

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: 22235 - 22240

APPLICATION OF MEWBOURNE OIL COMPANY  
FOR COMPULSORY POOLING  
EDDY COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS  
EXAMINER HEARING  
APRIL 21, 2022  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

This matter came on for virtual hearing before  
the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, HEARING OFFICER  
WILLIAM BRANCARD and TECHNICAL EXAMINER DYLAN ROSE-COSS on  
Thursday, April 21, 2022, through the Webex Platform.

Reported by: PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS  
500 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 105  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
505-843-9241

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

For Applicant:  
JAMES BRUCE  
P.O. Box 1056  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1056  
505-982-2151  
jamesbruce@aol.com

I N D E X

CASE CALLED	
CONTINUATION	03
TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT	07
REPORTER CERTIFICATE	08

E X H I B I T I N D E X

	Admitted
Exhibits and Attachments	07

1 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: I still do not see  
2 Mr. Parrot. So short of dismissing his cases, we will move  
3 forward with hearings then. Mr. Bruce, are you available?

4 (No audible response.)

5 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Mr. Bruce, are you  
6 on?

7 MR. BRUCE: Yes. Can you hear me?

8 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Now I can, yes.  
9 Thank you. You really need to get a camera, Mr. Bruce. If  
10 we all assume you have been growing this bodacious beard  
11 during the pandemic, we want to see it.

12 MR. BRUCE: Okay. Well, this won't take long.

13 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Let me call the cases  
14 then. Cases 22235, 22236, 22237, 22238, 22239 and 22240,  
15 Mewbourne Oil Company.

16 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce representing  
17 Mewbourne.

18 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. We have  
19 no other entries of appearances. Are there other entries of  
20 appearances on this case? This is a continued case from  
21 March 17.

22 (No audible response.)

23 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Hearing none, Mr.  
24 Bruce, I believe you have a whole list of things you were  
25 supposed to supply us with.

1           MR. BRUCE: Yes. Mr. Examiner, I presented the  
2 cases, but that was where I had a three- or four-day period  
3 of computer and printer problems, and I was able to get all  
4 the stuff, plus I couldn't find the publication notice.

5           So what I have submitted a couple of days ago was  
6 a notice of filing additional exhibits, but exhibit -- so I  
7 have submitted Exhibit 4-A which is an additional green card  
8 received after the original hearing.

9           Exhibit 5, I had not received the affidavit of  
10 publication. I contacted the Carlsbad Current Argus --  
11 actually it's part of the chain and you have to go back to  
12 Wisconsin to try to get ahold of them, and I never heard  
13 back from them, so I did republish notice and that is  
14 submitted as Exhibit 5. And I believe it was timely -- I'm  
15 positive it was.

16           And then the Division requested the spreadsheet,  
17 which I'm not much on spreadsheets, but I did submit the  
18 list of the parties pooled as Exhibit 6, and I highlighted  
19 enlarged those who had not returned the green card, but  
20 there were multiple addresses for a number of the people, so  
21 some of them did receive notice at a different address and  
22 that was noticed by a green highlighting so at least the  
23 Division can see who -- who did and did not receive actual  
24 certified notice.

25           Exhibit 7 regarding case 22235, the original

1 C-102 for the E2IL Fed Com Well Number 1 was incorrect as to  
2 the first and last take points, and Exhibit 7 is a corrected  
3 C-102, the -- which agrees with the footages put forth in  
4 the proposal letter and the AFE.

5 And Exhibit 8 in Case 22237, which is a proximity  
6 tract, two of the wells were in that 640 proximity tract,  
7 two of the wells -- the C-102 indicated they were spaced on  
8 320 acres, so submitted as a new -- a new C-102s for those  
9 two wells showing it is a 640 acre unit.

10 And then finally Exhibit 9 is a pooling  
11 application checklist in all of the cases. And there is one  
12 other item which neither of us caught, but in Case 22240 I  
13 noticed on Tuesday that the footages on that proximity well  
14 were incorrect. They did not comply with what the AFE and  
15 the well proposal letter showed.

16 So -- and actually the -- a C-102 submitted with  
17 that complies with the proximity tract well, so I have  
18 submitted a correct -- I will submit to the state  
19 (inaudible) on the phone a revised C-102 showing the correct  
20 footages.

21 With that I would ask for -- I will mark that one  
22 exhibit, and I would move the admission of the exhibits and  
23 request that the matters be taken under advisement.

24 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you.

25 Mr. Rose-Coss, any questions?

1                   TECHNICAL EXAMINER ROSE-COSS: No questions from  
2 me. (Inaudible) a lot of details that you drifted through  
3 potentially manually, so that's it for me.

4                   HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Okay, so  
5 Mr. Bruce, you also had a geologic log.

6                   MR. BRUCE: Oh, yes, yes. And I think it was  
7 Monday I -- I requested it from my geology twice. I do not  
8 know how to get that filed through the Division's system,  
9 and so I e-mailed it, I think, to you, but also to Mr. Lowe.  
10 I'm afraid that to get it in my system I would have to scan  
11 it in and it would not be an expandable cross-section,  
12 actually two cross-sections.

13                   If there is another way I can get it to you, but  
14 it has been submitted to the engineering department. I  
15 believe Mr. Lowe was the engineer at the original hearing,  
16 and if Mr. Rose-Coss would like a copy of that -- of those  
17 expandable cross-sections, I can e-mail those to him, too.

18                   HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: We did receive that,  
19 Mr. Bruce. Mr. Lowe has reviewed it and found it  
20 acceptable, but you do need to submit some version of it  
21 into the portal.

22                   MR. BRUCE: Oh, okay, I will do so.

23                   HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Since you are already  
24 going to submit the revised C-102, you can include that as  
25 Exhibit 11 or whatever.

1 MR. BRUCE: Okay, thank you.

2 TECHNICAL EXAMINER ROSE-COSS: Mr. Bruce, is this  
3 a PDF? I don't understand the scanning problem. Is it an  
4 image file?

5 MR. BRUCE: I'm unfortunately my own IT  
6 department here, and -- let me see what I can do.

7 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. Thank you.  
8 Are there any other comments on case -- Cases 22235 through  
9 22240?

10 (No audible response.)

11 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Hearing none, the  
12 exhibits will be admitted into the record and the record  
13 will be left open to submit a revised C-102 and the geologic  
14 exhibits. Other than that, Cases 22235, 36, 37, 38, 39 and  
15 40 will be taken under advisement. Thank you.

16 (Exhibits admitted.)

17 (Taken under advisement.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3

4 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

5

6 I do hereby certify that I reported the  
7 foregoing virtual proceedings in stenographic shorthand and  
8 that the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript  
9 of those proceedings to the best of my ability.

10 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by  
11 nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this case  
12 and that I have no interest in the final disposition of this  
13 case.

14 I FURTHER CERTIFY that the Virtual Proceeding was  
15 of poor to good quality.

16 Dated this 21st day of April 2022.

17

/s/ Irene Delgado

18

\_\_\_\_\_  
Irene Delgado, NMCCR 253  
License Expires: 12-31-22

19

20

21

22

23

24

25