## STATE OF NEW MEXICO

## ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

CASE NO. 13,437

APPLICATION OF LANCE OIL AND GAS COMPANY FOR COMPULSORY POOLING, SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

SEP SEP

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AM AM

COMMISSION HEARING

ORIGINAL

BEFORE: MARK E. FESMIRE, CHAIRMAN

JAMI BAILEY, COMMISSIONER

FRANK T. CHAVEZ, COMMISSIONER

August 18th, 2005

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the Oil Conservation Commission, MARK E. FESMIRE, Chairman, on Thursday, August 18th, 2005, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, 1220 South Saint Francis Drive, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the State of New Mexico.

\* \* \*

## INDEX

August 18th, 2005 Commission Hearing CASE NO. 13,437

PAGE

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

15

\* \* \*

EXHIBIT

Applicant's

Identified Admitted

Exhibit 1

APPEARANCES

FOR THE COMMISSION:

CAROL LEACH General Counsel Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department 1220 South Saint Francis Drive Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN 117 N. Guadalupe P.O. Box 2265 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2265 By: W. THOMAS KELLAHIN

ALSO PRESENT:

JAMES THOMAS ROBBINS Mineral Interest Owner

1	WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at
2	9:02 a.m.:
3	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: The next order of business
4	before the Commission we're going to take them a little
5	bit out of order. Mr. Robinson $[sic]$ , did I see you come
6	in?
7	MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Would you mind if we
9	take your case first?
10	MR. ROBINSON: No problem.
11	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay, at this time the
12	Commission will call Case Number 13,437, continued from the
13	July 7th, 2005, Commission meeting. It's the Application
14	of Lance Oil and Gas Company for compulsory pooling in San
15	Juan County, New Mexico.
16	I guess we'll start with the Applicant. Mr.
17	Kellahin, you're representing the Applicant today?
18	MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Chairman, that's correct.
19	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: All right, do you have any
20	witnesses today?
21	MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir. We're here to argue my
22	motion on behalf of Lance to dismiss the Application.
23	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay.
24	MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the
25	Commission, back on June 28th, on behalf of Lance I filed a

motion to dismiss this Application. This is for Case 13,437, and the subject of that case has resulted in a pooling order which is Order R-12,339, which pooled the Pictured Cliff formation in the northwest quarter of Section 17.

If you give me a minute, I'll give you a copy of the motion and a copy of the locator map.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: I think we've got a copy of the motion, I'm not sure. And...

Florene, was a copy of the map attached to the --

MS. DAVIDSON: I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Kellahin?

MR. KELLAHIN: Would you like a copy of the locator map?

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Please, sir.

MR. KELLAHIN: Earlier this year, Lance began a project of drilling Pictured Cliff and Fruitland Coal gas wells in an area of the San Juan Basin that included among this well population some wells in Section 17.

If you'll look at the locator map, you'll find the north half of the section. Their strategy has been to pool the north-half spacing unit for the coal gas and then to drill a parent well. In this circumstance, the parent well is the well designated over in the northeast quarter of Section 17. That parent well was the subject of a

separate pooling application. It's the -38 case.

That case was filed, and contemporarily with filing that case there was another pooling case to pool the PC over in the northwest quarter. So when taken in combination, then, Lance would have the circumstance where they had the north-half pool for a parent well, and then they had each of the quarter sections pooled for the PC. And their strategy has been to make choices as they drill this, in order to have either a Coal infill well and a parent well, or two PC wells.

Both those cases were served on Mr. Robbins. He filed an entry of appearance only in the pooling case that affected the northwest quarter of the section.

As a result of a prehearing conference with Mr.

Brooks of the Division and the Examiner and me and Mr.

Robbins, at his request Mr. Robbins asked for a continuance of the case for the northwest quarter. That was bumped and finally went to hearing on April 7th, I believe.

In the interim, the other cases, a whole package of cases, had gone to hearings, including the one for the north half.

At the hearing, then, Examiner Jones was the Hearing Examiner that heard the hearing for the Case -37 that's now the subject of this *de novo* Application. He heard all the facts and circumstances, heard from Mr.

Robbins that Mr. Robbins did not want to be pooled, he did not want to be involved in the spacing unit. In fact, he went to so far as to say that the well should not be drilled. And before and after that hearing we have not been able to come to a solution with Mr. Robbins.

So the pooling orders were issued. Mr. Robbins was given elections under the north-half pooling order for both the PC portions of each wellbore, and the prehearing statement will show that -- I mean the motion will show that there's a component to doing that, that those notice letters were sent to him on June 3rd, and to the best of my knowledge he made no election on either well.

When Lance drilled the well in the northwest quarter, they got down to the top of the PC and made the technical choice not to complete in the PC. And so they're prepared to abandon the order for the pooling of the PC. They then have come up slightly uphole, and I think they are now completing and have made a Coal well. And the Coal well, then, is the infill well to the parent spacing unit well over in the northeast quarter.

So it's our position that as a result of this sequence of events, Mr. Robbins' failure to take timely action, to enter an appearance and participate in the spacing of the north half for the two coal wells, has now lost the opportunity to further complain about that pooling

order. His complaint was as to the PC wellbore, and he made his appearance, participated in the hearing. He's unhappy with that result.

And rather than hear all that again, it is our position that by dismissing the pooling case for the zone that he's pooled in, which we're releasing, that there's no need for a de novo hearing on this matter. And that in substance is our position on the motion, and we would ask that the Commission grant the motion.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Robbins?

MR. ROBBINS: All of that -- you know, if you're completing two wells in one hole, my objection to the thing was the hole itself. I don't care where you perf it, I don't care where you frac it. Splitting the wells out into two wells in one hole seems to me a legal move that, you know, I guess I don't understand why you would do that, except that you could do something like this.

I could, you know, not realize that this is not the -- they've flooded me with enough paperwork to do who knows what, so I can't -- I'm just a plain old common guy. I don't know, you know, this number, that number. I know that they want to put a hole, and I don't want to participate with Lance on it.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Mr. Robbins, you own the surface and some of the minerals; is that correct?

MR. ROBBINS: Yes, I do, all the minerals.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: All the minerals. In the quarter section or in the half section?

MR. ROBBINS: In the half section, I believe.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay.

MR. ROBBINS: And I've got -- you know, people -Mr. Kellahin has said, and Lance has said, that I have a
small little piece. I own a half acre, is what I own. You
know, the fact is, they can't -- you know, I'm not so
insignificant there that they can't do the well without my
participation.

I have tried to negotiate with Lance, they refused to negotiate. They won't even hear anything about it. I believe compulsory pooling should -- you know, there's a need for it, just like on this same section the State owns seven acres, and the State won't make a decision on it, so they just let themselves be forced into compulsory pooling and then get paid.

I don't want to have Lance -- Lance put in a -just part of what Lance has done out there, they've put in
a water-return line, and it tore up the road. I mean, it
just tore up the road, all down -- it's solid mud. They
have made no effort to fix that.

The other morning, Saturday morning, I woke up to the sound of a workover rig at 6:00 a.m. Saturday morning.

They're just irresponsible. They need to -- Having an 1 industrial operation in my neighborhood lowers my property 2 values, and I think Lance should compensate me for that. 3 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioner Bailey, do you 4 have any questions? 5 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Is the wellbore on your 6 7 property? MR. ROBBINS: No, it's about a thousand feet to 8 9 the west of me. MR. KELLAHIN: If I may, Commissioner Bailey, I 10 do have a map that will show you. This is taken from the 11 Examiner transcript, it's Exhibit 4 [sic], and it shows a 12 location for the well and approximately a thousand-foot 13 distance over to Mr. Robinson's. 14 MR. ROBBINS: Incidentally, that well is 150 feet 15 from a bald eagle nest that Lance never even bothered to 16 17 investigate and find. COMMISSIONER BAILEY: The negotiations that you 18 tried to enter into with the company, did they have to do 19 20 with money or with environmental effects? MR. ROBBINS: Several things. My main opposition 21 to this is the lifetime lease aspect of it. Once they get 22 23 -- you know, once they get me into a pool or whatever, into 24 their agreement then, you know, as long as their production 25 or exploration, then they have it locked up. From the

experience I've had around oil companies, once they have 1 that, then they just run rough-shod over everybody. 2 I think -- I would like to see a term lease with 3 Lance and me, to keep them responsible for what they're 4 doing, because they haven't been responsible so far. 5 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Robbins, can I clarify 6 7 something? You have 100 percent of the minerals under your half-acre, right? 8 MR. ROBBINS: That's correct. 9 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay, but not under the half 10 11 section? MR. ROBBINS: No, that's right. 12 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. 13 MR. ROBBINS: One other thing, in the order 14 15 written up from the last hearing, they quoted, you know, as 16 a big piece, that Tom Udall contacted James Kolocny, an 17 attorney for Lance, and Lance's attorney is trying to 18 counsel me on what's my best interest, and I disagree with 19 that entirely. 20 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay, so you contacted Congressman Udall, and he --21 22 MR. ROBBINS: He contacted Lance. And Lance, 23 instead of putting him in touch with Mr. Kellahin, who's 24 representing this case, put him in touch with some 25 attorneys in Grand Junction, of all places.

计标识编 具有一种

circuitously, you know, leading around the bush. 1 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Anything else, 2 Commissioner? 3 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: What is it that you want 4 out of this deal? The well not to be drilled, or 5 compensation or --6 MR. ROBBINS: I want compensation, and I want a 7 term lease, I want it where they can be held responsible 8 for what they're doing in my neighborhood and not just have 9 it for life. 10 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay, thank you. That's 11 all I have. 12 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioner Chavez? 13 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes, this is starting to 14 sound complicated to me as far as the process, Mr. 15 16 Kellahin. Basically, the order that was issued in the first 17 hearing included a provision that drilling would continue 18 and should continue due diligence to test the PC formation; 19 20 and now that there's no intent to do that, does a case 21 actually exist -- is this what you're trying to tell us? -because there's no longer an intent to do that, and this is 22 23 a de novo application, or your Application has been brought de novo, there's no real case? Is this what you're trying 24 25 to tell us?

日本的 法国国际特别

MR. KELLAHIN: I think that's a fair way of 1 saying what I'm trying to express for you, is, we pooled 2 the northwest quarter for the PC interest, and because 3 that's being abandoned, it's not to be completed in the PC, 4 this matter is over. 5 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Okay, and the Commission 6 action to -- basically you're asking the Commission to just 7 dismiss the Application entirely --8 MR. KELLAHIN: Right. 9 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: -- and that vacates the 10 previous order then? 11 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes. 12 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Okay, just wanted to be 13 14 clear. Thank you. That's all I have. 15 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Kellahin, will Mr. Robbins 16 have any interest in the Number 2 well in the Coal? 17 won't, will he? 18 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, he will. 19 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: He will? 20 MR. KELLAHIN: He has an interest in both those 21 wellbores, the parent well and the infill well, and is simply taking -- In the motion to dismiss it shows that 22 23 there are about 15 percent of the PC spacing unit at the 24 time of the pooling that had not been committed. started with some 50 or 60 different owners. As you can 25

The Carlotter

see from the map, it's spread out over a subdivision area 1 where the owners of the surface and the subdivision lots 2 also have their minerals. 3 When we came down to the pooling we had this 4 short list. And of the list, then, Mr. Robbins and his 5 wife, in the PC, have 0.293. Simply divide that in half, 6 7 and then he has the component of participation in the production associated with the two Coal gas wells. 8 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. It seems to me that the 9 relief that Mr. Robbins is seeking is not within the 10 purview of this Commission. I think our choice is either 11 to grant the motion or not to grant the motion. You know, 12 the decision that we would make today is probably not going 13 to affect the claim that you're making, if you were to 14 bring that claim in court. But I don't think that we have 15 16 a choice other than to grant the motion. Commissioner? 17 18 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Yes, I agree. 19 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: I concur. 20 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay, and the Chair would 21 entertain a motion to that effect. 22 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I so move. 23 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Second. 24 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: All those in favor? 25 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Aye.

```
COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Aye.
 1
               CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Opposed?
 2
               We'll draft an order to that effect and rule that
 3
     way, Mr. Robbins. I appreciate your time.
 4
               MR. ROBBINS: Thank you very much.
 5
               CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: You bet. Thank you, Mr.
 6
 7
     Kellahin.
               MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you.
 8
 9
               (Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
10
     9:20 a.m.)
                                 * * *
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I was a street of

## 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 Commission 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 August 19th, 2005.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 16th, 2006

