 271-3314 (Advisory)

This message is from the Office of General Counsel of the Kansas Corporation Commission and is intended only for the addressee. This transmission, email, and any files transmitted with it, may be (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) strictly confidential under federal or state law. Unauthorized forwarding, printing, copying, distributing, or using such information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender (only) and delete the message. This message may also be subject to disclosure under the Kansas Open Records Act, K.S.A. 45-215 *et scq*.

From: Brian Birk [mailto:blbpetro@gmail.com] Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2018 4:36 PM To: Michael Duenes <m.duenes@kcc.ks.gov> Subject: Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. Think before clicking a link or opening attachments.

٠

-

Please see attached re: the upcoming Prehearing Conference.

Thank you

Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC located in Coffey County. Kansas. and Close the Docket in Both Matters (exhibits 2, 3 docket fronticepieces)



Docket 19-CONS-3106-CUIC

Docket Documents

6 documents Show All Print Results

• :

Document Type	Description	Date Filed	Filed By
Filing	Letter of Protest with Acknowledgement - Susan Royd-Sykes Files:	8/28/2018	
Filing	Application Files: سيد	8/31/2018	
Filing	Affidavit of Publication - The Coffey County Republican Files: سِنَ	9/13/2018	
Filing	Letter Requesting Hearing - Susan Royd-Sykes Files:	9/13/2018	
Order	Order Designating Prehearing Officer and Setting Prehearing Conference Files: عني	10/2/2018	
Filing	Birk Petroleum's response to letter of protest filed by Ms. Susan Royd- Sykes Files:	10/22/2018	Not est

These web links contain scanned images of legal filings with the Kansas Corporation Commission. Printed copies from these links should not be considered official copies.

Website questions or problems contact 785-271-3300.

Site Map | Accessibility | Contact Us

19- CONS-31017- CUIC

<u>Document Type</u>	Description	Date Filed	<u>Filed By</u>
Filing	Letter of Protest with Acknowledgement - Susan Royd-Sykes Files:	8/28/2018	
Filing	Application Files: 🚣	8/31/2018	
Filing	Affidavit of Publication - The Coffey County Republican Files:	9/13/2018	
Filing	Letter Requesting Hearing - Susan Royd-Sykes Files: <u>-</u>	9/13/2018	

Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters (exhibit 4 KORA request)

.

STATE OF KANSAS



CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHFAD ROAD TOPERA, KS 66604-4027 PHONE: 785-271-3100 FAX: 785-271-3354 http://kec.ks/gov/

GOVERNOR JEFF COLYER, M.D. Shari Ffist Albrecht, Chair | Jay Scott Emiler, Commissioner | Dwight D. Keen, Commissioner

October 25, 2018

Susan Royd-Sykes 504 S 6th St Burlington, Kansas 66839

RE: Request for records under the Kansas Open Records Act

Dear Susan Royd-Sykes:

Your request for records under the Kansas Open Records Act has been received and is being processed. Because the Kansas Corporation Commission houses voluminous records covering various areas of regulation and physical locations, your request may not be completed immediately. You may expect follow-up correspondence detailing the expected time and cost to complete your request.

Record requests that can be provided at less than 2 hours of staff time or consist of 100 pages or fewer will be provided at no charge. If charges are necessitated by the scope of your request, the Kansas Corporation Commission must receive payment prior to preparing or releasing any records.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the Custodian of Records at 785-271-3170 or open records group@kcc.ks.gov.

These are the parameters that were submitted:

Name: Susan Royd-Sykes Address: 504 S 6th St City: Burlington State: Kansas Zip Code: 66839 Daytime Phone: 6208032172 E-mail: moondrummer88@gmail.com

Description of records requested:

Pursuant to the Kansas Open Records Act, K.S.A. 45-215, et. seq., please provide any and all documents maintained by the Kansas Corporation Commission regarding:

1) e-mails sent to KCC Staff Attorney and designated Pre-hearing Officer Michael Duennes by Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum with regards to Docket 19-CONS-3106-CUIC and Docket 19-CONS-3107-CUIC, specifically over the dates of Oct. 18 and 19, 2018

2) any additional records of other communications between KCC Staff Attorney and designated Pre-hearing Officer Michael Duennes by Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum with regards to Docket 19-CONS-3106-CUIC and Docket 19-CONS-3107-CUIC

3) e-mails and or any additional records of other such communications between any and all KCC Staff and Brian L. Birk dba Birk Petroleum with regards to Docket 19-CONS-3106-CUIC and Docket 19-CONS-3107-CUIC that do not appear on the Public Docket for either of those Docket Numbers. If you choose to deny any or all parts of this request, please state each specific KORA exemption and the justification used for your refusal to release this requested information. Thank you, Susan Royd-Sykes Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters

(exhibit 5 Birk's filed "response" documents)

2018-10-23 11:08:53 Kansas Corporation Commission /s/ Lynn M. Retz

BIRK PETROLEUM

874 12th Rd, BURLINGTON, KS 66839 620-364-1311

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

OCT 2 2 2018

CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

10/15/2018

Michael J. Duenes Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead Road Topeka, Ks 66604-4027 RE DCCKET No. 19-CONS - 3106-CUTC.

Dear Mr. Duenes,

I am writing this in response to the letter of protest filed by Ms. Susan Royd-Sykes and to address the issues that will be brought at the Prehearing Conference.

First, I would like to state that I have been a licensed operator in the State of Kansas since 1990 and have a well established record of compliance with the Kansas Corporation Commission. The vast majority of Kansas operators are small independent producers, including myself. We are also farmers and ranchers, members of our communities, employers and parents. We contribute to our local economies and the state economy. I am a 4th generation and life-long resident of Coffey County where the application wells are located so I have a direct interest in following good operating practices. The Kansas Corporation Commission has implemented rules and regulations governing the operations of the oil and gas industry in Kansas. As you know, waste water comes with the production of crude oil. It is <u>proven</u> that the best way to limit pollution to our surface water and environment is to dispose or inject the waste water back into the ground at depths that keep the surface water protected. The KCC has established regulations concerning the depths, pressures, and rates for disposal and injection wells. The applicant wells have had mechanical integrity tests performed as per regulations and have been approved by District staff. The applicant wells meet the existing regulations and should be approved.

Ms. Royd-Sykes sites concerns about earthquakes being caused by "heavy saltwater disposal". I believe that concern is unfounded in this instance and most other instances in Eastern Kansas. The application wells have a maximum operating pressure of 300 psi and a maximum injection rate of 100 bbls/day and well #5 is already permitted at a max operating pressure of 100 psi and maximum injection rate of 50 bbls/day and has had no issues. According to information obtained from the Kansas Geological Survey the most recent earthquakes recorded in Kansas have been at a depth of 5 km or more, or over 16,404 feet and have been between magnitudes of 2.0 - 3.5 on the Richter Scale and were located in south central Kansas. The USGS states that "Earthquakes with magnitude of about 2.0 or less are usually called microearthquakes; they are not commonly felt by people and are generally recorded only on local seismographs." The applicant wells are at a depth of 650-700 feet. It seems unlikely that disposal at the depths and rates requested would be capable of causing earthquakes.

Ms. Royd-Sykes claims damage to her home from earthquakes located in Oklahoma. It should be noted that County records show her home was built in 1885. A structure that is 133 years old may have other issues that affect it besides earthquake activity being the main cause of any damage.

It appears your office is in receipt of the Application to Amend the injection permit and I have enclosed a copy of the completed mechanical integrity test for well #10 that was witnessed and signed by district staff. Please also find copies of data acquired from the KGS, USGS and Coffey County attached.

I look forward to the approval of the applicant wells and a quick resolution to this issue.

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

Sincerely,

Brian L Birk, dba Birk Petroleum Cc: Rene Stucky, Kansas Corporation Commission

OCT 2 2 2018 CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DOCKET# D-32724
CASING MECHANICAL INTEGRITY TEST	•
Disposal Well Enhanced Recovery: Repressuring Flood NWNP Tertiary Date injection started	N = SWSW , Sec 7, T 23 S, R 15 EW GPS $V = 162 Feet from South Section Line Feet from East Section Line Lease MIVVIII Well # 10$
API #15- 031-19151-00-00	County <u>COHEL</u>
Operator: Birk Petroleum Name & Address 874 12th Rd SW	Operator License# 312-80 Contact Person Brain Birk
Max. Auth. Injection Press 200 Psi; Max Inj. If Dual Completion – Injection above production Conductor Surface	Phone <u>6203141311</u> Rate <u>50</u> bbl/d; <u>Injection below production</u> Production <u>LinReceived</u> Tubing
Size 8.625	
Set at <u>40</u> Cement Top <u>5Ur face</u>	<u>5urrace</u> <u>CONSERVATION DIVISION</u> Type
" Bottom	
DV/Perf. TI Packer type Siz	D (and plug back) 724 ft. depth ze Set at
Zone of injection (100 ft. to ft.	Traff Perf. br open hole Per-4
Type MIT: Pressure: Kadioactiv	e Tracer Survey: Temperature Survey:
F Time: Start 20 Min 40 Min 60	Min SCANNED
E Pressures: <u>266</u> <u>260</u> <u>260</u>	<u>1</u> Set up 1 System Pres. during test 7 2010
D	Set up 2 Annular Pres. during test
D	Set up 3 Fluid loss during test bbls.
T Tested: Casing	Annulus
The bottom of the tested zone in shut in with	· · ·
Test Date _ <u>9/11/18</u> Using	BAB Company Took Company's Equipment
The operator hereby certifies that the zone betwee	en feet and feet
was the zone tested Rolling	fame
"Sígnature	Title
The results were Satisfactory X Margina State Agent: <u>Mike Wither</u>	al Not Satisfactory Title: <u>ECRS</u> Witness: YES <u></u> NO
REMARKS: An 10 20 From Surface 66	6-20-646-50-1596 X-43-256,28
Orgin. Conservation Div.; K	DHE/T: OF Dist. Office SEP 17 2018
	ant or a Mechanical Casing patch in the annular space? (Y/N)
GPS Lat 35.05629 GPS La	ong 095.80947 (If YES please describe in REMARKS) KCC Form U-7

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

OCT 22 2018

CONSERVATION DIVISION

WICHITA, KS

Manaph Performance

Kanas Genhade de Sueger

			Topics
Kansas Earthquake Overview	Interactive Map	Kansas Earthquake Database	Home <u>Resources on Seismicity</u> <u>Public Information Circular</u> <u>on Earthquakes</u>

Kansas Earthquake History

Seismometer Network Data

"Earthquake Highlights" newsletter

Kansas Earthquake **Database**

Oklahoma Geological Survey Earthquake Information

ID: 1001454210 UTC Date: 2018-10-14 12:10:27 Local Date: OCT-14-2018, 07:55:27 AM Latitude: 37.079 Longitude: -97.812 Magnitude: 2.5 County: Harper

Most Recent Quakes from the Survey's Network

ID: 1001454206 UTC Date: 2018-10-14 06:10:10 Local Date: OCT-14-2018, 01:21:10 AM Latitude: 37.092 Longitude: -97.809 Magnitude: 2 County: Harper

ID: 1001454205 .------ -. . . .

USGS Notifications

The following data are from alerts sent from the U.S. Geological Survey Earthquake Hazards Program. If you feel an earthquake you can report it to the USGS using the "Did You Feel It?" link on the page for the earthquake you felt. Reporting the quake helps the USGS get a more complete description of what people experienced, the effects of an earthquake, and the extent of damage.

Most Recent Earthquake

Oct. 11, 2018

Date: 10/11/2018, 5:30:27 AM Latitude: 37.061 Longitude: -97.846 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 2.7 More info: <u>us1000haix</u> Location: 3.1 km (1.9 mi) ESE of Bluff City, Kansas

Most Recent Earthquakes

Oct. 3, 2018

Date: 10/3/2018, 2:36:41 AM Latitude: 38.336 Longitude: -96.826 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 3.5 More info: <u>us1000h656</u> Location: 4.8 km (3.0 mi) W of Runnymede, Kansas

Date: 10/3/2018, 7:40:46 PM Latitude: 37.364 Longitude: -97.983 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 2.4 More info: <u>us1000h6q2</u> Location: 8.5 km (5.2 mi) WNW of Clements, Kansas

Most Recent Earthquakes

Date: 09/30/2018, 3:39:08 AM Latitude: 37.175 Longitude: -97.478 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 2.6 More info: <u>us1000h4jy</u>

Location: 2.4 km (1.5 mi) E of Perth, Kansas

Date: 09/30/2018, 7:33:23 PM Latitude: 37.186 Longitude: -97.442 Depth (km): 5.8 Magnitude: 3.0 More info: <u>us1000h4tp</u> Location: 5.7 km (3.6 mi) ENE of Perth, Kansas

> Kansas Geological Survey, Exploration Services Updated Oct. 13, 2018 Comments to <u>web cloum::kgs.ku.edu</u> The URL for this page is http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Geophysics/Earthquakes/index.html

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

OCT 2 2 2018

CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

Sept. 30, 2018



fra Laverny af ar Ros Passad

The Severity of an Earthquake

The severity of an earthquake can be expressed in terms of both *intensity* and *magnitude*. However, the two terms are quite different, and they are often confused.

Intensity is based on the observed effects of ground shaking on people, buildings, and natural features. It varies from place to place within the disturbed region depending on the location of the observer with respect to the earthquake epicenter.

Magnitude is related to the amount of seismic energy released at the hypocenter of the earthquake. It is based on the amplitude of the earthquake waves recorded on instruments which have a common calibration. The magnitude of an earthquake is thus represented by a single, instrumentally determined value.

Earthquakes are the result of forces deep within the Earth's interior that continuously affect the surface of the Earth. The energy from these forces is stored in a variety of ways within the rocks. When this energy is released suddenly, for example by shearing movements along faults in the crust of the Earth, an earthquake results. The area of the fault where the sudden rupture takes place is called the *focus* or *hypocenter* of the earthquake. The point on the Earth's surface directly above the focus is called the *epicenter* of the earthquake.



San Fernando, California, 1971. Highway interchange heavily damaged by the magnitude 6.5 earthquake [Click on image for a larger view] Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

OCT 2 2 2018

CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

The Richter Magnitude Scale

Seismic waves are the vibrations from earthquakes that travel through the Earth; they are recorded on instruments called seismographs. Seismographs record a zig-zag trace that shows the varying amplitude of ground oscillations beneath the instrument. Sensitive seismographs, which greatly magnify these ground motions, can detect strong earthquakes from sources anywhere in the world. The time, location, and magnitude of an earthquake can be determined from the data recorded by seismograph stations.

The Richter magnitude scale was developed in 1935 by Charles F. Richter of the California Institute of Technology as a mathematical device to compare the size of earthquakes. The magnitude of an earthquake is determined from the logarithm of the amplitude of waves recorded by seismographs. Adjustments are included in the magnitude formula to compensate for the variation in the distance between the various seismographs and the epicenter of the earthquakes. On the Richter Scale, magnitude is expressed in whole numbers and decimal fractions. For example, a magnitude of 5.3 might be computed for a moderate earthquake, and a strong earthquake might be rated as magnitude 6.3. Because of the logarithmic basis of the scale, each whole number increase in magnitude represents a tenfold increase in measured amplitude; as an estimate of energy, each whole number step in the magnitude scale corresponds to the release of about 31 times more energy than the amount associated with the preceding whole number value.



Van Norman Dam, San Fernando, California, 1971. Earthquake-induced liquefaction of the earth-filled dam resulted in a landslide that caused partial collapse [Click on image for a larger view]

At first, the Richter Scale could be applied only to the records from instruments of identical manufacture. Now, instruments are carefully calibrated with respect to each other. Thus, magnitude can be computed from the record of any calibrated seismograph.

10/15/2018

The Severity of an Earthquake

Earthquakes with magnitude of about 2.0 or less are usually called microearthquakes; they are not commonly felt by people and are generally recorded only on local seismographs. Events with magnitudes of about 4.5 or greater--there are several thousand such shocks annually--are strong enough to be recorded by sensitive seismographs all over the world. Great earthquakes, such as the 1964 Good Friday earthquake in Alaska, have magnitudes of 8.0 or higher. On the average, one earthquake of such size occurs somewhere in the world each year. Although the Richter Scale has no upper limit, the largest known shocks have had magnitudes in the 8.8 to 8.9 range. Recently, another scale called the moment magnitude scale has been devised for more precise study of great earthquakes.

The Richter Scale is not used to express damage. An earthquake in a densely populated area which results in many deaths and considerable damage may have the same magnitude as a shock in a remote area that does nothing more than frighten the wildlife. Large-magnitude earthquakes that occur beneath the oceans may not even be felt by humans.



(Top) San Francisco, California, 1906. Collapse of City Hall after the 8.3 magnitude earthquake. Most of the property destruction was caused by the fire that raged after the earthquake.

(Bottom) Anchorage, Alaska, 1964. Much of the damage after this magnitude 8.6 earthquake was due to huge landslides, such as this one under Government Hill elementary School.

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

OCT 22 2018 CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

[Click on image for a larger view]

The Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale

The effect of an earthquake on the Earth's surface is called the intensity. The intensity scale consists of a series of certain key responses such as people awakening, movement of furniture, damage to chimneys, and finally--total destruction. Although numerous intensity scales have been developed over the last several hundred years to evaluate the effects of earthquakes, the one currently used in the United States is the Modified Mercalli (MM) Intensity Scale. It was developed in 1931 by the American seismologists Harry Wood and Frank Neumann. This scale, composed of 12 increasing levels of intensity that range from imperceptible shaking to catastrophic destruction, is designated by Roman numerals. It does not have a mathematical basis; instead it is an arbitrary ranking based on observed effects.

The Modified Mercalli Intensity value assigned to a specific site after an earthquake has a more meaningful measure of severity to the nonscientist than the magnitude because intensity refers to the effects actually experienced at that place. After the occurrence of widely-felt earthquakes, the Geological Survey mails questionnaires to postmasters in the disturbed area requesting the information so that intensity values can be assigned. The results of this postal canvass and information furnished by other sources are used to assign an intensity value, and to compile isoseismal maps that show the extent of various levels of intensity within the felt area. The maximum observed intensity generally occurs near the epicenter.



(Top) Mindanao, Phillippines, 1976. Apartment building destroyed by a magnitude 7.9 earthquake.

(Bottom) Long Beach, California, 1933. Exterior walls collapsed onto parked cars after this magnitude 6.3 earthquake (photo by Southern California Earthquake Pictures).



[Click on image for a larger view]

The lower numbers of the intensity scale generally deal with the manner in which the earthquake is felt by people. The higher numbers of the scale are based on observed structural damage. Structural engineers usually contribute information for assigning intensity values of VIII or above.



ł

Return to County Website | Log_Out

This database was last updated on 10/15/2018 at 5:27 AM

Parcel Details for 016-138-27-0-40-10-001.00-0 - Printer Friendly Version Quick Reference #: r5207

o.a. the adda		[\$]
Owner's Name (P Mailing Address:		
Free sty 2 datase		[×];
Address:	504 S 6th St Burlington, KS 66839	
the class wh	காக கீற	i¢)
Property Class: Living Units: Zoning: Neighborhood: Taxing Unit:	Residential - R 1 R-1 002 001-BURLINGTON CITY	
h-o-boom/6-b		[\$]
Document #	Document Link	
176-98	Ver, Deed Information	
175-374	View Dood Lifernation	
174-41	Vex Deed Electronen	
172-184	View D. ad Information	

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION OC.1 2 2 2018 CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

http://ks367.cichosting.com/webportal/appraiser/PrinterFriendly.aspx

Relegioscico d'Incat Informatio	up			12
Neighborhood:	002 Block: 081 Lot: 1, 2 AND			
Tract:	Section: Township: Range:			
Legal Description:	BURLINGTON CITY, BLOCK 081,	Lol 1, 2 AND, E 35' OF LOT 3		
Acres:	0.00			
Market Acres:	0.00			
Fand Based Gas shicadan By I	s 129			[A]
Function:	Single family residence (detached)			
Activity:	Household activities	Household activities		
Ownership:	Private-fee simple	Private-lee simple		
Site:	Developed sile - with buildings			
Pagaglassia				18
Topography:	Above Street - 2	Parking Type:	On and Off Street - 3	
Utilities:	All Public - 1	Parking Quantity:	Adequate - 2	
Access:	Paved Road - 1; Alley - 7	Parking Proximity:	On Site - 3	
Fronting:	Residential Street - 4	Parking Covered:		
Location:	Neighborhood or Spot - 6	Parking Uncovered:		

Appealed Matery						12
Tax Year	Proj	perty Class		Land	Building	Total
2018	Resi	denliai - R		5,490	179.610	185,100
ttut at aktada	ત લેખા					[8]
Туре	Metl	iod	Area or Acres	Eff. Frontage	Depth	Est, Value
Regular Lot - 1	Fron	tage and Depth		120	135	5,490
Influence #1: Factor:	Influence #2: Factor:	Influence Override: Depth Factor: 0.9	600			

Received KANSAS CORPORATION COMPAISSION

OCT 2 2 2018

CONSERVATION DIVISION WICHITA, KS

10/15/2018

In dealled Information				
Building #: 1				,
Dwelling Information	Comp	onent Sates Informatio	n	
Residence Type: Residential/Agricultural - 1	Archi	tectural Style: Old Style	- 09	
Quality: GD	Ba	sement Type: Partial - 3		
Year Built: 1885		Total Rooms: 7		
Effective Year:		Bedrooms: 4		
MS Style: 2	F	amily Rooms: 1		
LBCS Structure: Detached SFR unit		Full Baths: 2		
# of Units:		Half Baths:		
Total Living Area:	Gai	age Capacity:		
Calculated Area: 2,698		Foundation: Stone - 4		
Main Floor LA: 1,848				
Upper Floor LA %: 46.0				
CDU: GD				
Phys/Func/Econ: AV/N/A/N/A				
Ovr % Good / RCN: /				
Remodel:				
% Complete: Assessment Class:				
	ass #3 / %: /			
Residential Components				
Code / Description	Units	Percentage	Quality	Year
Wood Deck (SF) with Roof	112	-	GD	
Frame, Siding, Vinyl		100		
Composition Shingle		100		
Total Basement Area (SF)	432			
Raised Subfloor (% or SF)	2,698	100		
Warmed & Cooled Air Plumbing Fixtures (#)	8	100		
Plumbing Rough-ins (#)				
Single 1-Story Fireplace (#)	1	Received KNNSAS CORPORATION COM	MISSION	
Automatic Floor Cover Allowance		CORPORATION		
Wood Deck (SF)	56 360	KANSAS CO.		1991 2008
Open Slab Porch (SF) Slab Porch (SF) with Roof	236	OCT 22 20	10 00	2008
Wood Deck (SF) with Roof	145		NON	
		CONSERVATION DIV	151014	•••••
i - histori d faltara dita		CONSERVATION KS		
<pre>3uilding #: 1 Sketch Vector : Sketch Vector</pre>	Not Available			
	the state same is a set			
lenna read funcia don - (bifermetren (kol Ze illeble)				
idha finising lagrov mart liferantian				
MS Year Effe	ctive		ys	Ovr % M
ecup Class Rank Quantity Built Ye	ar LBCS Area Perim Hgt	(L x W) Stories Co	nd Func Econ Ovr %	Reason RCN Good Va
tesidential Garage - D AV 1 1975 letached	884 120 8	34 x 26 1 AV	AV	2020 9 20
omponents		Orean to an to	0.4	Pank Vaa-
Code	Units	Percentage % Are	a Other	Rank Year
Service at the second service of the second s				

This particle ord vas betapdaled on 10.152018 at 6 am.

© 2014 Coffey County, Kansas Version: 2.0.0.48 : 04/14/2015 Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters (exhibit 6 KORA completion)



CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWNFAD ROAD TOPERA, KS 66604-4027 Phone: 785-271-3100 Fax: 785-271-3354 http://kee.ks.gov/

GOVERNOR JEFF COLVER, M.D. Shari Feist Alerecht, Chair | Jay Scoli Emler, Commissioner | Dwight D. Keen, Commissioner

October 30, 2018

Susan Royd-Sykes 504 S 6th St Burlington, KS 66839 <u>moondrummer88@gmail.com</u>

Re: 10/25/2018 Kansas Open Records Act Request #1540495252

Ms. Royd-Sykes,

Please find enclosed the documents you requested pursuant to the Kansas Open Records Act, K.S.A. 45-215 *et seq*. This constitutes the completion of your request. Any additional request received within one calendar year from the date of this request may be billed at the cost of complying with such request.

Respectfully,

Lynn M. R.F.

Lynn M. Retz Official Custodian of Records Secretary to the Commission

Michael Duenes

From:	Brian Birk <blbpetro@gmail.com></blbpetro@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, October 18, 2018 4:36 PM
То:	Michael Duenes
Subject:	Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC
Attachments:	pdf_0733.pdf

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. Think before clicking a link or opening attachments.

.

Please see attached re: the upcoming Prehearing Conference.

Thank you

BIRK PETROLEUNS

874 12th Rd, BURLINGTON, KS 66839 620-364-1311

10/15/2018

Michael J. Duenes Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead Road Topeka, Ks 66604-4027

Dear Mr. Duenes,

I am writing this in response to the letter of protest filed by Ms. Susan Royd-Sykes and to address the issues that will be brought at the Prehearing Conference.

First, I would like to state that I have been a licensed operator in the State of Kansas since 1990 and have a well established record of compliance with the Kansas Corporation Commission. The vast majority of Kansas operators are small independent producers, including myself. We are also farmers and ranchers, members of our communities, employers and parents. We contribute to our local economies and the state economy. I am a 4th generation and life-long resident of Coffey County where the application wells are located so I have a direct interest In following good operating practices. The Kansas Corporation Commission has implemented rules and regulations governing the operations of the oil and gas industry in Kansas. As you know, waste water comes with the production of crude oil. It is <u>proven</u> that the best way to limit pollution to our surface water and environment is to dispose or inject the waste water back into the ground at depths that keep the surface water protected. The KCC has established regulations concerning the depths, pressures, and rates for disposal and injection wells. The applicant wells have had mechanical integrity tests performed as per regulations and have been approved by District staff. The applicant wells meet the existing regulations and should be approved.

Ms. Royd-Sykes sites concerns about earthquakes being caused by "heavy saltwater disposal". I believe that concern is unfounded in this instance and most other instances in Eastern Kansas. The application wells have a maximum operating pressure of 300 psi and a maximum injection rate of 100 bbls/day and well #5 is already permitted at a max operating pressure of 100 psi and maximum injection rate of 50 bbls/day and has had no issues. According to information obtained from the Kansas Geological Survey the most recent earthquakes recorded in Kansas have been at a depth of 5 km or more, or over 16,404 feet and have been between magnitudes of 2.0 - 3.5 on the Richter Scale and were located in south

central Kansas. The USGS states that "Earthquakes with magnitude of about 2.0 or less are usually called microearthquakes; they are not commonly felt by people and are generally recorded only on local seismographs." The applicant wells are at a depth of 650-700 feet. It seems unlikely that disposal at the depths and rates requested would be capable of causing earthquakes.

Ms. Royd-Sykes claims damage to her home from earthquakes located in Oklahoma. It should be noted that County records show her home was built in 1885. A structure that is 133 years old may have other issues that affect it besides earthquake activity being the main cause of any damage.

It appears your office is in receipt of the Application to Amend the injection permit and I have enclosed a copy of the completed mechanical integrity test for well #10 that was witnessed and signed by district staff. Please also find copies of data acquired from the KGS, USGS and Coffey County attached.

I look forward to the approval of the applicant wells and a quick resolution to this issue.

Sincerely,

Brian L Birk, dba Birk Petroleum

Cc: Rene Stucky, Kansas Corporation Commission

Michael Duenes

From:	Michael Duenes
Sent:	Monday, October 22, 2018 1:35 PM
То:	'Brian Birk'; Lauren Wright
Cc:	'moondrummer88@gmail.com'
Subject:	RE: Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC

Mr. Birk,

You sent separate emails with attachments to me on October 18th and 19th. As far as I can tell, you did not send the same emails to Commission Conservation Staff (i.e., Lauren Wright; although it appears you mailed your attachments to Rene Stucky), and the Protestant in this matter, Susan Royd-Sykes.

Although the Commission has not yet determined and announced that a hearing should be held in this matter, as the Prehearing Officer, I would ask that you not communicate with me unless you also include in your communications all the parties to the docket. I have not forwarded your attachments to Staff or Ms. Royd-Sykes at this point. I have also not passed them along to the Commission for their consideration.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to let me know, and again, make sure you communicate with all of the emails listed on this email.

Yours,

Michael J. Duenes, Assistant General Counsel Office of General Counsel Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead Road | Topeka, KS | 66604-4027 Phone (785) 271-3181 | <u>http://kcc.ks.gov/</u> Fax (785) 271-3314 (Advisory)

This message is from the Office of General Counsel of the Kansas Corporation Commission and is intended only for the addressee. This transmission, email, and any files transmitted with it, may be (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) strictly confidential under federal or state law. Unauthorized forwarding, printing, copying, distributing, or using such information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender (only) and delete the message. This message may also be subject to disclosure under the Kansas Open Records Act, K.S.A. 45-215 et seq.

From: Brian Birk [mailto:blbpetro@gmail.com] Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2018 4:36 PM To: Michael Duenes <m.duenes@kcc.ks.gov> Subject: Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. Think before clicking a link or opening attachments.

Please see attached re: the upcoming Prehearing Conference.

Thank you

Michael Duenes

From:	Brian Birk <blbpetro@gmail.com></blbpetro@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, October 19, 2018 12:55 PM
То:	Michael Duenes
Subject:	Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC
Attachments:	pdf_0734.pdf

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. Think before clicking a link or opening attachments.

-

Please see attachments regarding the above Docket. Thank you,

CASING MECHANICAL INTEGRITY TEST	DOCKET# D-32724	
Disposal Well Enhanced Recovery: Repressuring Flood	NESWSW J, Sec 7, T 23 S,R 15 A	jw
NWNP Tertiary Date injection started API #15- 031-1915 - 08-00	1/162 Feet from South Section Line 43/9 Feet from East Section Line Lease Meyrith County Offlure	
Operator: Birk Petroleum	Operator License# 312-80	
Name & Address 874 12th Rd SW	Contact Person Brich Birk	
Burlington KS 60839	Phone 6203141311	
Max. Auth. Injection Press 300 Psi; Max Inj		
If Dual Completion – Injection above production Conductor Surface	Injection below production Production Liner Tub	ing
Size	<u>5 3.5</u> Size 7.24 Set at	•
Cement Top		
"Bottom 40 DV/Perf. T	TD (and plug back) 724 fl. de	epth
Packer type S	Size Set at	
Zone of injection Type MIT: Pressure: Radioacti	ive Tracer Survey: Temperature Survey:	
F Time: Start 20 Min- 40 Min 60		
1		
E Pressures: <u>260</u> <u>260</u> <u>26</u> L	Set up 1 System Pres. during lest 7 200	
D	Set up 2 Annular Pres. during test	
D	Set up 3 Fluid loss during test bbls.	
A T Tested: Casing 🔀 or Casing – Tubing	g Annulus	
A The bottom of the tested zone in shut in with		
Test Date 9/1/18 Using	PAR (Monus Tork Company's Equipment	
The operator hereby certifies that the zone betwee	a latata	
was the zone tested Rolling	Far	
The results were Satisfactory X Margir	nal Not Satisfactory	
State Agent: Mike Withen	Title: ECRS Witness: YES X NO	
REMARKS: Auile 20 From Surface 6	66-20-646-50-576 X-43=256.2B	
Orgin. Conservation Div.:	KDHE/T: AF Dist. Office SEP 17 2018	
Computer Update <u>Ie there Chemical Sec</u>	alant or a Mechanical Casing patch in the annular space? (Y/N)	
GPS Lat 38.05629 GPS I	Long 095. 80947 (If YES please describe in REM. KCC Fo	

•

·

10/15/2018

Kansas Earthquakes

Kansas Geological Survey



Most Recent Quakes from the Survey's Network

ID: 1001454210 UTC Date: 2018-10-14 12:10:27 Local Date: OCT-14-2018, 07:55:27 AM Latitude: 37.079 Longitude: -97.812 Magnitude: 2.5 County: Harper

ID: 1001454206 UTC Date: 2018-10-14 06:10:10 Local Date: OCT-14-2018, 01:21:10 AM Latitude: 37.092 Longitude: -97.809 Magnitude: 2 County: Harper

ID: 1001454205

USGS Notifications

The following data are from alerts sent from the <u>U.S. Geological Survey</u> Earthquake Hazards Program. If you feel an earthquake you can report it to the USGS using the "Did You Feel It?" link on the page for the earthquake you felt. Reporting the quake helps the USGS get a more complete description of what people experienced, the effects of an earthquake, and the extent of damage.

Most Recent Earthquake

Oct. 11, 2018

Topics...

Home

Resources on Seismicity

Public Information Circular on Earthquakes

Kansas Earthquake History

Seismometer Network Data

"Earthquake Highlights" newsletter

Kansas Earthquake Database

Oklahoma Geological Survey Earthquake Information

10/15/2018

KGS-Kansas Earthquakes

Date: 10/11/2018, 5:30:27 AM Latitude: 37.061 Longitude: -97.846 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 2.7 More info: <u>us1000haix</u> Location: 3.1 km (1.9 mi) ESE of Bluff City, Kansas

Most Recent Earthquakes

Oct. 3, 2018

Date: 10/3/2018, 2:36:41 AM Latitude: 38.336 Longitude: -96.826 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 3.5 More info: <u>us1000h656</u> Location: 4.8 km (3.0 mi) W of Runnymede, Kansas

Date: 10/3/2018, 7:40:46 PM Latitude: 37.364 Longitude: -97.983 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 2.4 More info: <u>us1000h6q2</u> Location: 8.5 km (5.2 mi) WNW of Clements, Kansas

Most Recent Earthquakes

Sept. 30, 2018

Date: 09/30/2018, 3:39:08 AM Latitude: 37.175 Longitude: -97.478 Depth (km): 5.0 Magnitude: 2.6 More info: <u>us1000h4jy</u> Location: 2.4 km (1.5 mi) E of Perth, Kansas

Date: 09/30/2018, 7:33:23 PM Latitude: 37.186 Longitude: -97.442 Depth (km): 5.8 Magnitude: 3.0 More info: <u>us1000h4tp</u> Location: 5.7 km (3.6 mi) ENE of Perth, Kansas

> Kansas Geological Survey, Exploration Services Updated Oct. 13, 2018 Comments to <u>webadmin@kgs.ku.edu</u> The URL for this page is http://www.kgs.ku.edu/Geophysics/Earthquakes/Index.html





Historic N Bischicker

The Severity of an Earthquake

The severity of an earthquake can be expressed in terms of both *Intensity* and *magnitude*. However, the two terms are quite different, and they are often confused.

Intensity is based on the observed effects of ground shaking on people, buildings, and natural features. It varies from place to place within the disturbed region depending on the location of the observer with respect to the earthquake epicenter.

Magnitude is related to the amount of seismic energy released at the hypocenter of the earthquake. It is based on the amplitude of the earthquake waves recorded on instruments which have a common calibration. The magnitude of an earthquake is thus represented by a single, instrumentally determined value.

Earthquakes are the result of forces deep within the Earth's interior that continuously affect the surface of the Earth. The energy from these forces is stored in a variety of ways within the rocks. When this energy is released suddenly, for example by shearing movements along faults in the crust of the Earth, an earthquake results. The area of the fault where the sudden rupture takes place is called the *focus* or *hypocenter* of the earthquake. The point on the Earth's surface directly above the focus is called the *epicenter* of the earthquake.



San Fernando, California, 1971. Highway interchange heavily damaged by the magnitude 6.5 earthquake [Click on Image for a larger view]

The Richter Magnitude Scale

Seismic waves are the vibrations from earthquakes that travel through the Earth; they are recorded on instruments called seismographs. Seismographs record a zig-zag trace that shows the varying amplitude of ground oscillations beneath the instrument. Sensitive seismographs, which greatly magnify these ground motions, can detect strong earthquakes from sources anywhere in the world. The time, location, and magnitude of an earthquake can be determined from the data recorded by seismograph stations.

The Richter magnitude scale was developed in 1935 by Charles F. Richter of the California Institute of Technology as a mathematical device to compare the size of earthquakes. The magnitude of an earthquake is determined from the logarithm of the amplitude of waves recorded by seismographs. Adjustments are included in the magnitude formula to compensate for the variation in the distance between the various seismographs and the epicenter of the earthquakes. On the Richter Scale, magnitude is expressed in whole numbers and decimal fractions. For example, a magnitude of 5.3 might be computed for a moderate earthquake, and a strong earthquake might be rated as magnitude 6.3. Because of the logarithmic basis of the scale, each whole number increase in magnitude represents a tenfold increase in measured amplitude; as an estimate of energy, each whole number step in the magnitude scale corresponds to the release of about 31 times more energy than the amount associated with the preceding whole number value.



Van Norman Dam, San Fernando, California, 1971. Earthquake-Induced liquefaction of the earth-filled dam resulted in a landslide that caused partial collapse [Click on image for a larger view]

At first, the Richter Scale could be applied only to the records from instruments of identical manufacture. Now, instruments are carefully calibrated with respect to each other. Thus, magnitude can be computed from the record of any calibrated seismograph.

10/15/2018

The Severity of an Earthquake

Earthquakes with magnitude of about 2.0 or less are usually called microearthquakes; they are not commonly felt by people and are generally recorded only on local seismographs. Events with magnitudes of about 4.5 or greater--there are several thousand such shocks annually--are strong enough to be recorded by sensitive seismographs all over the world. Great earthquakes, such as the 1964 Good Friday earthquake in Alaska, have magnitudes of 8.0 or higher. On the average, one earthquake of such size occurs somewhere in the world each year. Although the Richter Scale has no upper limit, the largest known shocks have had magnitudes in the 8.8 to 8.9 range. Recently, another scale called the moment magnitude scale has been devised for more precise study of great earthquakes.

The Richter Scale is not used to express damage. An earthquake in a densely populated area which results in many deaths and considerable damage may have the same magnitude as a shock in a remote area that does nothing more than frighten the wildlife. Large-magnitude earthquakes that occur beneath the oceans may not even be felt by humans.



(Top) San Francisco, California, 1906. Collapse of City Hall after the 8.3 magnitude earthquake. Most of the property destruction was caused by the fire that raged after the earthquake.

(Bottom) Anchorage, Alaska, 1964. Much of the damage after this magnitude 8.6 earthquake was due to huge landslides, such as this one under Government Hill elementary School.

[Click on image for a larger view]

The Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale

The effect of an earthquake on the Earth's surface is called the intensity. The intensity scale consists of a series of certain key responses such as people awakening, movement of furniture, damage to chimneys, and finally--total destruction. Although numerous intensity scales have been developed over the last several hundred years to evaluate the effects of earthquakes, the one currently used in the United States is the Modified Mercalli (MM) Intensity Scale. It was developed in 1931 by the American seismologists Harry Wood and Frank Neumann. This scale, composed of 12 increasing levels of intensity that range from imperceptible shaking to catastrophic destruction, is designated by Roman numerals. It does not have a mathematical basis; instead it is an arbitrary ranking based on observed effects.

The Modified Mercalli Intensity value assigned to a specific site after an earthquake has a more meaningful measure of severity to the nonscientist than the magnitude because intensity refers to the effects actually experienced at that place. After the occurrence of widely-felt earthquakes, the Geological Survey mails questionnaires to postmasters in the disturbed area requesting the information so that intensity values can be assigned. The results of this postal canvass and information furnished by other sources are used to assign an Intensity value, and to compile isoseismal maps that show the extent of various levels of intensity within the felt area. The maximum observed intensity generally occurs near the epicenter.



(Top) Mindanao, Phillippines, 1976. Apartment building destroyed by a magnitude 7.9 earthquake.

(Bottom) Long Beach, California, 1933. Exterior walls collapsed onto parked cars after this magnitude 6.3 earthquake (photo by Southern California Earthquake Pictures).



[Click on image for a larger view]

The lower numbers of the intensity scale generally deal with the manner in which the earthquake is felt by people. The higher numbers of the scale are based on observed structural damage. Structural engineers usually contribute information for assigning intensity values of VIII or above.

CASING MECHANICAL INTEGRITY TEST	DOCKET# D-32-724
Disposal Well Enhanced Recovery: Repressuring Flood NWNP Tertiary Date injection started	$\frac{NESWSW}{GPS}, Sec 7, T 23 S, R 15 EW$ $\frac{1776}{4319}$ Feet from South Section Line Feet from East Section Line Lease MVVVIH Well # 10
API #15- 031-1915 -00-00	County Coffey
Operator: Birk Petroleum Name & Address 874 12th Rd SW	Operator License# 31280 Contact Person Brian Birr
Buchington KS 60839 Max. Auth. Injection Press 300 Psi; Max Inj If Dual Completion – Injection above production Conductor Surface Size 8.625 Set at 40	Phone <u>() 203(41/3[/</u> Rate <u>50</u> bbl/d; Injection below production Production Liner Tubing 3.5 Size 724 Set at
	724 D (and plug back) 724 ize Set at
Type MIT: Pressure: K	ve Tracer Survey: Temperature Survey:
F Time: Start au Min 40 Min 60	Min SCANNED
E Pressures: <u>266</u> <u>260</u> <u>266</u>	Set up 1 System Pres. durting est 7 2018
D	Set up 2 Annular Pres. during test
D A T Tested: Casing 🔀 or Casing – Tubing	Set up 3 Fluid loss during test bbls.
A The bottom of the tested zone in shut in with	
Test Date <u>9/1/18</u> Using <u>[</u>	3.B. Company Took Company's Equipment
The operator hereby certifies that the zone betwee	een feet and feet
was the zone tested <u>Signature</u>	Title
The results were Satisfactory X Margin State Agent: Mik Wiffun	21
	KDHE/T: of Digt. Office SEP 1 7 2018
	alant or a Mechanical Casing patch in the annular space? (Y/N)
GPS Lat 38.05629 GPS 1	Long 095. 80947 (If YES please describe in REMARKS) KCC Form U-7

.



This database was last updated on 10/15/2018 at 5:27 AM

Return to County Website | Log_Out

Parcel Details for 016-138-27-0-40-10-001.00-0 - Printer Friendly Version Quick Reference #: r5207

Quick Reference #: r5	5207	i
ter por Jak en Kotta.		逐
Owner's Name (Pri	imary): ROYD-SYKES, SUSAN M	
Mailing Address:	504 S 6th St Burfington, KS 66839	
been ny Artonisa		逐
Address:	504 S 6th St Burlington, KS 66839	
Presidentes	est julies	181
Property Class:	Residential - R	
Living Units:	1	1
Zoning:	R-1	
Neighborhood:	002	
Taxing Unit:	001-BURLINGTON CITY	
n an agara shi a		Ø
Document #	Document Link	
176-96	View Deed Information	
175-374	View Deed Information	
174-41	<u>View Deed Information</u>	
172-184	<u>View Deed Information</u>	

10/15/2018

ks367.cichosting.com/webportal/appraiser/PrinterFriendly.aspx

liking and the set of the	um taītela laikus					181								
Neighborhood: Tract: Legal Description		002 Block: 081 Lot: 1, 2 AND Section: Township: Range: BURLINGTON CITY, BLOCK 081, Lot 1, 2 AND, E 35' OF LOT 3												
Acres:	n:	0.00												
Market Acres:		0.00		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •										
Lotet Rayon Olios	Made System	······································				E.								
Function:		Single family residence (c	letached)											
Activity:		Household activities												
Ownership:		Private-fee simple	d											
Site:		Developed site - with built				•••••••••••••••								
Pauga no filo ta n	····•					<u>(</u>								
Topography:		Above Street - 2		Parking Type:	On and Off Street - 3									
Utilities:		All Public - 1		Parking Quantity:	Adequate - 2									
Access:		Paved Road - 1; Alley - 7		Parking Proximity:	On Site - 3									
Fronting:		Residential Street - 4		Parking Covered:										
Location:		Neighborhood or Spot - 6		Parking Uncovered:	••••••	·····								
Аралард такж				·····	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6								
Tax Yoar	Proj	perty Class		Land	Building	Total								
2018	Resi	dential - R		5,490	179.610	185,100								
Sherke Stories Patrice	waliwa		·····			(×)								
Туре	Meti	nod	Area or Acres	Eff, Frontage	Depth	Est. Value								
Regular Lot - 1	Fron	tage and Depth		120	135	5,490								
influence #1: Factor:	Influence #2: Factor:	Influence Override: Depth Factor: 0.96	00											

10/15/2018

ks367.cichosting.com/webportal/appraiser/PrinterFriendly.aspx

Building #: 1									******											
Dwelling Information									C		1 6									
Residence Type:		antial/Acri	cultural .	1					•	onent Sal										
Quality:		sinarayir								itectural 5										
Year Built:									В	asement T			3							
Effective Year:										Total Roo										
MS Style:										Bedroo										
LBCS Structure:		hed SFR (tinu							Family Roo										
# of Units:										Fuli Ba										
Total Living Area:									•	Half Ba										
Calculated Area:									Ga	rage Capa	-									
Main Floor LA:										Foundat	10 n : 5	sione -	4							
Upper Floor LA %:																				
CDU:																				
Phys / Func / Econ:																				
Ovr % Good / RCN:		ATNA																		
Remodal:																				
% Complete: Assessment Class:																				
MU Class #1 / %:		IU Class																		
Residential Compo		IO CIASS	#2]76:	/ •	U Class #	3/%:/	/													
Code / Descripti								Units		De	rcentag			0	uality			Year		
Wood Deck (SF)		f						112			centag	le.			GD			160		
Frame, Siding, Vir		l I						112			100				60					
Composition Shin											100									
Total Basement A								432												
Raised Subfloor (2,698												
Warmed & Cooled											100									
Plumbing Fixtures								8												
Plumbing Rough- Single 1-Story Fin		*						1												
Automatic Floor C								1												
Wood Deck (SF)								56							FR			1991		
Open Slab Porch	(SF)							360							GD			2008		
Slab Porch (SF) v								236												
Wood Deck (SF)	with Roo	f						145												
									••••••				••••••	• • • • • • •					•••••	
unside and the consideration of the	eu:																			1
Building #: 1 Sk																				
			ORCIG					····	•••••		•••••									• •• • •
							••	•• •		<u>د.</u>										
farsterizer i Amilianaa	:'or (l.:	55-75 P. P.	1 N-1 A.	nat as	!															[
Mine: Buliding Imper	wente v	latorie: 1	÷s.																	[
	MS			Year	Effective					Dimension			hys				Ovr		%	MS
)ccup	Class	Rank Q	vantity	Built	Year	LBCS	Area	Perim	Hgt	(L x W)	Sto	ries C	ond	Func	Econ	Ovr %	Reason	RCN	Good	Valu
Residential Garage - Detached	C) AV	1	197	5		884	120	8	34 x 26	1	AV	AV					2020	9	202
omponents																				
Code								Uni	ts	Percenta	ge %	A	rea		Other		Rank		Year	
											••••••									

This parcel record was last updated on 10/15/2018 at 6 am.

© 2014 Coffey County, Kansas Version: 2.0.0.48 : 04/14/2015 Protestant's Motion to Deny the Permits in Docket No. 19-CONS-3106-CUIC (Merritt# 10) and No. 19-CONC-3107-CUIC located in Coffey County, Kansas, and Close the Docket in Both Matters

(exhibit 7 Birk's ex parte letter to Duenes)

BIRA PETROLEHING

874 12th Rd, BURLINGTON, KS 66839 620-364-1311

10/15/2018

Michael J. Duenes Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead Road Topeka, Ks 66604-4027

Dear Mr. Duenes,

I am writing this in response to the letter of protest filed by Ms. Susan Royd-Sykes and to address the issues that will be brought at the Prehearing Conference.

Hirst, I would like to state that I have been a licensed operator in the State of Kansas since 1990 and have a well established record of compliance with the Kansas Corporation Commission. The vast majority of Kansas operators are small independent producers, including myself. We are also farmers and ranchers, members of our communities, employers and parents. We contribute to our local economies and the state economy. I am a 4th generation and life-long resident of Coffey County where the application wells are located so I have a direct interest in following good operating practices. The Kansas Corporation Commission has implemented rules and regulations governing the operations of the oil and gas industry in Kansas. As you know, waste water comes with the production of crude oil. It is <u>proven</u> that the best way to limit pollution to our surface water and environment is to dispose or inject the waste water back into the ground at depths that keep the surface water protected. The KCC has established regulations concerning the depths, pressures, and rates for disposal and injection wells. The applicant wells have had mechanical integrity tests performed as per regulations and have been approved by District staff. The applicant wells meet the existing regulations and should be approved.

Ms. Royd-Sykes sites concerns about earthquakes being caused by "heavy saltwater disposal". I believe that concern is unfounded in this instance and most other instances in Eastern Kansas. The application wells have a maximum operating pressure of 300 psi and a maximum injection rate of 100 bbls/day and well #5 is already permitted at a max operating pressure of 100 psi and maximum injection rate of 50 bbls/day and has had no issues. According to information obtained from the Kansas Geological Survey the most recent earthquakes recorded in Kansas have been at a depth of 5 km or more, or over 16,404 feet and have been between magnitudes of 2.0 – 3.5 on the Richter Scale and were located in south

central Kansas. The USGS states that "Earthquakes with magnitude of about 2.0 or less are usually called microearthquakes; they are not commonly felt by people and are generally recorded only on local seismographs." The applicant wells are at a depth of 650-700 feet. It seems unlikely that disposal at the depths and rates requested would be capable of causing earthquakes.

Ms. Royd Sykes claims damage to her home from earthquakes located in Oklahoma. It should be noted that County records show her home was built in 1885. A structure that is 133 years old may have other issues that affect it besides earthquake activity being the main cause of any damage.

It appears your office is in receipt of the Application to Amend the injection permit and I have enclosed a copy of the completed mechanical integrity test for well #10 that was witnessed and signed by district staff. Please also find copies of data acquired from the KGS, USGS and Coffey County attached.

I look forward to the approval of the applicant wells and a quick resolution to this issue.

Sincerely,

Brian L Birk, dba Birk Petroleum

Cc: Rene Stucky, Kansas Corporation Commission