

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 Matador Production.  
Company for Compulsory Pooling,  
Lea County, New Mexico Case No. 22500

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022

STATUS CONFERENCE

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, William Brancard, Esq., Hearing Examiner, Leonard Lowe Technical Examiner, on Thursday, March 17, 2022, via Webex Virtual Conferencing Platform hosted by the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department

Reported by: Mary Therese Macfarlane  
New Mexico CCR #122  
PAUL BACA COURT REPORTERS  
500 Fourth Street NW, Suite 105  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102  
(505) 843-9241

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR MATADOR PRODUCTION COMPANY:

Adam G. Rankin, Esq.  
Holland & Hart  
110 North Guadalupe, Suite 1  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501  
(505) 988-4421  
agrarkin@hollandhart.com.

FOR DAVID PETROLEUM:

Jaclyn McLean, Esq.  
Hinkle Shanor, LLP  
P.O. Box 2068  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-2068  
(505) 982-4544.  
jmclean@hinklelawfirmcom

FOR SOUTH FIFTH ENERGY, LLC.

Stuart Carter, Manager  
P.O. Box 1121  
Wilcox, AZ 85644  
(520)400-4557  
209Sofie@gmail.com

C O N T E N T S

CASE NO. 22500	PAGE
CASE CALLED:	3
STATEMENT BY EXAMINER BRANCARD:	3
STATEMENT BY MR. RANKIN:	4
CONTINUED TO 04/07/2022	7
INQUIRY By EXAMINER LOWE:	7
RESPONSE BY MR. RANKIN:	8

1 (Time noted 8:26 a.m.)

2 EXAMINER BRANCARD: All right. Now we have a  
3 series of cases that were continued from our prior hearing  
4 March 3rd, and we will start with No. 8 on the worksheet,  
5 Case 22500, Matador Production Company.

6 MR. RANKIN: Good morning, Mr. Examiner. May it  
7 please the Division, Adam Rankin appearing on behalf of  
8 the applicant in this case.

9 MR. BRANCARD: All right. Do we have an entry  
10 from David Petroleum?

11 MS. McLEAN: Yes. Jackie McClean for David  
12 Petroleum.

13 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you, Ms. McLean.  
14 Then South Fifth Energy.

15 MR. CARTER: Yes, sir. This is Stuart Carter  
16 again.

17 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

18 Are there any other interested persons in  
19 Case 22500? (Note: No response.)

20 Okay. Mr. Rankin, I think we need to  
21 apologize to you, because we were saying we were going to  
22 get back to you on this case, but our engineers have been  
23 tied up in nasty waste-pool stuff, so we have not gotten  
24 back to you about this case in the interim.

25 So where are we? I think where we are is

1 the question we were left with, which was whether you're  
2 required, your client is required to file geologic  
3 evidence in this case, as is normal in an affidavit case  
4 for compulsory pooling. And I believe after consulting  
5 with the engineers they believe that that is appropriate,  
6 that all cases for compulsory pooling, we have not made  
7 any kind of distinction between horizontal and vertical,  
8 so we do need geologic evidence in this case.

9 MR. RANKIN: Okay. Mr. Examiner, I'm happy to  
10 do that. I'll just -- you know one point of explanation I  
11 think that may help: The distinction between the  
12 horizontal cases and the vertical cases is that where  
13 operators are seeking pooling for vertical cases,  
14 generally the pooling is the smallest -- you know, you  
15 have a single spacing unit that you're pooling, and  
16 generally you're confined or constrained by the pool rules  
17 for whatever formation you're targeting. And generally  
18 speaking, you know, if it's 40-acre pooling or -- 40-acre  
19 spacing or 80-acre spacing, that's the smallest unit size  
20 that you can produce on.

21 So for that reason, because you can't go  
22 any smaller, there was never a need to present any  
23 geologic evidence, because that was the smallest spacing  
24 size, whereas horizontal wells, you were generally  
25 combining more than one tract or spacing unit to create a

1 spacing unit for horizontal well development, and for that  
2 reason the Division had required geologic evidence to  
3 demonstrate that each of the tracts would contribute more  
4 or less equally to the production in the well.

5 So for that reason traditionally vertical  
6 wells never required geologic evidence, because you were  
7 targeting and producing from the smallest available tract,  
8 which is governed by the spacing rules for the pool.

9 So for that reason we did not prepare or  
10 present any geologic evidence, because we were already  
11 constrained to an 80-acre spacing unit, in which case here  
12 it was -- interest was uniform across an undivided  
13 interest.

14 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Well, I appreciate that, and  
15 I think -- you know, when we developed this checklist two  
16 years ago, or more, I think the idea was that we'll give  
17 it a try and see if there needs to be changes in the  
18 future, and we may need to go back and relook at this  
19 checklist for the affidavit process.

20 I think when we get to one of our cases  
21 later on I will discuss some ideas for Notice that we may  
22 want to update also on our checklist.

23 So I think that's worth looking at, and I  
24 think we will look at that in the future, Mr. Rankin.

25 You know, the other issue surrounding this

1 case that I'm aware of relate to a nonstandard location,  
2 but I think we will be handling all of that  
3 administratively. There has been a fair amount of  
4 discussion in-house about that, so I think if there are  
5 questions, you can get back to your client directly on  
6 that application rather than going through the hearing  
7 process on that, which is not really part of this hearing  
8 process. So --

9 MR. RANKIN: Right. Yeah, Mr. Lowe has reached  
10 out with one question which I believe we've addressed, and  
11 so hopefully, you know, if he has any more questions about  
12 the NSL we would be able to provide prompt responses to  
13 him. But in the meantime we will prepare the geologic  
14 affidavit and exhibit and submit that to the portal and  
15 serve all parties.

16 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. What time frame do  
17 you think you can work that on so we can continue this  
18 case till some point.

19 MR. RANKIN: Well, I'm sure the client would  
20 like to get that done as quickly as possible, so I will --  
21 how about we continue it two weeks, if that's okay with  
22 Marlene, if we can continue it two weeks, and then I'll  
23 plan to get it filed the early part of next week.

24 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. So this would be  
25 continued to April 7th.

1 MR. RANKIN: Yes, please.

2 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Our April dockets are  
3 overflowing, each with over 130 cases right now. But, you  
4 know, today we started with 120, now we're down to 28.

5 But I guess that's spring break.

6 So I'll go around to the other parties.

7 David Petroleum, any concerns or questions  
8 at this point.

9 MS. McLEAN: No issues from David Petroleum at  
10 this point.

11 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. South Fifth  
12 Energy?

13 MR. CARTER: Nothing at this point. Thank you.

14 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

15 Any other persons on Case 22500?

16 Hearing none, this case will be continued  
17 to April 7th for submittal and review on the geologic  
18 evidence at that time. Thank you.

19 EXAMINER LOWE: I've got a question.

20 EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yes. Yes, Mr. Lowe. I'm  
21 sorry.

22 EXAMINER LOWE: I have one question for  
23 Mr. Rankin. Good morning, Mr. Rankin.

24 MR. RANKIN: Hi, Leonard. Good morning.

25 EXAMINER LOWE: Just a curious question on the

1 well that -- the Monika well?

2 Why was it deviated, its surface location  
3 deviated off, I guess, the bottomhole location.

4 MR. RANKIN: I can tell you why I understand  
5 that the bottomhole location is targeted for where it is.  
6 I can't tell you why the surface location is where it is.  
7 I believe it may be -- you know, speculating, it may be  
8 topographical or just a surface issue. I think I recall  
9 Mr. Carter suggesting that there may have been an  
10 irrigation center pivot that they had to avoid, so there  
11 may have been some surface issues that required moving the  
12 location to avoid surface issues.

13 As to the bottomhole location, Matador has  
14 identified a -- and I don't have the correct geologic term  
15 for it, but like a bubble or a mound or a point of  
16 interest that they believe has the most prospective, is  
17 the most prospective in that zone, so they had to target  
18 it by a directional location.

19 EXAMINER LOWE: Okay. All right. That was the  
20 only question I've got. Thank you.

21 EXAMINER BRANCARD: So it seems your geologic  
22 evidence might help our nonstandard analysis also, Mr.  
23 Rankin.

24 MR. RANKIN: Yes, Mr. Examiner. Back in the day  
25 we used to do all these together, I guess at the hearing,



1 but I understand that's not the way we are doing it now,  
2 which is fine.

3 EXAMINER BRANCARD: And if there's an objection,  
4 obviously you could do that. I mean, sometimes people do  
5 combine these two, but it's rare.

6 Anyway, thank you.

7 MR. RANKIN: Thank you.

8 (Time noted 8:32 a.m.)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1     STATE OF NEW MEXICO             )  
2   : ss  
3     COUNTY OF TAOS                 )

4

5   REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

6                     I, MARY THERESE MACFARLANE, New Mexico Reporter  
7     CCR No. 122, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that on Thursday, March 17,  
8     2022, the proceedings in the above-captioned matter were  
9     taken before me; that I did report in stenographic  
10    shorthand the proceedings set forth herein, and the  
11    foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription to  
12    the best of my ability and control.

13                    I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by  
14    nor related to nor contracted with (unless excepted by the  
15    rules) any of the parties or attorneys in this case, and  
16    that I have no interest whatsoever in the final  
17    disposition of this case in any court.

18   /s/ccr/Mary Therese Macfarlane\_\_\_\_\_

19   MARY THERESE MACFARLANE, CCR  
20   NM Certified Court Reporter No. 122  
  License Expires: 12/31/2022

21

22

23

24

25