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:

CASE NO. 11,604

APPLICATION OF SUNCO TRUCKING WATER

DISPOSAL COMPANY FOR A SHOW CAUSE

HEARING AS TO WHY IT SHOULD NOT BE FINED

FOR VIOLATIONS OF OIL CONSERVATION

DIVISION RULE 711, SAN JUAN COUNTY,

NEW MEXICO

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner

January 9th, 1997

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, January 9th, 1997, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources

Department, Porter Hall, 2040 South Pacheco, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

INDEX

January 9th, 1997 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 11,604

PAGE

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

8

* * *

EXHIBITS

Applicant's Identified Admitted

Exhibit 1 3 7

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE DIVISION:

RAND L. CARROLL Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division 2040 South Pacheco Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

* * *

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 1 2 4:10 p.m.: EXAMINER STOGNER: At this time I'll call Case 3 Number 11,604, which is the Application of Sunco Trucking 4 and Water Disposal Company for a show cause why hearing 5 concerning its violation of Division Rule 711, in San Juan 6 7 County, New Mexico. Call for appearances. 8 MR. CARROLL: May it please the Examiner, my name 9 is Rand Carroll, appearing on behalf of the Oil 10 Conservation Division. 11 I have no witnesses, just a statement and the 12 exhibit and a proposed order. 13 EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay. This matter was heard 14 15 previously, was it not, Mr. Carroll? MR. CARROLL: No, it wasn't. 16 EXAMINER STOGNER: It was not heard? 17 This 18 appeared on the docket -- so what do you -- Okay, maybe I 19 need to see what you've got. 20 MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I'd like to introduce what is marked as OCD Exhibit Number 1. It's a certified 21 22 letter from the Division to Mr. Chuck Badsgard, vice 23 president of Sunco Trucking. Said letter is a notice of

violation, notice of third violation, and an assessment of

a \$5000 fine, with an advisement that Sunco may request a

24

25

hearing before the Division if it wishes to contest this fine.

Subsequent to this letter, we were contacted by Mr. John Dean, the attorney for Sunco, who advised us that Sunco would like to set this matter for hearing.

Subsequent discussions with Mr. Dean revealed that Sunco was not contesting the violations but wanted to explain why these violations occurred.

After a few discussions on the phone, Sunco realized that the Division has rules that were violated, and regardless of the reasons why the violations occurred, these rules are in effect to protect the public health and the environment, and whether or not Sunco believes that public health and the environment was protected, regardless of the rules violation, in the OCD's mind, does not excuse the violations. It's not for Sunco to determine that on their own.

With that, Sunco agreed to admit all the allegations in the notice of violation and agreed to a stipulated order, which I am submitting to you today, on the condition that they submit a letter which I just received today by fax, explaining why the violations occurred. And if the Examiner wishes to review the letter, in all three violations Sunco admits the violations occurred, but says that Sunco did not believe that a threat

to the environment or to the public health and safety 1 2 occurred. 3 So I submit to the Examiner the proposed order, 4 which is accepted by Sunco. And I also submit to the Examiner the letter from 5 6 Sunco dated yesterday, January 8th, received today by the 7 OCD. 8 EXAMINER STOGNER: Is that Exhibit 2? 9 MR. CARROLL: No. 10 EXAMINER STOGNER: You just want to make that 11 part of the record? 12 MR. CARROLL: I move that what has been OCD Exhibit Number 1 be admitted into the record, and I would 13 14 ask that Mr. Dean's letter also be incorporated into the 15 record. EXAMINER STOGNER: And you have also prepared a 16 17 rough draft order --MR. CARROLL: Right. 18 EXAMINER STOGNER: -- for this agency? 19 20 Essentially, what is the outcome of this -- Well, 21 can you explain on the record what the order says? MR. CARROLL: Well, yes. The order allows Sunco, 22 23 in lieu of the \$5000 fine, to put on an environmental 24 education program, approved by our Aztec District Office, 25 that will cost Sunco at least the amount of \$5000,

exclusive of any benefits Sunco may receive.

So the OCD has allowed -- or is proposing to you that Sunco be allowed to avoid the fine by expending at least \$5000 on this environmental education program.

If Sunco does not get this proposed education program approved by the Aztec District Office by January 31st, by the end of this month, then the fine is due by the end of February. And even if Sunco does get the education program approved by the Aztec District Office, they must complete the program by the end of 1997 or pay the \$5000 fine.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Would they be the actual teaching of it, or would they just sponsor it and have professionals do the actual teaching? And where would the public education take place at?

MR. CARROLL: That is to be worked out between Sunco and the Aztec District Office.

It is my understanding that Sunco will either put on the presentation or hire professionals to do it. The OCD will not be a part of it, but the OCD will attend and answer any questions that are posed.

EXAMINER STOGNER: I'd be interested in attending as an observer. Would there be any problem?

MR. CARROLL: I would suggest you take that up with the Director of the Division, Mr. Examiner.

1	EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay. Well, with that, I will
2	enter into the record Exhibit Number 1 and also make part
3	of the record a prepared rough draft order for this case,
4	and also make part of the record Mr I'm sorry, this is
5	the response letter faxed today, dated
6	MR. CARROLL: yesterday.
7	EXAMINER STOGNER: yesterday, January 8th, but
8	received today, and addressed to this office from Curtis
9	and Dean, attorneys in Farmington.
10	Anything further in this matter?
11	MR. CARROLL: That's all I have, your Honor.
12	EXAMINER STOGNER: Then Case 11,604 will be taken
13	under advisement and acted on accordingly.
14	If there's nothing further for Docket Number
15	1-97, then hearing is adjourned.
16	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
17	4:15 p.m.)
18	* * *
19	
20	
21	de hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in
22	eard by me on
23	. Examiner
24	Oil Concernation Division
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL January 18th, 1997.

STEVEN T. BRENNER CCR No. 7

To the contract

My commission expires: October 14, 1998