## 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 NOS: 22261

APPLICATION OF EOG RESOURCES INC.
FOR APPROVAL OF 945.20 ACRE NON-STANDARD
SPACING UNIT IN THE WOLFCAMP FORMATION
COMPRISED OF ACREAGE SUBJECT TO A PROPOSED
COMMUNITIZATION AGREEMENT,
LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

DECEMBER 2, 2021

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

This matter came on for virtual hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, HEARING OFFICER WILLIAM BRANCARD and TECHNICAL EXAMINERS DEAN McCLURE and DYLAN ROSE-COSS on Thursday, December 2, 2021, through the Webex Platform.

Reported by: Irene Delgado, NMCCR 253

PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS

500 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 105

Albuquerque, NM 87102

505-843-9241

		Page 2
1	APPEARANCES	
2	For the Applicant:	
3	ADAM RANKIN HOLLAND & HART	
4	110 North Guadalupe, Suite 1	
5	Santa Fe, NM 87501 505-954-7286	
6		
7	I N D E X	
8	CASE CALLED	
9	SUMMARY OF CASE AND EXHIBITS	03
10	TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT	09
11	REPORTER CERTIFICATE	10
12		
13	EXHIBIT INDEX	
14		Admitted
15	Exhibits and Attachments	10
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: With that, I will

- 2 call 22361, EOG Resources.
- 3 MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, Adam Rankin with the
- 4 Santa Fe office of Holland & Hart appearing on behalf of the
- 5 applicant in this case EOG Resources.
- 6 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Are there
- 7 any other interested persons for Case 22261?
- 8 (No audible response.)
- 9 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Hearing none, you may
- 10 proceed.
- 11 MR. RANKIN: Thank you. In this case EOG is
- 12 seeking approval of a 945.2 acre, more or less, non-standard
- 13 spacing unit in the Wolfcamp formation that will be
- 14 comprised of acreage subject to a proposed federal
- 15 communitization unit in Lea County, New Mexico.
- 16 This application consists of -- sorry. The
- 17 exhibit packet that was submitted on Tuesday consists of six
- 18 exhibits, Exhibit A being the application that was filed in
- 19 the case, Exhibit B being the affidavit of EOG's landman,
- 20 Mr. Reese Cook. Mr. Cook has not previously testified
- 21 before the Division, so he includes with his affidavit a
- 22 copy of his relevant education and work experience that
- 23 qualifies him to testify as a petroleum, expert in petroleum
- 24 land matters. We ask at this time that Mr. Cook be
- 25 qualified as an expert in petroleum land matters based on

- 1 his education and work experience.
- 2 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Any objections?
- 3 (No audible response.)
- 4 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So accepted.
- 5 MR. RANKIN: Mr. Cook, in his affidavit, reviews
- 6 the basis for EOG's request for the approval of their
- 7 non-standard spacing unit. It would be located in all of
- 8 Sections 26 and 35, including lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, in
- 9 Township 26 South, Range 32 East in Lea County. It will be
- 10 comprised of the Wolfcamp formation.
- 11 The exhibits outlines the acreage that were
- 12 comprised, but not (unclear) non-standard spacing unit also
- 13 identifies the federal leases that would be included in the
- 14 acreage.
- 15 In this case EOG owns 100 percent of the working
- 16 interest in the Wolfcamp formation underlying within the
- 17 proposed spacing unit, and they seek approval in this case
- 18 to conform with the BLM's requirement for spacing units to
- 19 match the CA that they are seeking approval for.
- 20 Exhibit B-3 is a copy of the proposed CA that
- 21 would be submitted to the BLM. In this case the target pool
- is the (unclear) a Wolfcamp pool, Pool Code 98097.
- 23 Mr. Cook's affidavit identifies each of the wells that have
- 24 been drilled within the proposed spacing unit.
- 25 Exhibit C-4 identifies the C-102s for each of the

1 wells that reflect first and last take points and the

- 2 (unclear) with the standard required setbacks.
- 3 And EOG in this case has been designated operator
- 4 for each of the tracts that surround the spacing units and
- 5 100 working interest owners, so the only parties requiring
- 6 notice were the BLM and the state land office.
- 7 Exhibit C is the affidavit of EOG's geologist in
- 8 this case, Mr. Megan Cook. As with Mr. Cook, she has not
- 9 previously testified before the Division, so she attached
- 10 her resume, CV, outlining her educational and relevant work
- 11 experience qualifying her to testify as an expert in
- 12 petroleum geology. So at this time, Mr. Examiner, we would
- 13 ask that Ms. Cook be qualified as an expert in petroleum
- 14 geology.
- 15 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: The witness is so
- 16 qualified.
- 17 MR. RANKIN: Thank you. Exhibit C-2 is a subsea
- 18 structure map with (unclear) on top with Wolfcamp that
- 19 identifies the proposed spacing unit. She does not identify
- 20 any issues with pinchouts or impediments for horizontal well
- 21 development.
- It also identifies a cross section, land cross
- 23 section which is depicted in in her Exhibit C-3 showing the
- 24 target interval for each of the proposed -- each of the
- 25 wells drilled in the proposed spacing units, and

- 1 demonstrates that the formation here in the Wolfcamp is
- 2 continuous across the entire standard spacing unit that is
- 3 being proposed.
- 4 She testifies that, in her opinion, a
- 5 non-standard spacing unit will afford EOG the flexibility to
- 6 match the well spacing of the target reservoir rather than
- 7 individual standard spacing units and will allow for more
- 8 efficient and effective development since the internal
- 9 setbacks required by the standard spacing units will be
- 10 eliminated.
- 11 She also testifies that it will result in greater
- 12 efficiency if the federal allow EOG to consolidate the
- 13 surface facilities which is addressed in the third and final
- 14 affidavit. So she testifies that granting the application
- 15 will be in the interest of conservation and prevention of
- 16 waste and protection of correlative rights.
- 17 EOG's last exhibit is the affidavit of Mr. Shaun
- 18 Guthrie. He is a petroleum -- rather the facilities
- 19 engineer specialist with EOG. He also has not testified
- 20 been the Division, and so has included an outline of his
- 21 education and relevant work experience as a facilities
- 22 engineer.
- 23 At this time, Mr. Examiner, I would ask that the
- 24 Division recognize Mr. Guthrie as an expert in facilities
- 25 engineering.

1 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: The witness is so

- 2 accepted.
- 3 MR. RANKIN: Mr. Guthrie's testimony reviews and
- 4 identifies the proposed spacing unit and the facilities that
- 5 are in place and the facilities that would be required if
- 6 the spacing units were -- two spacing units were to be
- 7 required rather than one as proposed.
- 8 And he identifies and testifies that a single
- 9 tank battery will reduce the pipeline length and will reduce
- 10 overall surface disturbance as well as reduce the estimated
- 11 emissions by approximately half.
- 12 In sum, he testifies that the total cost saving
- 13 by not having to construct an additional central tank
- 14 battery and additional pipelines would result in
- 15 approximately \$3.2 million of cost savings which would allow
- 16 these wells to be perpetuated for a longer period of time,
- 17 number one. And then, as a result of the fewer facilities,
- 18 would result in approximately 50 percent fewer air
- 19 emissions.
- 20 For those reasons he testifies that permitting
- 21 EOG to develop this as a non-standard spacing unit will be
- 22 necessary for the interest of conservation and prevention of
- 23 waste and the protection of correlative rights.
- 24 And Exhibits E and F are our affidavit of notice
- 25 that we provided. Notice is required by the Division rules

1 to BLM and State Land Office, and we went ahead and

- 2 published that notice as well.
- 3 So at this time, Mr. Examiner, I would move the
- 4 admission of Exhibits A through F, and if the Division or
- 5 yourself have any questions, I will do my best to address
- 6 them.
- 7 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Mr.
- 8 Rose-Coss, questions?
- 9 TECHNICAL EXAMINER ROSE-COSS: No questions.
- 10 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. Mr. Rankin,
- 11 I'm looking at Mr. Guthrie's affidavit.
- MR. RANKIN: Yes.
- 13 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: And you may not know
- 14 the answer to this, but he makes this sort of blanket
- 15 statement that decrease in the surface facilities will
- 16 reduce by approximately 50 percent the air emissions.
- 17 Is that just simply because there are fewer tanks
- 18 and surface facilities, therefore there is fewer emissions?
- 19 MR. RANKIN: My understanding is that because you
- 20 would be cutting in half the number of facilities, you would
- 21 be cutting in half the amount of emissions that would
- 22 result.
- 23 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: We certainly hope you
- 24 eliminate all of your emissions. That's a subject for
- 25 another day. Are there any other interested persons for

Page 9 Case 22261, EOG Resources. (No audible response.) HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Hearing none, the exhibits will be admitted into the record, and Case 22261 will be taken under advisement. Thank you. MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner. (Exhibits admitted.) (Taken under advisement.) 

Page 10 STATE OF NEW MEXICO 2. COUNTY OF BERNALILLO 3 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 5 I, IRENE DELGADO, New Mexico Certified Court 6 7 Reporter, CCR 253, do hereby certify that I reported the 8 foregoing virtual proceedings in stenographic shorthand and 9 that the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript 10 of those proceedings to the best of my ability. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by 11 nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this case 12 13 and that I have no interest in the final disposition of this 14 case. I FURTHER CERTIFY that the Virtual Proceeding was 15 of reasonable quality. 16 Dated this 2nd day of December 2021. 17 18 /s/ Irene Delgado 19 Irene Delgado, NMCCR 253 20 License Expires: 12-31-21 2.1 22 23 2.4 25