(505) 843-9241

25

```
Page 2
 1
                             APPEARANCES
 2
     FOR APPLICANT COG OPERATING, LLC:
 3
          MICHAEL H. FELDEWERT, ESQ.
          HOLLAND & HART
          110 North Guadalupe, Suite 1
 4
          Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
          (505) 988-4421
 5
          mfeldewert@hollandhart.com
 6
 7
     FOR YATES BROTHERS, SUGARBERRY and KATY PIPELINE:
 8
          JAMES G. BRUCE, ESO.
          Post Office Box 1056
 9
          Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
          (505) 982-2043
10
          jamesbruc@aol.com
11
     FOR EOG RESOURCES:
12
          ERNEST L. PADILLA, ESQ.
          PADILLA LAW FIRM, P.A.
13
          1512 South St. Francis Drive
          Post Office Box 2523
14
          Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
          (505) 988-7577
15
          epadillaplf@qwestoffice.net
16
     FOR INLAND TITLE and OXY (OCCIDENTAL PERMIAN):
17
          GERMAINE R. CHAPPELLE, ESO.
          GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.
18
          1233 Paseo de Peralta
          Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-2758
19
          (505) 982-9523
          germaine.chappelle@gknet.com
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		Page 3
1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3	Case Numbers 15035 and 15044 Called	4
4	Presentation by Mr. Feldewert/Motion for Remand	4
5	Proceedings Conclude	10
6	Certificate of Court Reporter	11
7		
8		
9		
10	EXHIBITS OFFERED AND ADMITTED	
11	(No exhibits.)	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		:
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

- 1 (9:05 a.m.)
- 2 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: I now call Case 15035,
- 3 which has been consolidated with Case 15044. These are
- 4 de novo cases that I understand we have some issues
- 5 here. These are applications of COG Operating, LLC for
- 6 a nonstandard spacing and proration unit and compulsory
- 7 pooling and approval of nonstandard locations for two
- 8 wells.
- 9 Would you care to explain what we are doing
- 10 today?
- MR. FELDEWERT: Yes, Madam Chair. Michael
- 12 Feldewert appearing on behalf of COG Operating, LLC.
- 13 And also in the room are the attorneys for the other
- 14 parties to the appeal and also for one of the parties
- 15 that appeared in the case below.
- 16 What I'm able to report is after some
- 17 tireless and sustained and dedicated efforts by
- 18 Ms. Chappelle, and particularly by Mr. Bruce even after
- 19 he withdrew from the case, the parties were able to
- 20 finally agree on a development plan for the acreage in
- 21 question. And since a picture is worth a thousand
- 22 words, if you have our package, COG's exhibits, Exhibit
- 23 Number 2 depicts the acreage in guestion. And
- 24 essentially what you'll see on there are Sections 5 and
- 25 8 in Township 26 South, Range 34 East, in Lea County.

- 1 I'm not going to admit this exhibit. I just want to use
- 2 it for demonstrative purposes.
- Most of that acreage is covered by a single
- 4 federal lease, and it's the acreage there in the north
- 5 half-north half of Section 5, which is fee acreage. And
- 6 the order that was entered by the Division essentially
- 7 approved the development plan that you see depicted
- 8 here, one of which involved the 5H, which is a well that
- 9 has been drilled. The 8H was drilled sometime ago
- 10 before a lot of the rules went into effect. And then
- 11 there are three other additional wells involved as
- 12 stand-ups, and then the 1H was a lay-down in the north
- 13 half-north half.
- 14 The approval of that -- that case was
- 15 controversial. The order was appealed by the parties in
- 16 the north half-north half of the area, but they have now
- 17 been able to reach a resolution on the development of
- 18 this acreage, and essentially it's going to involve the
- 19 drilling of some additional stand-up wells that will
- 20 penetrate all of the 40-acre tracts in the north
- 21 half-north half of the section. So that has been --
- 22 that development plan has been agreed upon by all
- 23 parties to the appeal, but it will require amendments to
- 24 the existing order and essentially keep the approvals
- 25 for the existing 5H well, and then there would no longer

- 1 be the need for the approvals granted for the 6H well
- 2 that you see on here or the 1H well that you see in the
- 3 north half-north half.
- 4 If we get this remanded down to the
- 5 Division level, an amendment can be made to the order
- 6 that would accomplish the settlement that was reached by
- 7 the parties.
- 8 So we're here today to request that the
- 9 Commission remand this case back to the Division so that
- 10 the parties can then work with the Division in issuing a
- 11 revised order that will accomplish the settlement that
- 12 was reached by the parties.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: Are there other
- 14 appearances?
- MR. BRUCE: Madam Chair, Jim Bruce on
- 16 behalf of Yates Brothers, Sugarberry and Katy Pipeline.
- 17 MR. PADILLA: Madam Chair, Ernest L.
- 18 Padilla for EOG Resources. We have just been looking at
- 19 this case. We have not participated, and whatever Yates
- 20 Brothers and COG agree to would be fine with us.
- MS. CHAPPELLE: Good morning, Chairman and
- 22 Commissioners.
- 23 Germaine Chappelle representing Inland
- 24 Title and OXY, Occidental Permian. And we support the
- 25 settlement in this and the remand.

- 1 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: Mr. Bruce,
- 2 Mr. Padilla, do you agree with the remand and the
- 3 settlement?
- 4 MR. PADILLA: Yes, Madam Chair.
- 5 MR. BRUCE: Yes, Madam Chair.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: This is not an
- 7 evidentiary hearing at all then. So do we have a motion
- 8 for continuance that we need to deal with?
- 9 MR. BRUCE: I did withdraw that motion for
- 10 continuance, Madam Chair, due to the settlement. And I
- 11 think Mr. Feldewert and Ms. Chappelle and Ms. Munds-Dry
- 12 and I worked what seemed like nonstop for two weeks to
- 13 take care of this, so please don't ask us what we did,
- 14 but we did it (laughter).
- 15 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: So, Mr. Brancard, do
- 16 we just vote on remanding it back to the Examiner?
- MR. BRANCARD: I quess we'll take
- 18 Mr. Feldewert's presentation as a motion for a remand
- 19 and treat it as that.
- MR. FELDEWERT: Yes. We would formally
- 21 request that the Commission remand the case down to the
- 22 Division for the entry of an amended order consistent
- 23 with the parties' settlement.
- MR. BRANCARD: I guess perhaps the way to
- 25 do this is -- we can do a very simple order remanding,

- 1 but perhaps it would be best that the parties attach to
- 2 that a very simple stipulation that says whatever you
- 3 want to say -- we've reached some sort of agreement
- 4 about it, and we would like to present this to the
- 5 Hearing Examiners -- rather than the Commission trying
- 6 to characterize what you've agreed to. I don't know
- 7 that you need to provide any details --
- 8 MR. FELDEWERT: Right.
- 9 MR. BRANCARD: -- other than you have a
- 10 framework that you want to present to the Division
- 11 Hearing Examiner and attach that stipulation as part of
- 12 the order for the Commission.
- MR. FELDEWERT: We can do that, certainly.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: Then in that case --
- MR. BRANCARD: Is there a motion before us?
- 16 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: Commissioners, do you
- 17 have any issues --
- 18 COMMISSIONER BALCH: I don't have any
- 19 issue.
- 20 COMMISSIONER WARNELL: No issues.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: Okay. Well, then we
- 22 ask for a draft order to be due before our next meeting,
- 23 which is August 17th.
- MR. BRANCARD: Is there a need to do this
- 25 quickly?

## PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS 500 FOURTH STREET NW - SUITE 105, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87102

CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: Then do I hear a

Not from me, Madam Chair.

MR. FELDEWERT:

motion for us to adjourn?

23

24

25

	Page 10	
1	COMMISSIONER BALCH: I'll make a motion to	
2	adjourn.	
3	COMMISSIONER WARNELL: Second that motion.	
4	CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: All those in favor?	
5	(Ayes are unanimous.)	
6	CHAIRPERSON BAILEY: We are adjourned.	
7	Thank you very much.	
8	(Case Numbers 15035 and 15044 conclude,	
9	9:12 a.m.)	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		