


HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Are there people here for case 22973?

MR. SANCHEZ: Miguel Sanchez here for (unclear audio).

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. And then, Mr. Feldewert, are you representing the applicant?

MR. FELDEWERT: Yes, sir.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Is there anyone else, Mr. Sanchez? I know we had people attempting to submit prehearing statements or entries of appearance. We had Greg Santistevan, Danny Quintana.

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm not sure. I did see those in the filings, but $I$ don't know those people.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. Are any of those persons here?
(No audible response.)
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: All right. Mr.
Feldewert, we can go ahead. This may take a little bit of time. Are you willing to go forward?

MR. FELDEWERT: Yes, sir, if you're ready to go.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Let's do it then. Case 22973, Catamount Energy Partners.

MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Examiner, I remember during the enactment or prior to the enactment of the horizontal well rules, there was a lot of discussion among the
technical people about multilateral horizontal wells.
And when we got to the hearing on the horizontal well rules, the Commission ended up defining multilateral horizontal wells and issued rules governing them which are under 19.15.16.15(B) (7) which is what we're operating under here today.

And this application is the first to my knowledge that seeks to create a spacing unit for these (unclear audio) lot of people would consider very efficient horizontal wells.

We presented initially our package of exhibits in a timely manner. When $I$ went through them I noticed that we needed a little supplementation, so we filed an amended package yesterday to add compulsory pooling checklist, which was inadvertently left out, and additional information for Exhibit $A-3$ which is the ownership breakdown.

I would encourage you at the beginning here to take a look at Exhibit A-1. There -- it's comprised of three different plats, and a picture is worth a thousand words, and $I$ like the second page of that exhibit which shows the Navajo Lake and the relationship it has to this application.

And you will see that this acreage is right along -- just south of the Colorado, New Mexico state line. And they seek to -- the company seeks to create in that pool
a non-standard spacing unit in the Fruitland Coal Gas for a horizontal well that's going to have three laterals.

And if you look at -- I'm looking at the second page of Exhibit 1, and you will see that the, you will see the surface whole there on the left, which is the blue circle that's in the E/2 E/2 of Section 10 , so it's off the acreage at issue.

And then from there the lateral reaches out into Section 11; first take point is actually where that blue circle is. And then following that first take point, the three laterals then reach out into -- through the remainder of Section 11 and into Section 12.

What was interesting to me, and in the course of doing that, I didn't realize this, the county line runs right along kind of inside the lake, so there is a yellow line there where you see the wellbore crosses from San Juan for all three laterals, cross from San Juan County into Rio Arriba County, so that's why we listed both counties on our application.

And they created this as a non-standard spacing unit in the sense that it was going to be smaller than what it normally would be in utilizing the spacing applicable to Fruitland Coal and Gas. And the reason that they have excluded those three tracts down there in the $S E / 4$ of Section 12 is because they visited with BLM, both the

Farmington office and Santa Fe office, and it was unclear when, if ever, the BLM was going to lease that unleased federal land and that portion of Section 12 that also continues to the east of this area.

So we, we then provide notice of this hearing to BLM because they are the only party affected by the non-standard spacing unit. Pooling is required here because, as you can imagine, this land up here is very complicated due to previous condemnation proceedings. There is also a lot of unprobated estates, and then there are a number of lots that exist along the Navajo Lake.

At the end of the day we seek to pool are unleased mineral owners and various estates, along with a group of overriding royalty interest owners that are highlighted at the end of Exhibit $A-3$, which should be page 25 of the 56 -page PDF.

And what you will see from that list is that Catamount itself owns 56 percent of the working interest. There is a number of other working interest owners that have voluntarily committed. I did the math real quick, and it's roughly 82 percent are committed. So all the remaining owners that you see in red are the parties that the company seeks to pool who own very small interests in this non-standard spacing unit.

Now, I'm glad Mr. Sanchez is here. I understand
you work for Exxon and has filed a prehearing statement in this case and we will get to that in a minute. But $I$ also want to alert you to the fact that there was one other owner contacted Catamount recently objecting to their development plan because her family owns a family compound (unclear audio). Her name is Carla Clark. She is a highlighted party that we seek to pool.

She is apparently a spokesperson for the family. Her address is of record for the acreage, so she received notice of this hearing, and just, to be up front, she informed Catamount that the family objected to the development because there are too many wells in their opinion already surrounding her family property.

Mr. Sanchez is here. He has filed his prehearing statement. I took a look at that, and I understand from him that they seek to ensure that the pooling order is limited to the Fruitland Coal Formation and ensure that the pooled owners have an opportunity to participate in the well upon the issuance of the pooling order, both of which $I$ can confirm, Mr. Sanchez, and I think you could too, Mr. Brancard, will be addressed and granted by the standard language in the pooling order.

I also saw that there were a number of e-mails in the file that you kindly forwarded to me yesterday afternoon. My understanding is that -- understanding is
that both Danny Quintana who sent one of the e-mails and Gregory Santistevan who sent the second e-mail, they are all heirs of Maria Dina Santistevan, who is one of the pooled parties, as is Mr. Quintana and Mr. Santistevan.

As I read the e-mails, they express disagreement with the lease terms. What I take the meaning there, Mr. Brancard, is that there has obviously been discussion about the development plan with these parties, there's been discussions about voluntarily agreements, both the JOA and leases. This has been going on for months now, at least since right before May, but they've just simply been unable to reach a voluntary agreement.

So with that introduction, I'm prepared to quickly go through the exhibits that we have filed. We have our package which contains the application of the compulsory pooling checklist.

Exhibit A is the self-affirmed statement of Ms. Greer. She is a land -- senior landman with the company. She has previously testified before this Division. She identifies the spacing unit that the company seeks to pool, which is non-standard, and describes the development that they are seeking to do here under the Navajo Lake with a multilateral horizontal well.

We have already talked about Exhibit A-1.
Exhibit $A-2$ is the $C-102 s$ that we put together,
and I don't know, Mr. Brancard, if you file an individual C-102 for each lateral, or whether you file a $C-102$-- one C-102 that shows all three laterals. Ms. Greer has put together a draft $C-102$ that contains all the information for each individual lateral, but you will see that they share a common surface location, and they share a common portion of the wellbore until they diverged.

Exhibit $A-3$ is the information on the tracts that are on there, and it starts with a tract map. And you will see that Section 11 is pretty easy. There is a tract to the north, and there is a tract to the south. In fact, there is some existing vertical wells in the Fruitland Coal Gas Pool that are dedicated to the $N / 2$ of Section 11 and the $S / 2$ of Section 11.

Those vertical wells are located on the E/2 E/2 of Section 11, and we have sent out notice, Ms. Greer testifies we sent out notice of the overlapping spacing units to all the working interest owners and nobody has objected to it.

And one of the reasons that we perforated, the interval starts outside of the E/2 E/2 of Section 11 is in part because of those existing vertical wells. We then -she then provides an ownership breakdown for each of the these numerous tracts, again highlighting the owners they seek to pool. All of this culminates in a summary of the
ownership on Page 25 of this -- of this PDF, and in that list, you will see a group of overriding royalty interest owners that they seek to pool.

She provides as Exhibit A-4 the well proposal letter which doubles both as a well proposal letter and notice of the overlapping spacing unit that is being created here to accommodate this small time lateral horizontal well.

And then Exhibit $A-5$ is the chronology of contacts. One thing $I$ want to make note of before $I$ forget is that -- oh, the -- you will see in her affidavit a couple of things. One, in Paragraph 10 , she notes that since the issuance of their initial well proposal letter, the location of that northern-most lateral was moved to the south in the $S / 2 \mathrm{~N} / 2$ equivalent of that irregular Section 12 in order to comply with the setbacks that apply to the Basin Fruitland Coal Gas Pool.

The other thing of note in her affidavit is that on Paragraph 14 , they are requesting overhead rates of $\$ 14,000$ a month, and 1,400 a month while producing. I asked her about that, and she testified in here that those costs are consistent up here in the San Juan Basin with what Catamount and other operators are charging in this area for standard horizontal wells.

So while it's a little different from what you see in the Permian, the testimony is that these are the
rates that they are seeing up there for standard horizontal wells.

She also then confirms in Paragraph 15 that, yes, there are a large number of parties that they seek to pool, and some of them they have been able to find address, and some they have been unable to find addresses. But they conducted, as part of this process, a diligent search of public records in both counties. They consulted phone directories, they engaged into computer searches, they discussed with family members trying to get telephone numbers.

So they have undertaken good faith efforts not only to reach agreement with those they have been able to locate, but also to try to find these very small interest owners, many of which are under unprobated estates.

Exhibit B, as in boy, is the statement of Rusty Kelly. He's a geologist with the company. This is the first time he has testified before Division as a petroleum geologist. He has provided his resume, his credentials as Catamount Exhibit $B-1$, and $I$ believe they qualify him to testify as an expert, Mr. Brancard, in petroleum geology. From there Exhibit $B-2$ is a structure map that he's created that highlights the spacing unit, non-standard spacing unit and again shows the general trajectory of the multilateral horizontal well.

B-3 is the exhibit that provides the location of the well logs in relation to the proposed spacing unit and unifies to create a west to east cross section which I believe is a stratigraphic cross section -- yes, a stratigraphic cross section that is provided as Exhibit B-4. When you bring it up, it comes up very big, so you can kind of see it, but you can shrink it down and stay oriented within that.

On that exhibit he identifies with a red dash line the approximate landing depth of each of the three laterals in the Basin Fruitland Coal Gas Pool.

Exhibit C is my affidavit providing -- indicating notice was provided to the parties we have been able to locate with the attached letter and provides the update of the status of delivery as of July 28 when we filed these exhibits.

I did see in there when $I$ was there at the post office, and $I$ had the same questions you had, Mr. Brancard, I don't know what that means. But because there was so many estates involved and parties we have been unable to locate, Exhibit D as in David, is an affidavit of publication that is directed by name to the parties they seek to pool and the estates.

And one was published timely in the San Juan County, Farmington, Farmington Daily Times. And the second
publication was timely filed in Rio Arriba County in the Rio Grande Sun.

So with that, I would ask the admission of

Catamount Exhibits A through D, as in David, and that the matter be taken under advisement.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Let me go to Mr. Sanchez. Are you still on?

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, I am.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Would you like to make some comments then for the record?

MR. SANCHEZ: The only comment $I$ would make is that it's kind of (unclear audio) the parties that are there, entries, and it's hard to characterize Catamount's proposal to the small owners as (unclear audio) given that terms offered were much worse than if we proceeded to compulsory pooling.

So I don't think that there is an objective to go beyond what we already have, which is 56 percent owned and to engage in any sort of good faith negotiations.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Mr. Garcia, questions?

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: Yeah, I have a few. Bear with me one second, Mr. Feldewert.

I just wanted to see what 14,000 looked like on a checklist. It's higher than what we're used to, so it's
interesting to see it.
I guess I will start with the NSP portion. I'm looking at -- before we -- can we take a look at the picture of the lake. I was there two weekends ago. I guess my question is, as far as NSP goes, there's a lot of $I$ guess confusion on NSP because of the (unclear audio) but I guess my question is, in general, OCD's formal policy is when we do NSP applications, whether they be admin or hearing order on process, if the straps surrounding the NSP are also noticed and (unclear audio) I guess the question is, are they -- I have been reading 19.15.15 and 19.15.4 and 19.15 -- just 4 and 15 all these times for the last few minutes, basically the policy updates -- and if you want the citation I'm referring to, it's 19.15.15.11(B)(2) little (b). And basically, you know, on our website it breaks down to like the Purple Sage group, they are 320 building blocks, you noticed 160 acre spacing units. So I don't know that Fruitland Coal's building block of memory, it's gas, so I'm assuming it's 160. So we would notice half of that, 80 acres out which north is Colorado. Notices get a little vague with Colorado and Texas.

So I know you notified the people you were reading off, which is BLM, but $I$ guess I'm curious about the other people that surround this tract.

MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Garcia, I, first off, the
good thing is the horizontal well rules have specific language dealing with these non-standard horizontal spacing units. And when you look at those, those trump any other conflicting language with the rules.

When you look at 19.15.16.15(B)(5), non-standard horizontal spacing unit, it talks about the administrative rule process, and it specifically states in subpart 5 (B) as in boy, the notice requirements.

And what it says is that, in (B) (1), the affected persons in all tracts that are excluded from the horizontal spacing unit if the horizontal spacing unit would be standard except for the exclusion of tracts, which is what we have here.

Because what you will see is that they, the normal spacing unit would encompass all of Section 11 and all of Section 12 because there are quarter sections, but because we are making it smaller, the rule states you provide notice to those that are being excluded, which here would be only the BLM since it's unleased federal acreage.

The next portion of the rule says, it's the or, and it says joined in all other cases. So in every other case you give notice to the owners surrounding it. The time you don't is when you are making it smaller than what it would otherwise be.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I'll have to look at
it. 19.15.16 -- what was it again?
MR. FELDEWERT: (B) (5) (B).
TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: Most people who ask for NSPs operate are making them massive units as you're aware.

MR. FELDEWERT: I think most of what you have seen and what $I$ have presented is always trying to make it larger, right, so then that would fall under (B) (5) (B) little (i) (2). That's where you have to give notice to everybody around.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I will do my reading, and, you know, I obviously always have -- I always tell (unclear audio) if $I$ have any questions $I$ will reach out to you more on it. (unclear audio) subject to question on me every day. That's a citation $I$ will look into it further.

Compulsory pooling portion, $I$ see there is a vertical well -- yeah, I guess really the main question is -- I mean, you answered it. It's just interesting, I mean the testimony on it. So $I$ guess in general that's all the questions for now. I will pass to Mr. Brancard and may come back, but $I$ believe I'm done for now.

I have one more question actually, sorry. Does anyone -- is anyone subject to notice as far as the lake, Bureau of Rec or anyone like that. Based on my knowledge, Bureau of Rec tends to control waterways and et cetera, BLM,

Bureau of Rec, they are both federal entities, but different agencies. Do you know if they are subject to notice?

MR. FELDEWERT: Matter of notice would go to the owners of the mineral interests in the acreage. Looking at the tract map on Exhibit $A-1$, the first page, it's apparent that the -- the owners of the tracts of minerals are accounted for. I haven't exactly gone through the list, but I don't recall seeing the -- what did you say, the bureau of --

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: Reclamation.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: I don't see them on here which tells me that Bureau of Reclamation doesn't own the minerals.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I'm sure they don't. They are typically water ways, lakes, rivers, they care about rivers, lakes, you know. You know, you've done this longer than $I$ have. This is my first case with a lake involved, is why I ask.

MR. FELDEWERT: It's my first case with a lake involved, too. I have dealt with towns and cities, but never dealt with a lake.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I mean, I go to this lake all the time (unclear audio) but $I$ will pass to Mr. Brancard who is far more knowledgeable in this area than I am, so --

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: It's my first lake case, too, and it makes me nervous. Mr. Feldewert, do you know the depth of these wells, the laterals?

MR. FELDEWERT: If you look at the, I believe the Exhibit B-4 would be a source of that, perhaps. You might also look at the well proposal letter. Hold on a second.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: I looked at the geology exhibits and $I$ kind of went --

MR. FELDEWERT: I do, too. Let me see here. Look and see if the well proposal letter -- total vertical depth, I'm looking at -- I see the pilot hole, I am looking at the laterals, estimated TVD 2712, looking at Page 28 or $29--29$.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: That's as deep as they go, 2712?

MR. FELDEWERT: That's what I glean from TVD.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: That would be where the lateral is.

MR. FELDEWERT: Yes.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: That's a lot shallower.

MR. FELDEWERT: I believe the vertical portion is well away from the lake.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Right. And you wouldn't want to make any estimates on the (unclear audio)
which is vertical.

MR. FELDEWERT: No. I got as much expertise as you've got.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yeah, okay. So go back to Mr. Garcia's question about non-standard spacing units. Your statement is that, if $I$ read this correctly, I'm looking at Page 12, and if we took those three quarter-quarter sections there in the southeast, and we added them to their spacing units, right, the three that are excluded --

MR. FELDEWERT: I see them.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: -- you would have a standard spacing unit.

MR. FELDEWERT: Yes, because the Fruitland Coal is 320.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: No, it's 160 .

MR. FELDEWERT: It would be four 160 s.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yeah. So then when you have those three quarter-quarters in there, wouldn't you have two standard horizontal spacing units, not one?

MR. FELDEWERT: Good question. I don't know how far off that middle lateral is, but $I$ will try, Mr. Brancard, since it's the quarter section up there is less than the middle lateral, which $I$ think is lateral one, is sufficiently close to the half section, $I$ think you are
correct, and that's a $N / 2$ equivalent and then $a \quad S / 2$.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Your application does not describe that well as a proximity well.

MR. FELDEWERT: Correct.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: But I looked at it, your first take point could be proximity, but your last take point is not, so it wouldn't take much to turn that into a proximity well.

MR. FELDEWERT: I'm not a geologist, but I'll visit with them and clearly they chose this spacing for a reason.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Because, otherwise, the addition of that $N / 2$ into your spacing unit, instead of a second reason for making this a non-standard, in other words, making it an oversized non-standard spacing unit which would trigger the notice to all surrounding parcels.

Unless, of course, you kind of step back and sort of refigure this to apply to be one large standard with a proximity well. I don't want to give you suggestions, but I will let John give you suggestions.

So at this point you basically have, from my perspective, you should have two causes of a non-standard, things you are leaving out and things you are adding on, which, to my perspective reading the rule, would trigger both notice requirements.

As I discussed with Ms. Vance in the prior case, don't worry about the lots. You might want to roll that one over, be right up front with you, Mr. Feldewert, we may end up continuing this case anyway because there is a lot going on here, so you may want to consider whether you want to make some changes.

The other big issue, obviously, is the more people you are pooling, a lot of people, and as I -- I mentioned to someone earlier, the more people you pool the more evidence you have to provide. It's one of those mathematical things. And you have a fair number unlocatable parties here, so, you know, following with what we talked about in other cases today, I would look first at -- let me see, go to Page 33.

MR. FELDEWERT: You're on the chronology?

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yeah, yeah. You are going to have to have a lot more detail.

MR. FELDEWERT: I will speak with our (unclear audio)

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. And on Number 3, it says 24 packages have been returned unlocatable. Please, provide that kind of -- you know, when something is unlocatable, that's triggering, you know, notice, due process issues here. So the more detail your folks can provide about the efforts they made to locate people by
additional addresses, we tried that, that didn't work, we called somebody, that didn't work. Great. I'm sure it seems tedious to them, but they did all of this work, I assume, and so they can document it, $I$ assume.

MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Brancard, let me ask you about that. So I don't disagree, number one. Number two, there is a couple of ways you go about it. I mean, they would identify each and discuss the effort for each, or are they allowed to aggregate? How do you want to see it?

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yeah, and there's been evidence from today's cases, there have been a couple of good examples. I think COG did a nice job in one. Some of them actually did, in situations that are similar to yours where there are groups of people, like heirs of so and so, you can aggregate, you know, those conversations. Because there probably were, you tried to communicate with one person, communicate with one person to reach a number of people.

MR. FELDEWERT: Right.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So that's totally reasonable. And in fact, that's a great thing if you can use one party to try to communicate with another party you can't reach, sure, it's all helpful.

MR. FELDEWERT: Yup. Got it.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So that would be sort
of my concern there with that. Just curious, do you know whose surface you're on for the surface hole location? (unclear audio)

MR. FELDEWERT: I don't know off the top of my head, but I think Ms. Greer is here, she may know.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: I don't know whether there are little subdivisions out in that area or --

MS. GREER: Yes, we have a surface agreement from (unclear audio) that are out there.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Could you identify yourself for the record.

MS. GREER: Denise Greer, Catamount Energy.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: That's what $I$ was thinking. I was assuming that the governmental interest here is largely along the shoreline of the lake in terms of recreation, et cetera, controlling use.

MS. GREER: It's would all be minerals in our spacing unit.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: All right.
MS. GREER: I would like to address the question about offset owners.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Hang on. Let me first -- raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth?

MS. GREER: I do.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: And can you identify who you are and what your title and responsibility is.

MS. GREER: Denise Greer, senior landman with Catamount Energy.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you.
MS. GREER: I did want to say that the offsetting owners, offsetting operators are in our well, but have elected to participate in the well.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Offsetting as in --
MS. GREER: There was a question about --
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Which direction?

MS. GREER: All directions -- well, every direction except to the east, which is the BLM, and the BLM was notified.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. So to the south and to the west and Colorado?

MS. GREER: And Colorado.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. Who is the name of the entity again.

MS. GREER: Morning Star is the operator to the north and south, and Simco LLC is the operator to the west.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. Okay. Thank you. That may solve part of your problem, Mr. Feldewert.

MR. FELDEWERT: Well, that's good to hear.

MS. GREER: I think you had a question about fracking. If you want that answer, our geologist is on the line and could probably answer that quickly for you.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: I think that's fine.

That was just a theoretical question more than anything else.

MS. GREER: Okay.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: All right.
Mr. Garcia, back to you then. Have further questions now come up for you?

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I believe I'm still okay.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: All right. Was there anything you would like to see from the operator -- the applicant? Sorry.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: Other than your -- I guess it depends. If like -- the only thing I see outstanding right now would be, I guess, is the contacts, things you used. As far as everything else, I think it's fine the way it is. I'm definitely going to do more viewing of the exhibits for sure. I think we need more detail in the exhibit packet of effort to contact that you requested.

MR. FELDEWERT: I have that on my list to update and provide more detail on the chronology of contacts.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: As far as maps, one
or two, I think we're fine.
MR. FELDEWERT: Yeah. And I also wasn't quite sure how to do the compulsory pooling checklist, so we just go with the format on the $C-102$ s and see that we listed the information for each individual lateral, even though it will be, under the Division's rules, a well, a multilateral horizontal well dedicated to a single spacing unit.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I don't think the formation (unclear audio).

MR. FELDEWERT: Yes.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I don't think the formation or anything (unclear audio) really formation. The big thing for me is formation (unclear audio) I mean if you have a Bone Spring and Wolfcamp (unclear audio).

MR. FELDEWERT: In fact, we dedicated the spacing unit to the (unclear audio) multilateral horizontal well pools.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: Yeah, I think that's fine though. You know, after $I$ look into it more if there's anything, $I$ will reach out to you.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yeah, when I first glance back to the multilateral well section, it's kind of treated like separate wells in terms of how you fill out the forms, et cetera, and C-102, and I think that was helpful to do.

All right. Here's what $I$ propose, Mr. Feldewert, that we continue this case to September 1 , and in the meanwhile $I$ will leave it up to you how you would like to resolve the non-standard spacing unit question since you have several options here, you can treat it as one big non-standard spacing unit with two reasons to be non-standard, too small and too large --

MR. FELDEWERT: Okay.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: -- which would trigger the notice issues, the offsetting notice issues. Or you can try to make it one non-standard spacing unit with a proximity well, or you can make it one standard spacing unit and one non-standard spacing unit, but you might need to (unclear audio) the application.

MR. FELDEWERT: Since I believe the geologist and the engineers want to keep the locations where they are, the application and the notice that was provided was also approval of the non-standard spacing unit, so -- and the testimony has been that the only affected -- all the affected parties that have joined the non-standard spacing unit have then received notice of the application, so I think we are covered.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: That's one of your options.

MR. FELDEWERT: Okay, okay.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Is to treat it as a non-standard spacing unit for two reasons.

MR. FELDEWERT: Yes.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Too small here, too large there.

MR. FELDEWERT: That's right.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: That simply triggers the notice issue you just mentioned.

MR. FELDEWERT: Which $I$ think we are covered.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: You just need to document that then.

MR. FELDEWERT: Document by an affidavit?
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Yes.

TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: They call them waivers where they like waive the 20 -day notice period if they're okay with it. It's a legal process.

MR. FELDEWERT: Got it, I gotcha.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So in addition we need a more detailed discussion of the summary of communications, and that is, A, communications you actually had with persons, and, B, attempts to locate what appear to be unlocatable parties, what efforts did your client go through trying to track down addresses, et cetera, of people.

MR. FELDEWERT: Got it. Can we -- is there a
chance -- those are two things we need to do. Can we just supplement the record and you can take it under advisement? Do we have to continue it, because I think the company was trying to fit this into a drilling schedule.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Aren't they all. MR. FELDEWERT: Well --

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: It's not the first time we have heard that. I think, you know, it's going to take a little time to draft your order anyway because this a little bit unusual, and as Mr. Garcia indicated in other cases we have a bit of a backlog right now in orders that he is diligently working his way through.

So I'm also hoping that this time frame of four weeks would give your client more time to sort of reduce the number of uncommitted parties, to perhaps work it out.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Okay. So anything
else, Mr. Garcia, that you wanted to hear from --
TECHNICAL EXAMINER GARCIA: I don't believe so.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: All right. All
right. So this case then will be continued to the September 1 docket. If you can file a continuance, that would be great, Mr. Feldewert.

MR. FELDEWERT: Will do.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you.
MR. FELDEWERT: Thank you. It's a very
interesting case.
HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: It is.
MR. SANCHEZ: Can $I$ just ask one question?

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Sure.

MR. SANCHEZ: The input given by the two parties via e-mail regarding a contract on these terms, is that going to be a consideration in the order.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: You know, Mr. Sanchez, we don't -- in these compulsory pooling cases, we don't tend to get involved with negotiations between the parties, the applicants and other interest owners, so it's unlikely. You know, we appreciate those issues, and this is not a bad time to raise the issues and continue to push the issues with the applicant and get the best deal you can get, we certainly understand that, but that's sort of the short answer to that.

MR. FELDEWERT: Let me say this, Mr. Sanchez -- I think Mr. Brancard can confirm this -- first off, the pooling order will be limited to the Fruitland Coal Gas, that's the way they are written. And secondly, when you see 200 percent risk penalties, cost plus 200 percent, which is the equivalent of what you customarily see is a 300 percent risk penalty in a JOA. So $I$ hope that's --

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, one the applicants had raised concerns with the lease terms beyond those against
what he considered a standard terms. And so I think, you know, there is very little ability to negotiate especially once the order gets placed to negotiate any of those terms. I don't know the terms that have been offered across all the parties are the same as the terms being offered to the remaining parties, that's not clear to me.

Because I see a lot of communications with negotiations but it's not, it's not well understood what, what you can actually do once a (unclear audio) has his minimum acreage aligned, which you have basics, you already got 60 percent of the ownership.

MR. FELDEWERT: I will have Ms. Greer reach out to you after the hearing and you guys can have some discussion about that. Is that okay?

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. That will
give you a little more time for people to negotiate --

MR. FELDEWERT: Okay.

HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: -- before we enter an order.
(Continued.)
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| 9:18,24 10:3 | pass 16:20 17:23 | 6:23 7:7 8:20 | professional |
| 11:15 13:14 | paul 1:23 | 9:12,25 10:3,16 | 1:23 |
| 15:22 17:4,6 | pdf 6:16 10:1 | 11:4 12:11,22 | property 7:13 |
| 23:21 24:8 | penalties 30:21 | 21:9 | proposal 10:4,5 |
| 30:11 | penalty 30:23 | pooled 7:17 8:3 | 10:12 13:14 |
| ownership 4:16 | people 3:1,9,13 | pooling 1:9 4:14 | 18:6,10 |
| 9:23 10:1 31:11 | 4:1,9 14:22,24 | 6:7 7:16,19,22 | propose 27:1 |
| owns 6:18 7:5 | 16:3 21:8,8,9,25 | 8:16 13:16 | proposed 12:2 |
| p | 22:14,18 28:24 | 16:16 21:8 26:3 | provide 6:5 |
|  | 31:17 | 30:9,19 | 15:18 21:10,22 |
| package 4:11,14 | percent 6:18,21 | pools $26: 17$ | 21:25 25:24 |
| 8:15 |  | poor 32:15 | provided 11:19 |
| ackages 21:21 | 30:22 31:11 | portion 6:3 9:6 | 12:5,13 27:17 |
| cket 25:22 | perforated 9:20 | 14:2 15:20 | provides 9:23 <br> 10:4 12.114 |
| page 4:20 5:4 | period 28:15 <br> permian 10:25 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 16:16 18:22 } \\ \text { post } 12: 17 \end{gathered}$ | 10:4 12:1,14 providing $12: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:15,16 10:1 } \\ & \text { 17:5 18:12 19:7 } \end{aligned}$ | person 22:17,17 | prehearing 3:10 | proximity 20:3,6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:5 18:12 19:7 } \\ & 21: 14 \end{aligned}$ | persons 3:15 | 7:1,14 | 20:8,19 27:12 |
| ges 32:8 | 15:10 28:21 | prepared 8:13 | public 11:8 |
| paragraph 10 | perspective | presented 4:11 | publication |
| 10:18 11:3 | 20:22,24 | 16:7 | 12:21 13:1 |
| parcels 20:16 | petroleum 11:18 | pretty 9:10 | published 12:24 |
| part 9:22 11:7 | 11:21 | previous 6:9 | purple 14:16 |
| 24:24 | phone 11:8 | previously 8:19 | purpose 1:6 |
| participate 7:18 | picture 4:19 | prior 3:24 21:1 | push 30:13 |
| 24:9 | 14:3 | probably 22:16 | put 8:25 9:3 |
| parties 6:22 8:4 | pilot 18:11 | 25:3 |  |
| 8:8 11:4 12:13 | placed 31:3 | problem 24:24 |  |

[qualify - see]

| q | ```realize 5:14 really \(16: 17\) 26:12 reason 5:23 20:11,14 reasonable 22:21 32:15 reasons 9:20 27:6 28:2 rec \(16: 24,25\) 17:1 recall 17:8 received 7:9 27:21 reclamation 17:10,12 record 7:9 13:10 23:11 29:2 records 11:8 recreation 23:16 red 6:22 12:9 reduce 29:14 referring 14:14 refigure 20:18 regarding \(30: 6\) related 32:11 relation 12:2 relationship 4:21 remainder 5:11 remaining 6:21 31:6 remember 3:23 reported 1:23 32:6 reporter 2:12 32:18``` | $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline \text { reporter's } & 1: 17 \\ 32: 4 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{cc} \text { qualify } & 11: 20 \\ \text { quality } & 32: 15 \\ \text { quarter } & 15: 16 \\ 19: 8,8,19,23 \\ \text { quarters } & 19: 19 \\ \text { question } & 14: 5,7 \end{array}$ |  |  | s 2:19:13 |
|  |  | reporters 1:23 representing 3:6 | 20:1 |
|  |  | requested 25:22 | sage 14:16 |
|  |  | requested 25:22 requesting 10:18 | san 1:10 5:16, |
|  |  | quired 6:7 | 10:21 12:24 |
|  |  |  | sanchez 2: |
|  |  | quirements | :3,9,12 6:25 |
| 16:22 19:5,21 |  | 20:25 | 7:14,20 13:7,8 |
| 23:20 24:11 |  | resolve 27:4 | 3:11 30:3,5,9 |
| questions 12:18 |  | ces | 30:17,24 31:15 |
|  |  | bilit | santa 1:18 2:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:21 16:13,20 } \\ & 25: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | responsibility | 6:1 |
|  |  |  | ntisteva |
| quick 6:20 |  |  | 8:2,3,4 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { quickly } 8: 14 \\ 25: 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | returned 21:21 | saw 7:2 |
|  |  | ridge | says 15:9,20 |
| quintana 3:11 |  | right 3:174 | 21:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 1,4 \\ & \text { quite } 26: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | 15 8:11 16:8 | schedule 29: |
|  |  | 18:24 19:9 21:3 | se 5:24 |
|  |  | 23:19 | arch 11 |
| ```r 2:1,7 raise 23:23 30:13 raised 30:25 rates 10:18 11:1 reach 5:11 8:12 11:13 16:13 22:17,23 26:20 31:12 reaches 5:8 read 8:5 19:6 reading \(14: 11,23\) 16:11 20:24 ready 3:20 real 6:20``` |  | 8:6 | arches 11:9 |
|  |  | rio 1:10 5:17 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { second } 4: 205 \\ 8: 2 \quad 12: 25 \quad 13: 2 \end{array}$ |
|  |  | 13:1,1 | $18: 6 \text { 20:14 }$ |
|  |  | risk 30:21, | secondly 30:20 |
|  |  | rivers 17:15,16 | section 5:6,9,12 |
|  |  | 21:2 | 5:12,25 6:3 9:10 |
|  |  | roughly 6:21 | 13,14,16,21 |
|  |  | royalty 6:14 | 0:14 12:3,4,5 |
|  |  | 10: | 5:15,16 19:23 |
|  |  | rule 15:7,17 | 19:25 26:22 |
|  |  | 2:2 | sections 15:16 |
|  |  | rules 3:25 4:3 | 19:8 |
|  |  | 5:1,4 26: | see $3: 12$ 4:23 5:4 |
|  |  | runs 5:1 | $5: 4,166: 17,22$ |
|  |  | rusty 11:16 | 9:5,10 10:2,10 |
|  |  |  | 10:25 12:7,17 |

[see - terms]

[terms - wanted]

| ```31:5 testified 8:19 10:20 11:18``` | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { timely } & 4: 12 \\ 12: 24 & 13: 1 \\ \text { times } & 12: 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 27: 6 & 28: 2 \\ 30: 1 \\ \text { 30:5 } \\ \text { typically } & 17: 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unlocatable } \\ & 21: 11,21,23 \\ & 28: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| testifies 9:17 | 4:12 | u | unprobated 6:10 |
| testify |  | unable 8:11 11:6 | $11: 15$ |
| testimon | today 4:621 | 12:20 | unusual 29: |
| 6:19 23:24 | today's 22:11 | unclear 3:3 4:8 | update 12:14 |
| 27:19 | top 23:4 | $6: 17: 5 \quad 13: 12,14$ | 25:23 |
| texas | to | 14:6,10 16:13,14 | updates 14:13 |
| thank 13:6,20 | totally $22: 20$ | 17:23 18:25 | $\text { use } \quad 22: 22 \quad 23: 16$ |
| 24:6,23 29:24,25 | towns 17:20 | 21:18 23:3,9 | utilizing 5:22 |
| 1:15,16 | track 28:23 | $26: 9,12,13,14,16$ | v |
| theoretical 25 | tract 9:9,10 | 27:14 31:9 | vague 14:21 |
| thing 10:9,17 | 14:24 17:5 | uncommitted | vance $21: 1$ |
| 15:1 22:21 | tracts 5:24 9:8 | 29 | various 6:13 |
| 25:17 26:13 | 9:24 15:10,12 | understand 6:25 | $\text { vertical } 9: 12,15$ |
| things 10:11 | -6 | 7:15 30:15 | 9:22 16:17 |
| 20:23,23 21:11 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { trajectory } & 11: 24\end{array}$ | understanding | 18:10,22 19:1 |
| 25:19 29:1 | transcript 1:17 | 7:25,25 | viewing 25:20 |
| think 7:20 13: | $32: 8$ | understood 31:8 | virtual 1:17,20 |
| 16:6 19:24,25 | treat 27:5 | undertaken | 32:7,14 |
| 22:12 23:5 25 | treated 26:23 | 1:12 | visit 20:10 |
| 25:4,19,21 26:1 | tried 22:1,16 | unifies 12:3 | visited 5:25 |
| $26: 8,11,18,24$ | trigger 20:16,24 | unit 1:9 4:8 5:1 | voluntarily 6:20 |
| 27:22 28:9 29:3 | 27:10 | 5:21 6:7,24 8:20 | 8:9 |
| 29:8 30:18 31:1 | triggering 21:23 | 10:6 11:23,24 | voluntary $8: 12$ |
| thinking 23:14 <br> thousand $4: 19$ | triggers 28:7 <br> true 32.8 | 12:2 15:6,11,1 | $\mathbf{w}$ |
| three 4:19 5:2,11 | trum | 5:15 19:13 | waive 28:15 |
| $5: 17,24 \text { 9:3 }$ | truth 23:2 | 20:13,15 23:18 | waivers 28:15 |
| 12:10 19:7,9,19 | try 11:14 19:22 | 26:7,16 27:4,6 | want 7:3 10:9 |
| thursday 1:21 | 22:22 27:11 | $27: 11,12,13,18$ | 14:13 18:25 |
| time 3:19 10:7 | trying 11:10 | $\text { units } 9: 18 \quad 14: 17$ | 20:19 21:2,5,5 |
| 11:18 15:22 | 16:7 28:23 29:4 | units $9: 18 \quad 14.17$ | 22:9 24:7 25:2 |
| 17:23 29:8,9,13 | turn 20:7 | $9: 20$ | 27:16 |
| 29:14 30:13 | tvd $18: 12,16$ |  | wanted 13:24 |
| 31:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { two } \quad 14: 4 \quad 19: 20 \\ & 20: 2222: 626: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 19$ | 29:17 |

## [water - yup]



