1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO				
2	OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION				
3	IN THE MATTER OF: ) THE HEARING CALLED BY THE )				
4	OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION )				
5	TO CONSIDER: )				
6	MOTION FOR AN ORDER REPEALING RULES ) CASE NO. 10279 1204 AND 1206 OF THE RULES AND )				
_	REGULATIONS OF THE DIVISION AND )				
7	ADOPTING A NEW RULE 1204.				
8					
9	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
10	COMMISSION HEARING				
11	BEFORE: WILLIAM J. LeMAY, Chairman				
12	WILLIAM WEISS, Commissioner JAMI BAILEY, Commissioner				
12	JAMI BAILEI, COMMISSIONEI				
13	April 11, 1991 9:00 a.m.				
14	Santa Fe, New Mexico				
15	This matter came on for hearing before the Oil				
16	Conservation Commission on April 11, 1991, at 9:00 a.m. at Morgan Hall, State Land Office Building, 310 Old Santa Fe				
17	Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Susan G. Ptacek, a				
17	Certified Court Reporter No. 124, State of New Mexico.				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23	HOD. OIL CONCEDURATION DV. CUCAN C DESCRI				
2 4	FOR: OIL CONSERVATION BY: SUSAN G. PTACEK  Certified Court Reporter  CCR No. 124				
25	CCR No. 124				

COMMISSIONER LEMAY: The meeting will come to order of the Oil Conservation Commission hearing, and Jami Bailey is here representing the Commissioner of Public Lands. My name is Bill LeMay. I'm chairman of the commission.

Commissioner Weiss will not be able to make the meeting today.

2.1

We will begin by calling case 10279. In the matter of hearing called by the Oil Conservation Division's own motion for an order repealing rules 1204 and 1206 of the rules and regulations of the division in adopting a new rule 1204.

Appearances in Case No. 10279?

MR. STOVALL: Robert G. Stovall, Santa Fe. I'm appearing on behalf of the division and am my own witness.

COMMISSIONER LEMAY: Thank you, Mr. Stovall. Are there any other witnesses or appearances in this case? If not, Mr. Stovall, do you care to be sworn in?

(Whereupon the witness was duly

sworn.)

COMMISSIONER LEMAY: You may proceed.

## SWORN STATEMENT

MR. STOVALL: What this case is about is to repeal 1204 of the rules and regulations of the division, which requires under the current rule -- requires publication of notice of hearings in a newspaper published in Santa Fe

County and in a paper published in the county or counties where the property to be affected is located. Rule 1204 is a modification of a rule which was in place prior to 1987, which was virtually identical to the statute which was in place by provision of the Oil and Gas Act, 70-23-78, which required publication in Santa Fe County and in the county where the property was located.

In 1987 the legislature amended the Oil and Gas Act and removed that rather detailed requirement for publication, and simply said that the division shall prescribe by rule its procedure and the inclusion of the procedure for giving notice. However, the rule requiring publication of notice in Santa Fe continued I assume primarily because that's the way it had been done, and also I suspect that somebody thought that maybe that was useful for giving notice to somebody.

I've done a survey of all the attorneys in town. They never read the New Mexican, where in fact we do publish in Santa Fe County. There are very few oil operators who operate in Santa Fe County. They operate properties outside of Santa Fe County, in the northwest or southeast.

So, in fact, publishing notice of hearings in the New Mexican provides no notice, no practical notice, to anybody who has any reason to hear about it. But what it

does do is double the cost of the publications because the division publishes in Santa Fe County and in the county where the property is.

What I propose and submit to the commissioners is a draft order adopting the new 1204, which would require publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which the land, oil and gas property which is affected may be situated, providing for the new manner for providing publication as actually contained in the statutes and in Chapter 14, Article 11 of the New Mexico Statutes Annotated, rather than detailed provisions contained in the regulations and rules and all that information as to a paper of general circulation and what the frequency is to be. This simply recognizes that and only requires one publication. It saves the division thousands of dollars per year in publication costs.

Therefore, the division recommends the repeal of rule 1204 and the adoption of new rule 1204 as provided for in the application and the proposed order. With respect to the rule 1206, 1206 again hearkens back to days prior to '87. The statute had language dealing with personal service as well as publication service. Apparently the division or the commission modified that rule sometime after '87 when the statute was amended.

Rule 1206 is now called personal service of

notice and actually says the division will pay for the cost of publication. That really is not necessary. It's rather redundant. Chapter 14, Article 11 talks about cost of publication and the division is obligated to do this, unless it were to adopt a rule to require the applicant to pay those costs. We're not asking for that.

So rule 1206 is sort of space filler, and we're recommending that rule simply be repealed and the new rule be enacted in its place.

One other point to note, just for the record, with respect to notice and currently cases pending before the New Mexico Supreme Court regarding notice, in some cases we have property rights that are affected, publication notice is not sufficient and the division recognizes that. But rule 1207 of the division rules provides for personal service of notice upon certain classes of persons in various types of cases, and that rule satisfies the constitutional due process requirements of notice and personal service.

So, again, with the proposed rule 1204 and the additional rule 1207, I believe that there will be appropriate notice procedure for the division and the commission to follow. And at the same time save the division -- as I say, save thousands of dollars a year in publication costs.

I have nothing further to add. I would recommend -- I have issued a proposed order. I would ask you to read it. We would like it to be effective immediately. Every time we have to publish it's a greater expense. If this order meets with your approval, I will have it put in finalized form and hopefully get your signatures today and maybe have it effective March 1 and that would mean we would only have one hearing to be publish under the old rules. It will be a considerable savings to the division.

2.2

COMMISSIONER LEMAY: Mr. Stovall, thank you. Any questions of the witness? Ms. Bailey.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: It is clarified those attorneys and operators located in Santa Fe County are on the mailing list for notice of hearings if they choose to be on the mailing list?

MR. STOVALL: Correct. We do have a letter from Yates Petroleum regarding -- Andy Patterson of Yates has asked we publish in the county where the property is, and that they send out notice which is published to the mailing list. We mail the dockets. The docket is the notice. It's the same thing.

What he is really saying, as I understand it, we send it to him once. I think the 4000 operators, including all the attorneys and anybody can get on that list. If

```
1
    they want to receive a mailing list, they're welcomed to
 2
    it. Yes, I think that addresses anybody who is in Santa
 3
   Fe.
         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I have no other questions.
 4
 5
         COMMISSIONER LEMAY: Mr. Stovall, you mentioned March
 6
    1. Was that an error? Do you want to make it effective
    April 1?
 7
         MR. STOVALL: Where do I have March 1?
 8
 9
         COMMISSIONER LEMAY: In your statement you said March
10
        The order provides May 1.
11
         MR. STOVALL: That's right. I always run a couple of
12
    months behind.
13
         COMMISSIONER LEMAY: Are there any other questions of
14
    the witness? If not, he may be excused.
15
               Any additional appearances in the case or
16
    statements?
17
               We will take the case under advisement.
                                                         Thank
18
    you.
19
         (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at the
20
    approximate hour of 9:13 a.m.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO )
2	) ss. COUNTY OF SANTA FE )
3	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4	
5	I, Susan G. Ptacek, a Certified Court Reporter and
6	Notary Public, do HEREBY CERTIFY that I stenographically
7	reported the proceedings before the Oil Conservation
8	Division, and that the foregoing is a true, complete and
9	accurate transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as
10	appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed
11	under my personal supervision.
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to nor
13	employed by any of the parties hereto, and have no interest
14	in the outcome thereof.
15	DATED at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 1st day of May,
16	1991.
17	Quan A Pracel
18	SUSAN G. PTÁCEK
19	My Commission Expires: Certified Court Reporter December 10, 1993 Notary Public
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

		Pagel
NEW MEXIC	O OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	
	COMMISSION HEARING	
	SANTA FE , NEW MEXICO	
Hearing Date	APRIL 11, 1991	Time: 9:00 A.M
NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
Maurice Min mer	Byram Cs.	SF
		; ;
: : :		