		Pä	age 2
1	APPEARANCES		_
2	FOR THE APPLICANT:		
3	HOLLAND & HART, LLP		
4	MICHAEL FELDEWERT, ESQ. 110 North Guadalupe, Suite 1		
5	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 (505) 988-4421		
6			
7	INDEX	PAGE	
8	EXHIBITS 1 AND 2 ADMITTED	6	
9		-	
10	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	7	
11			
12			
13			
14		·	
15			
16	·		
17			
18			•
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

- 1 EXAMINER BROOKS: At this time we'll call
- 2 Case 14731, Application of EOG Resources, Inc., for
- 3 approval of additional horizontal wells in the Bone
- 4 Spring formation within the Potash area, Eddy County, New
- 5 Mexico.
- 6 Call for appearances.
- 7 MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Examiner, Michael
- 8 Feldewert, with Holland & Hart, here on behalf of EOG
- 9 Resources, Inc.
- 10 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yes, sir.
- MR. FELDEWERT: If I may approach?
- 12 EXAMINER BROOKS: Per your prehearing
- 13 statement, I assume you have no witnesses?
- MR. FELDEWERT: Correct. Mr. Examiner, as
- 15 you know, in January 2011, under Order Number R-13354,
- 16 which was entered in Case Number 14584, this Division
- 17 approved three 160-acre project areas for horizontal oil
- 18 wells in the Turkey Track Bone Springs Pool in Section
- 19 23, 19 South, 29 East.
- There were three wells that were approved:
- 21 The Parkway 23 State Com Well Number 2H, which was
- 22 dedicated -- which has been drilled and which is
- 23 dedicated to the north half of the north half of Section
- 24 23. The second well is Parkway 23 State Com Well Number
- 25 3H, which has been drilled and dedicated to the south

- 1 half of the north half of Section 23. And the third well
- 2 that was approved by that order was the Parkway State
- 3 Well Number 4H, which is drilled and is dedicated to the
- 4 south half of the south half of Section 23.
- 5 The order from the Division in Case Number
- 6 14584 was necessary because these wells are in the Potash
- 7 area, and Intrepid Potash objected to those wells,
- 8 claiming that it was within a half mile of a purported
- 9 LMR. The Division therefore set it for hearing.
- 10 Intrepid did not appear. The Division took testimony and
- 11 it issued its order.
- This pool, Mr. Examiner, is governed by your
- 13 general statewide rules which allow up to four oil wells
- 14 per spacing unit. So in June of 2011, EOG submitted APDs
- 15 for an additional horizontal well to be completed in the
- 16 same pool in each of these three same spacing units. And
- 17 I've attached to the pre-hearing statement the C-102s
- 18 which ask for an additional well in each of these
- 19 approved spacing units. All of these additional wells
- 20 are at standard locations.
- The Division's district office has denied
- 22 these applications for the same reasons that it denied
- 23 the initial wells in each of these spacing units? And
- 24 that is, their records show that these locations are
- within a half mile of Intrepid's purported LMR.

- 1 So we filed this current application for
- 2 approval of these additional wells. EOG Exhibit 1 is the
- 3 notice affidavit for notice to Intrepid Potash Company of
- 4 this hearing and this application. And EOG Exhibit 2 is
- 5 the affidavit of publication in the newspaper of general
- 6 circulation in the area. I move the admission of these
- 7 two exhibits.
- 8 And I ask the Division to take note of the
- 9 testimony that was provided in Case Number 14584, which
- 10 resulted in the prior order, because that record supports
- 11 the additional wells in the same spacing units, in the
- 12 same pools at similar locations.
- So we ask that you amend existing Order Number
- 14 R-13354 to include these additional three wells which are
- 15 identified, Mr. Examiner, with more specificity in our
- 16 prehearing statement and the C-102s attached to that
- 17 prehearing statement.
- 18 EXAMINER BROOKS: You've handed me three
- 19 documents, and I'm trying to see -- Exhibit 1 is the
- 20 affidavit of notice, and your publication is attached to
- 21 it as Exhibit 2.
- MR. FELDEWERT: Correct.
- 23 EXAMINER BROOKS: The order is not marked
- 24 as an exhibit. And the other one is your prehearing
- 25 statement.