STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

APPLICATION OF GOODNIGHT MIDSTREAM PERMIAN, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF A SALTWATER DISPOSAL WELL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO. CASE NO. 20558

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

June 14, 2019

Santa Fe, New Mexico

BEFORE: PHILLIP GOETZE, CHIEF EXAMINER
DAVID K. BROOKS, LEGAL EXAMINER

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, Phillip Goetze, Chief Examiner; and David K. Brooks, Legal Examiner, on Friday, June 14, 2019, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Wendell Chino Building, 1220 South St. Francis Drive, Porter Hall, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

REPORTED BY: Mary C. Hankins, CCR, RPR
New Mexico CCR #20
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters
500 4th Street, Northwest, Suite 105
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
(505) 843-9241

APPEARANCES

FOR APPLICANT GOODNIGHT MIDSTREAM PERMIAN, LLC:

ADAM G. RANKIN, ESQ.
HOLLAND & HART, LLC
110 North Guadalupe, Suite 1
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
(505) 988-4421
agrankin@hollandhart.com

FOR INTERESTED PARTY NEW MEXICO STATE LAND OFFICE:

ANDREA ANTILLON, ESQ.
NEW MEXICO STATE LAND OFFICE
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
310 Old Santa Fe Trail
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
(505) 827-5702
aantillon@slo.state.nm.us

INDEX

EXHIBITS OFFERED AND ADMITTED

(11:46 a.m.)

EXAMINER GOETZE: Let's go back on the record.

In an effort to get through the Goodnight Midstream applications, we are going to their last case, Case Number 20558, application of Goodnight Midstream Permian, LLC for approval of a saltwater disposal well, Lea County, New Mexico.

Call for appearances.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, Adam Rankin with the law firm of Holland & Hart, appearing on behalf of the Applicant in this case. We will have four witnesses.

MS. ANTILLON: Andrea Antillon on behalf of the State Land Office. No witnesses.

EXAMINER GOETZE: And these are the same witnesses?

MR. RANKIN: Same witnesses.

EXAMINER GOETZE: So they have been sworn in already.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, in order to expedite the presentation of this case, we ask that the testimony of our first witness, Mr. Grant Adams, be incorporated from Case 20555.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Any objections?

MS. ANTILLON: No objections.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Therefore, the testimony from Case 20555, with the first witness, will be incorporated into 20558.

MR. RANKIN: We ask also that Exhibit A be admitted to the record at this time. It's the same exhibit that Mr. Adams presented in Case Number 20555.

MS. ANTILLON: No objection.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Very good.

Then Exhibit A from Case 20558 shall be incorporated into the record.

(Goodnight Midstream Permian, LLC Exhibit A is offered and admitted into evidence.)

MR. RANKIN: Thank you.

I would like to call my second witness, Mr. Nate Alleman.

EXAMINER GOETZE: First, the examiner would like a copy of the exhibits.

NATHAN ALLEMAN,

after having been previously sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RANKIN:

Q. Mr. Alleman, will you please state your full name for the record?

A. Nathan Alleman.

Q. And by whom are you employed?

A. ALL Consulting.

Q. Have you previously testified before the Division and had your credentials as an expert in saltwater disposal permitting and regulatory matters accepted as a matter of record?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Are you familiar with the C-108 application that was in this case?

A. I am.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, I would retender at this time Mr. Alleman as an expert in SWD permitting and regulatory matters.

MS. ANTILLON: No objection.

EXAMINER GOETZE: He is so qualified.

Q. (BY MR. RANKIN) Mr. Alleman, before you is an exhibit packet, and turning to what's been marked as Exhibit B, will you review with the examiners what it is that Goodnight Midstream is seeking in this case?

A. Goodnight Midstream is seeking authorization to drill and inject into the Yaz 28 SWD No. 1.

Q. Will you review for the examiners -- will you turn to Tab Number 1 -- the location of the proposed Yaz injector well?

A. The Yaz 28 SWD No. 1 is 230 feet from the north line and 236 feet from the east line of Section 28, Township 21 South, Range 36 East in Lea County, New Mexico.

Q. And is that location reflected on this exhibit the same currently for the proposed well?

A. It is.

Q. And what are the proposed injection -- what's the proposed injection formation and intervals for this well?

A. We are proposing to inject into the San Andres and Glorieta at depths from 4,630 feet to 6,100 feet.

Q. And would that be through an open hole or completed perforation in this well?

A. This would be cased and perforated.

Q. What are the proposed average injection rates and maximum injection rates for this well?

A. The proposed average injection rate is 15,000 barrels of water per day, and the maximum injection rate will be limited by the injection pressure.

Q. And how about this injection system, is it an open or closed injection system?

A. Closed injection system.

Q. It will be a commercial disposal well?

A. Correct.

Q. Now, what's the status of the lands at issue in this case?

A. It is private surface and federal minerals.

Q. And has the company prepared an exhibit, a C-108, that was filed for administrative approval in this case?

A. That is correct.

Q. Is that marked as Exhibit B in your exhibit packet?

A. It is.

Q. And is that prepared by Thomas Schumacher with MidCon Resource Group, LLC?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And it was done so at the request and on behalf of Goodnight Midstream?

A. That's correct.

Q. And did Goodnight Midstream provide information and business records, as well as did MidCon Resource Group rely on publicly available information in its preparation of this C-108?

A. It did.

Q. And have you reviewed the information and the data that was prepared by MidCon Resource Group in this C-108?

A. We did.

Q. Is the C-108 complete, and does it contain all the information required for approval of this injection well?

A. It does.

Q. Is this an expansion of an existing project or a new proposed well?

A. A new project.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Adam, speak up for the reporter, please --

MR. RANKIN: Oh, thank you.

EXAMINER GOETZE: -- and witnesses.

Q. (BY MR. RANKIN) Who are the parties that were entitled to notice in this case?

A. The parties that were notified were the landowner, Dasco Cattle Company, and the mineral owner -- sorry -- the leaseholders and oil and gas well operators within one-half mile.

Q. Turning to what's been marked as Tab 3, does this exhibit depict the area of review?

A. It does.

Q. Will you review for the examiners what it shows?

A. The large red circle shows a two-mile radius that shows all the leases within two miles, and the smaller blue circles shows all the leases --

leaseholders within one-half mile.

Q. And the next page behind that map, what does it show?

A. The radii are the same in terms of size, but this -- this map shows oil and gas wells in the area, specifically oil and gas wells within the one-half-mile radius.

Q. Okay. And the next map behind that shows the lease tracts within that half-mile area of review?

A. That's correct.

Q. Turning to Tab 12, is this a description of the procedure that was undertaken to identify the parties who were entitled to notice within that half-mile area of review of this proposed well?

A. It is.

Q. Have you reviewed the procedures that were undertaken to identify all the notice parties?

A. We have.

Q. Is it your opinion that they filed the correct procedures and correctly identified each of the parties entitled to notice within the area of review?

A. Yes.

Q. And is the next page behind that a description -- a letter that reviews the history and some of the factors that were identified while they were

conducting the land work to identify the notice parties?

A. Yes.

Q. And after that, is there a list of all the parties that were identified as requiring notice under this application?

A. Yes.

Q. And behind Tab 13, is that a letter that was sent to each of the parties identified as with prior notice giving them notice of this application and administrative filing?

A. It is.

Q. And behind that, is that a copy of all the green cards, the green-card receipts, reflecting that each of those parties received notice?

A. It is.

Q. And behind Tab 14, is that a copy of the Affidavit of Publication reflecting that Goodnight Midstream published notice of this administrative notification in the newspaper in the county where the well is located?

A. It is.

Q. In your opinion, Mr. Alleman, did Goodnight Midstream undertake a good-faith effort to locate and identify each of the correct parties and their valid addresses for all the parties entitled to notice for

this case?

A. They did.

Q. Were there any unlocatable interest owners, that is, owners that did not have a valid or correct address?

A. No.

Q. To the best of your knowledge, were all the addresses valid and correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now, Exhibit C in that exhibit packet before you, is that a copy of the affidavit that was prepared by my office reflecting that we provided notice to the parties who had protested the administrative application in this case?

A. It is.

Q. And the next page of that exhibit, is that a copy of the letter that went out to those parties who had protested?

A. Yes.

Q. And the following page of that, is that a tracking sheet reflecting that we sent those notices by certified mail and that those parties actually received and signed for those notices?

A. It is.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, at this time I

would move the admission of Exhibit B into the record at this time.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Ms. Antillon?

MS. ANTILLON: No objection.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Exhibit B is so entered.

(Goodnight Midstream Permian, LLC Exhibit B is offered and admitted into evidence.)

MR. RANKIN: No further questions, Mr. Examiner. I pass the witness.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Ms. Antillon?

MS. ANTILLON: No questions.

EXAMINER GOETZE: I have no questions, but I would suggest that your consultant in North Dakota -- the town is called Hobbs, not Hubb, so next time you say the Hubb-News, take a little more effort. But that's okay. You've done it in every case.

MR. RANKIN: Okay.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Thank you very much.

MR. RANKIN: With that, Mr. Examiner, I would ask that Mr. Alleman be dismissed, and we would call our next witness, Mr. Steve Drake.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Please.

STEVE DRAKE,

after having been previously sworn under oath, was

questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RANKIN:

Q. Mr. Drake, will you please state your full name for the record?

A. Steve Drake.

Q. And have you -- by whom are you employed?

A. Goodnight Midstream.

Q. Have you previously testified before the Division today and had your credentials as an expert petroleum geologist accepted as a matter of record?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Are you familiar with the C-108 application that was filed in this case?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Have you a conducted a study of the lands and geology in the surrounding areas?

A. Yes.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, at this time I would retender Mr. Drake as an expert in petroleum geology.

MS. ANTILLON: No objection.

EXAMINER GOETZE: He is so qualified.

Q. (BY MR. RANKIN) Mr. Drake, would you please review for the examiners what the proposed injection

interval and zones are for this proposed well?

A. We're proposing to inject into the San Andres and Glorieta Formations from 4,630 feet down to 6,100 feet.

Q. Flipping to what's been marked as Tab Number 8 in Exhibit B, which is part of the C-108, does this tab and the information behind it reflect all the geologic information -- or the geologic information that's required by the C-108 in this case?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. Will you review for the examiners what the stratigraphy is in the area and again with an emphasis on the proposed injection intervals and zones?

A. We have the Rustler Formation and Salado down to about 3,000 feet, then the Yates, Seven Rivers, Queen, Penrose and Grayburg down to about 4,000 feet. The San Andres starts around 4,000 and extends down to 5,700. And then the Glorieta, which would have a top around 5,700, would extend down to 6,350.

Q. Have you prepared a cross-section log or other exhibit that helps depict these zones?

A. Yes, I have. It should be behind --

Q. Tab 9.

A. -- 9.

Q. Mr. Drake, will you please review what that

exhibit shows and, in particular, review for the examiners the geologic strata that helps seal off the zone and point out the injection interval here?

A. Okay. This exhibit has the log from our Ted well, which is also located in Section 28. This well was drilled in July of 2018. We had designed the Ted well to inject into the Lower San Andres and Glorieta, but much to our surprise, when we drilled into the Upper San Andres, we had a massive loss of circulation at about 4,600 feet and drilled the next 250 feet of San Andres at extremely low bottom-hole pressures. We feel that this is the result of the extraction by the water supply wells in the area. We were surprised it extended this far away. So we are two-and-a-half, three-and-a-half miles from the nearest water supply well, and yet the pressure in the Upper San Andres porosity interval was massively depleted.

So our proposal in the new well is to include that zone for disposal. We did not include it in the Ted. So now we're looking to perforate from 4,630 in the upper porosity member, as well as the lower porosity member and the Glorieta in the new well. The Ted was drilled into the Leonard because there were no other wells in the area to give us a stratigraphic top, so we extended into that formation. The Yaz will stop

before we get there because the lower part of the Glorieta in the Ted well was very tight. Although we do have perforations in that interval, very little water goes into it, if any, in the lower part of the Glorieta. The Upper Glorieta has very good porosity.

I've highlighted here with colors the intervals where the porosities are low, dolomites and anhydrites with porosities less than 3 percent. We have two barriers near the top of the San Andres. We have the middle San Andres barrier, which is almost 200 feet thick, and then we have the lower San Andres limestones which are between 200 and 250 feet thick. We feel that those will isolate and prevent flow between porosity members.

Q. As for the lower zone, I think your testimony was that the Leonard functions as an effective barrier for downward migration --

A. That is correct.

Q. -- out of the Glorieta zone?

A. Yeah.

Q. And based on this analysis of the -- and your loss of circulation within the San Andres, it's your opinion that these intervals within the zones will be capable of receiving the volumes and the rates of injection that you're proposing for this well?

A. That's correct.

Q. And you've examined the geology and the engineering in the area and have satisfied yourself that there is no hydrologic connection between the injection zones and any sources of fresh water?

A. We have done that work, and we do not see any connections to fresh water.

Q. And you've included in this case a statement to that effect behind Tab Number 11?

A. That is correct.

Q. Mr. Drake, let's talk a little bit about protection of hydrocarbons and production in the area. Are there any productive hydrocarbon zones within that area?

A. There are. The Seven Rivers and Queen produce gas.

Q. And those are above the injection interval here?

A. They are above the injection interval.

Q. And they're within how far, what distance of your injection well here?

A. They would overlap with it. They're in the -- do we have a producing --

Q. I don't think we do in this case.

A. Yeah.

Q. But they're within the area of --

A. They are in the area.

Q. How about hydrocarbons below the injection zone?

A. There are no hydrocarbons being produced deeper.

Q. So in your opinion -- based on the stratigraphy and the geologic seals, is it your opinion that any shallower production will be protected against the -- any impairments from injection into this well?

A. I believe that we will be a significant distance below the production. We will not inhibit there or damage their production in any way. The greater formation is between the producing intervals and the San Andres. It is also a -- aquifer. It does also have anhydrite barriers within the Grayburg. So we are 5- to 600 feet below the Queen.

Q. Now -- and moving over to fresh water, are there freshwater zones and are there freshwater-bearing formations within the area of this proposed well?

A. Yes, I believe there are. We did sample -- I think it was one well.

Q. And is that -- are those zones -- the shallower zones, do they refer to those as the Red Beds in this area?

A. That is correct, which would be very shallow, up in the 1- to 200-foot range.

Q. In your opinion, have you identified any sources of fresh water or drinking water below that zone?

A. We have not.

Q. Are those zones effectively sealed off geologically from your injection interval?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. And in this case, is the Ogallala High Plains Aquifer within any reasonable distance of your proposed injection?

A. It's more than six miles off to the northeast.

Q. And speaking of fresh water, are there any wells that Goodnight was able to able to identify within the one-mile area of review? I think they may have been marked behind -- let's see what exhibit. Behind Tab Number 9. Where is that map?

A. Is it 9.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Number 10?

MR. RANKIN: Number 10. That's where I was.

THE WITNESS: 10 is the map, but I don't have the page for the wells.

Q. (BY MR. RANKIN) I can direct you to those.

A. Okay.

Q. So the map is -- behind Tab Number 10, is that the map reflecting the location of the freshwater well that was sampled within the one-half-mile area of review?

A. That is correct.

Q. And is that marked by the yellow thumbtack?

A. It is.

Q. And if you flip back to Tab Number 9 and turn the page past that cross section and then the page past the description of the freshwater sources, are there sample results for the well that are identified on that map?

A. Yes. That is correct.

Q. Were there any other wells that Goodnight Midstream identified that were not in the State Engineer's database within the two-mile area?

A. I believe there was one more. Is that correct?

Q. I think there was at least one or two, but those are identified in the C-108 as well; is that correct?

A. Yes, the Phillips stock tank well.

Q. In your opinion, based on your view of the geology and of the location of the depths of the freshwater zones here, is it your opinion that injection

into this well will not impair, cause any damage or harm to any freshwater or drinking water zones within the area?

A. That is correct.

Q. Let's talk about what you're going to be injecting here. As with the other cases, what are the principal zones of production from which the produced water will be originating?

A. It will originate in the Delaware Basin from Bone Spring and Wolfcamp production, but we could be receiving small amounts of water from other formations.

Q. Have you included an analysis of the water chemistry for each of the zones from which you may be injecting?

A. Yes, we have.

Q. And are those behind Tab Number 6?

A. Yes.

Q. If you flip through all those pages, those are a collection of the water chemistry analyses for the various wells producing from those zones?

A. Correct.

Q. And if you go to the end of that exhibit, you have some of the water as an example of what you would be injecting from your other injectors in the area?

A. That is correct. Yes.

Q. And behind Tab 7, are these water samples from the injection intervals into which you will be injecting?

A. That is correct. These are from the Ted.

Q. And based on the water chemistry for the source zones and the reservoir injection zones, have you identified any water chemistry compatibility issues that would be of concern to your injection here?

A. We have not.

Q. And that's also based on your prior experience commingling these waters in other projects?

A. Yes. We do have three functioning SWDs, and they are not experiencing any scaling issues at this time.

Q. Mr. Drake, based on your analysis of the geology and review of the issues required for approval for this injection well, is it your opinion that the granting of this application will be in the interest of conservation of resources, the protection against waste and the protection of correlative rights?

A. Yes, it will.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, at this time I would pass the witness for questioning.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Ms. Antillon?

MS. ANTILLON: No questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER GOETZE:

Q. The only question I have -- are you familiar with the original administrative application for this well?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. At that time you were looking at including a much larger section, and we had hesitations about it.

A. Yes. And that was communicated to us, and we altered the plan.

Q. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had gotten the communication across the reason why we did it. We were nervous when we saw this, especially not having much information for the Tubb, Drinkard and Abo through here. So we appreciate the contraction of the integral to something that we're more familiar and trusting with.

Other than that, I have no more questions for this witness.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Thank you.

MR. RANKIN: I ask that Mr. Drake be excused, and we would call our last witness, Mr. Tomastik.

THOMAS E. TOMASTIK,

after having been previously sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RANKIN:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Tomastik.

A. Good afternoon.

Q. Will you please state your full name for the record?

A. Thomas E. Tomastik.

Q. By whom are you employed?

A. ALL Consulting.

Q. And what's your position with ALL Consulting?

A. Senior geologist and regulatory specialist.

Q. Are you familiar with the application that was filed in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you had your credentials as an expert in petroleum engineering and SWD operations and design previously accepted by the Division?

A. Yes.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, at this time I would retender Mr. Tomastik as an expert in petroleum engineering and SWD design and operation.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Ms. Antillon?

MS. ANTILLON: No objection.

EXAMINER GOETZE: He is so qualified.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner.

Q. (BY MR. RANKIN) Turning first to the area-of-review issues, Mr. Tomastik, will you please identify in Tab 3, Exhibit B before you -- skip to the second page of that tab. There is an overview map showing --

A. Exhibit B or A?

Q. Exhibit B, Tab 3. Oh, did that one maybe get misplaced?

A. I've got Exhibit A.

Q. Oh, you're right. You're good. That's the right spot.

A. That one.

Q. Review for -- for me, if you would, Mr. Tomastik, the area of review identified on that map, what it shows.

A. Yes. This map shows the half-mile area of review, but also then shows a two-mile radius showing all the wells located within both the half-mile and the two-mile radius.

Q. And if you flip to Tab Number 4 in your exhibit packet, does that reflect the tabulation of data for each of those wells that you've identified in that

half-mile area of review?

A. Yes.

Q. And upon review of those wells, have you identified any that are plugged and abandoned or any, for that matter, that actually penetrate the injection interval in this area?

A. None of those wells penetrate the injection well -- or injection zone.

Q. And based on that, is it your opinion that there is no risk or concern or need for remedial work of any kind on any of these wells or that they will -- they will not function as a conduit for -- for fluids out of the injection zone?

A. Correct.

Q. Let's talk about the operation and well design here. Flipping to, if you would, Tab Number 2 on your exhibit packet, review for the examiners what the proposed well construction and design is for this well.

A. Yes. Proposed well construction is drilling to approximately 1,500 feet in a 12-1/4-inch hole and setting 9-5/8 surface casing and cementing that back to surface to cover the USVWs and all freshwater and drinking water supplies, and then drilling the well to a total depth of 6,200 feet and setting 6,200 feet of 7-inch casing and cementing that back to surface.

Q. And in this case, the tubing will be 4-1/2 inch; is that right?

A. And then after completion of the well, tubing and packer will be run to approximately a depth of 4,600 feet, 4-1/2-inch injection tubing and packer.

Q. Now, let's talk about the operational parameters for the well. Turning to Tab Number 5 in your exhibit packet, just referring to that -- the information there, will you review for the examiners what the proposed rates and surface injection pressures will be for this well?

A. The average daily injection rate is estimated to be 15,000 barrels a day. The maximum daily injection rate would be limited by the maximum allowable surface injection pressure. The maximum allowable surface injection pressure is calculated at 926 psi, and that's based on the regulatory requirement of .2 psi per foot.

Q. In your opinion, is that a guidance -- or mandated -- conservative for this area?

A. Yes.

Q. In your opinion, based on your review, can the volumes that are expected to be -- that are estimated to be injected here, can they be accepted by this well without exceeding that surface injection pressure limitation?

A. Yes.

Q. If Goodnight Midstream requires an increase in injection pressure, will they request an OCD-witnessed step-rate test to do so?

A. Yes.

Q. In your opinion, is the casing design and operation that's proposed for this well and the cement plan protective of the freshwater sources within the area?

A. Yes.

Q. Let's talk about how Goodnight Midstream will be monitor the integrity of the wellbore operations. Is there a plan for that?

A. Yes. That would be done -- once the tubing and packer has been set and the well demonstrates mechanical-integrity testing by the standard annulus pressure test, then an electronic SCADA system will be installed on the wellhead so the injection tubing pressure and the annular pressure will be monitored continuously to maintain mechanical integrity.

Q. And prior to injection, will the company undertake confirmation of any kind of cement job that's been performed?

A. Yes. A cement bond log will be performed on the 7-inch production casing.

Q. In your opinion, will the granting of this application be in the best interest of conservation resources and protection against waste and the protection of correlative rights?

A. Yes.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, at this time I would pass the witness. I have no further questions.

EXAMINER GOETZE: Ms. Antillon?

MS. ANTILLON: No questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER GOETZE:

Q. Well, seeing how this is the fourth one you've been up here for and it's a pretty basic design --

A. Sure.

Q. -- I don't have any questions. But I do thank you for the effort to work with just the Glorieta and the San Andres, and if you wish to move on to deeper zones, that will be treated as a separate well.

A. Sure.

Q. That makes our lives a lot easier.

So on that note, I have no questions.

MR. RANKIN: With that, Mr. Examiner, we ask that Case Number 20558 be taken under advisement by the Division.

EXAMINER GOETZE: And the State Land Office

wishes to make a statement?

MS. ANTILLON: It does.

The State Land Office wants to say it's reviewing this application and has concerns with the saltwater disposal spacing and proximity to State Trust Land.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, I think I moved the admission of Exhibits A, B and C.

EXAMINER GOETZE: I think we've got one that's out there. I believe the last one, Number C -- Letter C has not been entered, but I didn't know if you thought that was important, the notice.

MR. RANKIN: I will ask that -- I think we reviewed it with Mr. Alleman, but I will ask that Exhibit C be admitted to the record. It's my affidavit reflecting that notice was provided to the parties who objected to the administrative application.

MS. ANTILLON: No objection.

EXAMINER GOETZE: So in the midst of a flurry of activity, we will go ahead and enter C into record.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you.

(Goodnight Midstream Permian, LLC Exhibit C is offered and admitted into evidence.)

EXAMINER GOETZE: And with that, Case

Number 20558 is taken under advisement.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your patience.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you for your time.

(Case Number 20558 concludes, 12:17 p.m.)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, MARY C. HANKINS, Certified Court Reporter, New Mexico Certified Court Reporter No. 20, and Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported the foregoing proceedings in stenographic shorthand and that the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of those proceedings that were reduced to printed form by me to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the Reporter's Record of the proceedings truly and accurately reflects the exhibits, if any, offered by the respective parties.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this case and that I have no interest in the final disposition of this case.

DATED THIS 27th day of June 2019.

MARY C. HANKINS, CCR, RPR
Certified Court Reporter
New Mexico CCR No. 20
Date of CCR Expiration: 12/31/2019
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters