

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:

ORIGINAL

CASE, 15327

APPLICATION OF COG OPERATING, LLC, FOR
A NON-STANDARD SPACING AND PRORATION UNIT
AND COMPULSORY POOLING, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

JUNE 25, 2015

Santa Fe, New Mexico

RECEIVED OGD
2015 JUL 14 P 3:22

BEFORE: MICHAEL McMILLAN, CHIEF EXAMINER
WILLIAM V. JONES, EXAMINER
GABRIEL WADE, LEGAL EXAMINER

This matter came on for hearing before the
New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, Michael McMillan,
Chief Examiner, William V. Jones, Examiner, and Gabriel
Wade, Legal Examiner, on June 25, 2015, 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: ELLEN H. ALLANIC
NEW MEXICO CCR 100
CALIFORNIA CSR 8670
PAUL BACA COURT REPORTERS
500 Fourth Street, NW
Suite 105
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

A P P E A R A N C E S

1 For the Applicant

2 Michael Feldewert, Esq.
 3 Holland & Hart
 4 110 North Guadalupe
 Suite 1
 5 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
 (505) 983-6043
 6 mfeldewert@hollandhart.com

I N D E X

9 CASE NUMBER 15327 CALLED

10 COG OPERATING, LLC, CASE-IN-CHIEF:

11 WITNESS ASHLEY ROUSH

	Direct	Redirect	Further
13 By Mr. Feldewert	5		

	Direct	Redirect	Further
16 WITNESS CANDICE PETTIJOHN			

17 By Mr. Feldewert	20		
---------------------	----	--	--

19 By Examiner Jones	Examination		
	26		

		PAGE
21 Reporter's Certificate		28

EXHIBIT INDEX

Exhibits Offered and Admitted.

	PAGE
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 1	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 2	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 3	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 4	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 5	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 6	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 7	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 8	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 9	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 10	19
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 11	25
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 12	25
COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBIT 13	25

1 (Time noted 10:42 a.m.)

2 EXAMINER McMILLAN: We are going to do
3 things differently. We are going to call cases 15327,
4 Application of COG Operating, LLC, for a non-standard
5 spacing and proration unit and compulsory pooling, Lea
6 County, New Mexico.

7 Call for appearances.

8 MR. FELDEWERT: May it please, Examiner,
9 Michael Feldewert with the Santa Fe Office of Holland
10 and Hart, appearing on behalf of the applicant.

11 And I have two witnesses here today.

12 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Please have them sworn
13 in at this time. Thank you.

14 (Whereupon, the presenting witness was
15 administered the oath.)

16 EXAMINER McMILLAN: I know this is
17 non-standard protocol, but you're not combining the
18 cases, are you?

19 MR. FELDEWERT: No. And there are reasons
20 for that. I tried to but it wouldn't work.

21 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Thank you.

22 ASHLEY ROUSH
23 having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified
24 as follows:

25 ---oOo---

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FELDEWERT:

Q. Please state your name and identify by whom you are employed and in what capacity.

A. My name is Ashley Roush, and I'm employed by COG Operating, LLC, as a landman.

Q. How long have you been a landman with COG Operating?

A. Since June of 2013.

Q. Have your responsibilities included the Permian Basin of New Mexico?

A. Yes.

Q. And, Ms. Roush, have you had the opportunity to previously testify before this Division?

A. No, I haven't.

Q. Would you please provide the Examiners with your educational background.

A. I graduated from Texas Tech University in May of 2013 with my energy commerce degree.

Q. And then you started with COG upon graduation?

A. Yes, in June of 2015.

Q. Are you a member of any professional organization or affiliations?

A. I am a member of the Permian Basin Landman's Association and the American Association of Professional

1 Landmen.

2 Q. How long have you been a member of the PBLA?

3 A. From June of 2013.

4 Q. And what about the AAPL?

5 A. From the fall of 2012.

6 Q. Are you familiar with the application that has
7 been filed in this case?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And are you familiar with the status of the lands
10 in the subject area?

11 A. Yes.

12 MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Examiner, I would tender
13 Ms. Roush as an expert witness in petroleum land
14 matters.

15 EXAMINER McMILLAN: I guess we will have to,
16 but, you know, you did graduate from Texas Tech which is
17 not a good thing -- if she got the master's I'd accept
18 it.

19 MR. FELDEWERT: You can put an asterisk by
20 it if you'd like.

21 EXAMINER McMILLAN: That would be good.

22 Q. Would you be so kind to turn to what's been
23 marked as COG Exhibit 1. First identify this exhibit
24 and then explain what the company seeks in this
25 application.

1 A. This is the C-102 filed for our Sneed 9 Federal
2 Com 23H Well for the mile and a quarter lateral. We
3 seek to create a 200 acre non-standard spacing unit,
4 pooling the south half of the north half of section nine
5 and the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of
6 section ten, Township 17 South, Range 32 East, Lea
7 County, New Mexico, pooling the uncommitted mineral
8 interest owners within the Yeso Formation from
9 5,000 feet to the base of the Blinebry.

10 Q. Why are you only pooling from 5,000 feet to the
11 base of the Blinebry?

12 A. We have depth severances within the Yeso in this
13 section and ownership is different from 5,000 to the
14 base of the Blinebry and below the base of the Blinebry.
15 So we didn't include those owners that did not own in
16 our producing formation.

17 Q. Is it your understanding that the Yeso Formation
18 actually starts lower than 5,000 feet?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. But you have a depth severance issue of 5,000
21 feet?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And then you also mentioned the base of the
24 Blinebry --

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. -- which is itself an interval within the Yeso
2 Formation?

3 A. Within the Yeso, yes, sir.

4 Q. Does Exhibit 1 provide the Examiner with the API
5 numbers of the well?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And does it also provide the Examiner with the
8 pool and the pool code?

9 A. Yes. It's the Maljamar Yeso West, Pool Code
10 44500.

11 Q. Is this particular pool governed by the Division
12 statewide rules?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. And will the completed interval for this well
15 comply with the 330-foot setback requirements?

16 A. Yes. The completed interval is 330 feet away
17 from the lease line.

18 Q. What is the nature of the acreage involved in
19 sections nine and ten?

20 A. It is a federal and fee.

21 Q. Now, Exhibit 1 reflects, as you mentioned, that
22 the company seeks to drill a mile and a quarter lateral
23 extending into the southwest quarter of the northwest
24 quarter of section ten?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. If I turn to what's been marked as COG Exhibit 2,
2 does this help explain why the company is seeking to
3 drill a mile and a quarter?

4 A. Yes, it does.

5 Q. And, first off, why don't you identify what all
6 the colors mean?

7 A. The yellow is COG's ownership. The red dots are
8 Paddock wells. And there is one horizontal product
9 producer. And then the red and blue dots represent
10 vertical Paddock and Blinebry vertical wells.

11 Q. So you have existing vertical production in this
12 particular area?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And as you extend this well into the southwest
15 quarter of the -- the southwest quarter of the northwest
16 quarter of section ten, you're going to be developing
17 one of the 40-acre tracts that's not currently
18 developed?

19 A. It has current vertical production within the
20 southwest of the northwest.

21 Q. Okay. What are the plans with respect to the
22 acreage in the northeast quarter of the northwest
23 quarter of section ten?

24 A. We plan in the east half of the west half of
25 section 10 to drill stand-up horizontal wells.

1 Q. And then what about that northeast quarter of the
2 northwest quarter?

3 A: We have plans for the -- for a mile and a quarter
4 well in the north half, north half drilled into the
5 section ten for a mile and a quarter.

6 Q. Okay. So this is part of an overall plan to
7 develop what is currently undeveloped within section
8 ten?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. If I then turn to what has been marked as COG
11 Exhibit 3, is this a lease tract map that identifies a
12 company's interest in the uncommitted interest owners in
13 the proposed spacing unit?

14 A. Yes, it is.

15 Q. And does it identify the interest first by tract
16 and then the consolidated interest in the spacing unit?

17 A. Yes, it does.

18 Q. Now, you show on here that there are six groups
19 of uncommitted owners?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. You have your working interest owners highlighted
22 in yellow?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And then the next lines deal with, it looks like,
25 OORI, is that overriding royalty interests?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And are those overriding royalty interests whose
3 instruments do not currently provide for pooling or
4 communitization?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And then you have RI, is that royalty interest?

7 A. Yes, it is.

8 Q. Are those interest owners whose leases do not
9 provide for pooling?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And then you have NPRI, what does that stand for?

12 A. Nonparticipating royalty interests.

13 Q. Can you explain what those are?

14 A. This is basically an assignment of the royalty.
15 So they've assigned out a portion of their royalty
16 interest to these people.

17 Q. Okay. And then you have a group of unmarketable
18 title. Are those interest owners that you've located
19 that have some issues associated with their probate or
20 the assignment of their interest from one generation to
21 the next?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And then finally at the bottom here your last
24 group is a record title owner?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. That is a company that just has the record title
2 in the lease?

3 A. Yes, in the federal lease.

4 Q. And no other operating rights?

5 A. No operating rights.

6 Q. Returning then to that first group, the working
7 interest owners, was the company able to locate all of
8 these cost bearing working interest owners?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. If I turn to what has been marked as COG
11 Exhibit 4, is this the well proposal letter that was
12 sent to the working interest owners for this well?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. And did you include an AFE?

15 A. We did.

16 Q. And are all those costs reflected on an AFE
17 consistent with what the company has incurred for
18 drilling similar horizontal wells in the area?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Is it also about -- the first page of this
21 exhibit, halfway down in this letter, does it identify
22 the overhead and the administrative rates that the
23 company seeks?

24 A. Yes, it does. It's 7,000 a month for drilling
25 and 700 a month for production.

1 Q. And are these rates consistent with what other
2 operators are charging for similar wells?

3 A. Yes, they are.

4 Q. In addition to sending out this well proposal
5 letter, what other efforts did the company undertake to
6 reach an agreement with these working interest owners?

7 A. For Occidental Permian Ltd. Partnership, we sent
8 them an JOA and a communitization agreement. And we are
9 currently working out a deal on acquiring their acreage.
10 For Chevron, U.S.A. we also sent them a JOA and a
11 communitization agreement. And I called them and
12 e-mailed them numerous times and just heard back from
13 them last week. And they are currently reviewing the
14 JOA. And Devon Energy Production has elected to
15 participate in a well, and we are currently working on
16 getting the JOA signed.

17 Q. Has Devon actually signed the AFE?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. I want to return to the remaining groups, which
20 were all non-cost-bearing interests.

21 In the course of your study in putting the
22 interest owners together, did you come across certain
23 leases that not only did not provide for pooling but
24 also that required consent prior to pooling?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And did you attempt to either modify the lease
2 that did not provide pooling or obtain the necessary
3 consent?

4 A. Yes. For the leases that do not have any pooling
5 language, we sent them lease amendments to add in a
6 pooling provision. And the leases that required consent
7 to pool, we sent them a document of consent to pool for
8 them to sign.

9 Q. If I turn to COG Exhibit 5, is that an example of
10 a letter that you sent out to the royalty interest
11 owners in which you sought amendments to their leases?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. I then turn to what is marked COG Exhibit 6. Is
14 that an example of the letter that was sent to the
15 lessees that required consent to pooling?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And the owners that have not returned the
18 amendments or provided the consents, those are the ones
19 that you have listed for pooling in Exhibit 3?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. Another group of non-cost-bearing interests are
22 the overriding royalty interests, correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And did you send letters to those interest owners
25 seeking authority to communitize the federal lease?

1 A. Yes. We sent them a ratification to the
2 communitization agreement.

3 Q. If I turn to what has been marked as COG
4 Exhibit 7, is this an example of a letter that was sent
5 to the overriding royalty interest owners that did not,
6 by virtue of their instrument, authorize
7 communitization?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And again the overriding royalty interests that
10 you list on COG Exhibit 3 are the parties that did not
11 return the necessary ratifications?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Finally, did you also attempt to reach an
14 agreement for consolidation with the non-cost-bearing
15 record title owner?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. I will turn to what's been marked as COG
18 Exhibit 8. Is that a letter that was sent to that
19 non-cost-bearing record title owner seeking their
20 concurrence in communitization?

21 A. Yes, it is.

22 Q. And by virtue of the fact that they are on your
23 pool party list, had you not gotten a response?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. Of all these interests that you have to examine

1 here, are there certain interests that the company was
2 unable to locate or, as we pointed out, had title issues
3 associated with their interest?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. With respect to the parties that you were unable
6 to locate, what efforts did the company undertake to
7 locate these interest owners?

8 A. We searched through our internal databases, our
9 title opinions. We had a broker go to the county
10 courthouse to check for the addresses and to use their
11 own software databases to check. And we were unable to
12 locate an address.

13 Q. And for those interest owners that you were
14 unable to locate, did you provide notice of this hearing
15 by publication by name?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Turn to what has been marked as COG Exhibit 9.
18 Is that an affidavit of publication for this application
19 of hearing directed by name to these unlocatable
20 parties?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And is it the case that because of the newspaper
23 we were dealing with, that they were not able to get
24 this published in the necessary timeframe in advance of
25 this hearing?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And for that reason is it necessary to continue
3 for two weeks to allow the ten-day publication notice to
4 run?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Now in preparation for this hearing, did the
7 company also notify or identify the lease mineral
8 interest owners in 40-acre tracts surrounding their
9 proposed non-standard spacing unit?

10 A. Yes, they did.

11 Q. And did the company include those interest owners
12 in the notice of this hearing?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. You also mention that you had a depth severance
15 issue; correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And as I understand it, it affects interest
18 owners in the Yeso Formation below the base of the
19 Blinebry?

20 A. That is right.

21 Q. In preparation for this hearing, did you also
22 identify and provide notice to those interest owners in
23 the Yeso Formation below the Blinebry that are not being
24 pooled in this application?

25 A. Yes, I did.

1 Q. If I turn to what has is being marked as COG
2 Exhibit 10, is this an affidavit prepared by my office
3 with attached letters providing notice of hearing to the
4 affected parties?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And does it include three different types of
7 letters?

8 A. It does.

9 Q. You have a letter to the parties you seek to
10 pool?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And you have a letter to the offsetting lease
13 mineral interest owners surrounding your non-standard
14 spacing unit?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And then you have a letter to the owners in the
17 formation below Blinebry?

18 A. Yes, they were.

19 Q. Were some of these letters returned, believe it
20 or not, for insufficient postage?

21 A. Yes, they were.

22 Q. And as a result have they been re-sent to these
23 owners?

24 A. Yes, they have.

25 Q. But were they able to be sent twenty days in

1 advance of this hearing?

2 A. No, they were not.

3 Q. Is that another reason why we are going to
4 continue for two weeks?

5 A. Yes, it is.

6 Q. Were Exhibits 1 through 10 prepared by your
7 involvement or your direction and supervision?

8 A. Yes, they were.

9 MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Examiner, I would move
10 the admission into evidence of COG Exhibits 1 through
11 10, which includes our notice affidavit.

12 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,
13 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 may now be accepted as part of the
14 record.

15 (COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBITS 1-10 WERE
16 OFFERED AND ADMITTED.)

17 MR. FELDEWERT: And that concludes my
18 examination of this witness.

19 EXAMINER McMILLAN: So you are compulsory
20 pooling the working interest owners and then you are
21 compulsory pooling title record owners?

22 MR. FELDEWERT: I think the way I'd look at
23 it is we are pooling two groups, we have cost-bearing
24 interest owners, the owners that are going to be subject
25 to the normal provisions of the pooling order. And then

1 you have certain non-cost-bearing interest owners that
2 are just simply going to be pooled.

3 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay.

4 MR. FELDEWERT: And that would be the
5 overrides, the royalty owners, the record title owner.
6 We have to have some way of bringing them into an
7 agreement.

8 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay.

9 EXAMINER WADE: I don't have any questions.

10 EXAMINER JONES: No, thank you.

11 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Thank you. No further
12 questions.

13 MR. FELDEWERT: We will call our second
14 witness.

15 CANDICE PETTIJOHN

16 having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified
17 as follows:

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. FELDEWERT:

20 Q. Please state your name and identify by whom you
21 are employed and in what capacity.

22 A. I am Candice Pettijohn. I am a geologist at COG
23 Operating.

24 Q. How long have you been a geologist with COG
25 Operating.

1 A. Since July of 2014.

2 Q. And have your responsibilities included the
3 Permian Basin?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Have you had a chance to previously testify
6 before the Division as an expert in petroleum geology?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Would you please outline your educational
9 background?

10 A. In 2011, I received my bachelor's in geology from
11 the University of Alaska. And then in 2014, I received
12 my master's in geology from Louisiana State University.

13 Q. Is that when you commenced your employment with
14 COG after getting your master's?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Are you a member of any professional association
17 or affiliations?

18 A. Yes, the American Association of Petroleum
19 Geologists.

20 Q. How long have you been a member of that
21 organization?

22 A. Since August of 2012.

23 Q. So while you were in school?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Are you familiar with the application filed in

1 this case?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Have you conducted a geologic study of the lands
4 that were the subject of this application?

5 A. Yes.

6 MR. FELDEWERT: I would tender Ms. Pettijohn
7 as an expert witness in petroleum geology.

8 EXAMINER McMILLAN: So accepted.

9 Q. What is the targeted interval for this particular
10 well within this Yeso Formation?

11 A. This is an upper Blinebry well.

12 Q. Have you prepared a structure map in a cross
13 section of this formation for the Examiner?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. If I turn to what has been marked as COG
16 Exhibit 11, would you please describe it for us and then
17 tell us what it shows.

18 A. This a Yeso structure map based off the top of
19 the Paddock Formation. Contour interval is 100 feet.
20 COG acreage is in yellow.

21 Near the center of the map, you will see the
22 subject well in blue with its spacing unit outlined in
23 blue as well. This structure map shows that the dip is
24 consistent from west to east and there's no geologic
25 impediments to drilling horizontally.

1 Q. In this done by hand? Is this hand drawn?

2 A. This is a hand contour map.

3 Q. And in order to get sufficient contours, we show
4 the large area here?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And we see some consistent structure across this
7 entire area?

8 A. Yes, correct.

9 Q. Did you then also prepare a cross section?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. If I turn to what has been marked as COG
12 Exhibit 12, is this a close-up map of the area in
13 question that identifies the wells that you have chosen
14 for your cross section?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And it shows A to A Prime?

17 A. Yes, A to A Prime.

18 Q. And are the wells that you have chosen in your
19 opinion representative of the area in question?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. If I then turn to what has been marked as COG
22 Exhibit 13, is this the cross section that corresponds
23 with the wells identified in the previous exhibit?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Would you please explain to us what you are

1 showing here?

2 A. Starting from the top, in yellow you will see the
3 San Andres Formation. In the lighter yellow, beneath
4 that, you will see Glorieta; beneath that in green is
5 the Paddock Formation; beneath that is the Blinebry
6 Formation, which is the formation targeted in this well.
7 And then at the base, is the Tubb Formation.

8 Q. Have you identified for the Examiners as well the
9 landing depth of the target zone for your proposed well?

10 A. Yes. It is shown in blue at 6450.

11 Q. And you mention that there's a depth severance at
12 the base of the Tubb -- I'm sorry -- at the base of the
13 Blinebry?

14 A. Yes, which corresponds to the top of the Tubb.

15 Q. What is the approximate vertical distance between
16 the landing depth area of the well and the points of
17 depth severance?

18 A. About 4-to-500 feet.

19 Q. With respect to the continuity of this interval
20 across this area, what do you observe?

21 A. The thickness is consistent and there is no major
22 structural changes.

23 Q. So you see a continuity of the reservoir and a
24 continuity of the thickness in the reservoir across this
25 area?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. In your opinion, are there any geologic
3 impediments to developing this area using full section
4 horizontal wells?

5 A. No.

6 Q. In your opinion, is this an area that can be
7 efficiently and economically developed by horizontal
8 wells?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. In your opinion, will the acreage that you have
11 included in your proposed non-standard unit on average
12 contribute more or less equally to the production of the
13 well?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And, finally, in your opinion, is the granting of
16 this application in the best interests of conservation
17 and prevention of waste and protection of correlative
18 rights?

19 A. Yes.

20 MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Examiner, I move the
21 admission into evidence of COG Exhibits 11 through 13.

22 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Exhibit 11, Exhibit 12,
23 and Exhibit 13 may now be accepted as part of the
24 record.

25 (COG OPERATING LLC EXHIBITS 11 through 13

1 WERE OFFERED AND ADMITTED.)

2 MR. FELDEWERT: And that concludes my
3 examination of this witness.

4 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay. I just want to be
5 clear about something. You want the interval from
6 5,000 feet to the top of the Tubb, right?

7 MR. FELDEWERT: I think the way it is
8 advertised is 5,000 feet to the base of the Blinēbry,
9 which I believe corresponds with the Tubb; is that
10 correct?

11 THE WITNESS: The same thing, yes.

12 EXAMINER McMILLAN: I just want to make sure
13 we are clear. I have no further questions for the
14 witness.

15 EXAMINATION BY EXAMINER JONES

16 EXAMINER JONES: Well, the pool itself, that
17 includes the Tubb and the drain pool; is that correct?
18 I mean is the pool labeled -- is there a pool here,
19 maybe there's no pool?

20 EXAMINER McMILLAN: There's an outlying Yeso
21 West.

22 MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Examiner, it's on
23 Exhibit 1.

24 EXAMINER JONES: When is your target date to
25 drill this well?

1 THE WITNESS: It is constantly shifting, but
2 it will be drilled sometime within the next year.

3 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. I have nothing
4 further.

5 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Thank you. I have no
6 further questions at this time.

7 MR. FELDEWERT: Thank you, Mr. Examiner.

8 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Thank you.

9 Case No. 15327 will be continued until July
10 the 9th.

11

12 (Time noted 11:07 a.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
a complete record of the proceedings in
the Examiner hearing of Case No. _____
heard by me on _____

_____, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
2) ss.
3 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)
4
5
6

7 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

8
9 I, ELLEN H. ALLANIC, New Mexico Reporter CCR
10 No. 100, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that on Thursday, June 25,
11 2015, the proceedings in the above-captioned matter were
12 taken before me, that I did report in stenographic
13 shorthand the proceedings set forth herein, and the
14 foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription to
15 the best of my ability and control.

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

22
23
24
25


ELLEN H. ALLANIC, CSR
NM Certified Court Reporter No. 100
License Expires: 12/31/15