

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:

APPLICATION OF DEVON ENERGY PRODUCTION CASE NOS. 16427,
COMPANY, LP FOR A STANDARD HORIZONTAL 16428,
SPACING AND PRORATION UNIT AND COMPULSORY 16429
POOLING, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

October 4, 2018

Santa Fe, New Mexico

BEFORE: MICHAEL McMILLAN, CHIEF EXAMINER
DAVID K. BROOKS, LEGAL EXAMINER

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, Michael McMillan, Chief Examiner, and David K. Brooks, Legal Examiner, on Thursday, October 4, 2018, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Wendell Chino Building, 1220 South St. Francis Drive, Porter Hall, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

REPORTED BY: Mary C. Hankins, CCR, RPR
New Mexico CCR #20
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters
500 4th Street, Northwest, Suite 105
Albuquerque, New Mexico 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

APPEARANCES

FOR APPLICANT DEVON ENERGY PRODUCTION COMPANY, LP:

SETH C. McMILLAN, ESQ.
MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS LAW FIRM
325 Paseo de Peralta
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
(505) 982-3873
smcmillan@montand.com

INDEX

	PAGE
Case Numbers 16427, 16428 and 16429 Called	3
Case Presented by Affidavit	3
Proceedings Conclude	24
Certificate of Court Reporter	25

EXHIBITS OFFERED AND ADMITTED

Devon Energy Production Company, LP's Affidavits of Melissa Miller, J. Russell Goodin and Spencer Rolfs and Exhibits A, B, C and D associated with those affidavits	24
--	----

1 (2:46 p.m.)

2 EXAMINER McMILLAN: I'd like to call this
3 hearing back to order.

4 We're now going to hear Case Number 16427,
5 which is application of Devon Energy Production Company,
6 LP for a standard horizontal spacing and proration unit
7 and compulsory pooling.

8 Will this be combined with the next two
9 cases?

10 MR. McMILLAN: Please.

11 EXAMINER McMILLAN: And this will be
12 combined with Case Numbers 16428 and 16429.

13 Call for appearances.

14 MR. McMILLAN: Seth McMillan, Montgomery &
15 Andrews, on behalf of Devon.

16 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Any other appearances?

17 MR. McMILLAN: I have no witnesses. I'll
18 be submitting this case by affidavit.

19 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Please proceed.

20 MR. McMILLAN: Just to give the broad
21 strokes here, we are in Sections 6 and 7, Township 26
22 South, Range 34 East. We have three separate
23 applications filed for three separate 320-acre spacing
24 units. In Case 16427, we're in the east half of the
25 east half of Sections 6 and 7. We're dealing with the

1 Wolfcamp.

2 16428 involves the west half of the east
3 half, also the Wolfcamp.

4 And Case 16429 is the east half-east half
5 in the Bone Spring.

6 The wells throughout are named the Jayhawk
7 wells. The names are different, but they're all Jayhawk
8 wells. And I have here an affidavit of our land person,
9 as well as an affidavit of the geologist, one of each
10 for each of the three cases. And I have a combined
11 Notice of Affidavit that I executed.

12 Without reading every word, I'd like to
13 just guide the examiner through the affidavits, if that
14 would be helpful.

15 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Yes.

16 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. Our land person is
17 Melissa Miller. She has not been qualified as an expert
18 petroleum landman before, but she sets forth her
19 credentials here. She graduated from the University of
20 Oklahoma with a bachelor's degree in business in '05,
21 and she has worked at Devon for 13 years as a landman,
22 the last three specifically in New Mexico.

23 Ms. Miller notes that this affidavit is
24 being submitted per the Division rule allowing for
25 submission by affidavit and that Devon seeks to force

1 pool working interest owners into the horizontal spacing
2 unit described below and the wells to be drilled in the
3 unit.

4 Critically, Ms. Miller notes in paragraph
5 eight that there is no opposition -- well, at the time
6 there was no opposition expected and, as it turns out,
7 no opposition has materialized. That's one reason why
8 we are going forward with this by affidavit. The other
9 reason I will note is that these seem to me at least --
10 they may not to the examiner; you can let me know if you
11 disagree. But these seem like straightforward, simple
12 cases and, thus, more amenable the affidavit approach
13 than bringing witnesses in from Oklahoma.

14 In any event, all of the interest owners to
15 be pooled were contacted with well proposals, and they
16 either failed or refused to voluntarily commit their
17 interests. And in any event, they represented to
18 Ms. Miller that they do not oppose the pooling
19 application, and, as it turns out, no opposition has
20 materialized.

21 With respect to Case 16427, that's where
22 Devon seeks an order pooling all mineral interests in
23 the Wolfcamp underlying the west half-east half of
24 Section 7. That spacing unit is to be dedicated to the
25 Jayhawk 6-7 Fed Fee Com 3H well. It's a horizontal

1 well. The affidavit has attached to it Exhibit A
2 showing the plat outlining the unit being pooled. It
3 also shows the location of the proposed wells.

4 Exhibit B attached shows the parties being
5 pooled, the nature of their interests and their last
6 known addresses. We included there -- with respect to
7 the last known addresses and our Notice of Hearing, we
8 included both the working interest owners and the
9 overriding royalty interest owners.

10 Critically, Mr. Brooks, in paragraph 12,
11 there are no depth severances in the Wolfcamp Formation
12 here.

13 EXAMINER BROOKS: That should make it
14 straightforward and simple.

15 MR. McMILLAN: I hope so.

16 Paragraph 13 lays out the wells to be
17 drilled on this unit.

18 And I have one thing that I'd like to raise
19 for the record. It was brought to my attention recently
20 by Examiner McMillan that in the filed C-102 for the
21 Jayhawk 6-7 Fed Fee Com 3H well, the bottom-hole
22 location in that filed C-102 is, I believe, 1,020 feet
23 from the east line. What we're actually seeking -- and
24 this is what's set forth in the application, the
25 advertisement and the affidavits -- is a bottom-hole

1 location of 980 feet from the east line, that being
2 orthodox. The 1,020 was unorthodox.

3 Attached to Ms. Miller's affidavit are the
4 latest and greatest C-102s reflecting the 980.

5 I guess my question for you, Mr. Examiner,
6 is whether the attached C-102 is sufficient for clearing
7 up the issue with the unorthodox location or whether,
8 perhaps, Devon should be filing a sundry notice as to
9 its filed C-102 clarifying the 980. Does that make
10 sense?

11 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Yeah. Easily handled.
12 Call Hobbs.

13 MR. McMILLAN: Call Hobbs. Okay. I will
14 let them know to do that exactly.

15 EXAMINER BROOKS: Give them what they want.

16 MR. McMILLAN: I'm sorry?

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: And give them what they
18 want (laughter).

19 MR. McMILLAN: You got it (laughter).

20 Moving on, Ms. Miller testifies that she
21 did a diligent search of the public records in search of
22 all of the interest owners. She made a good-faith
23 effort to obtain voluntary joinder.

24 The proposed C-102s, as I mentioned, are
25 attached as Exhibit C. Also identified in paragraph 16

1 of the affidavit are the wells that will be developed
2 from the Wolfcamp Formation, and the pool and pool code
3 are identified there. It's an oil and gas pool.

4 Exhibit D shows a sample proposal letter
5 and the AFE that was sent along with the proposal
6 letters for the proposed wells. Also included with
7 Exhibit D are the -- is a list of the addresses to which
8 the well-proposal letters were sent, and hopefully the
9 signature date indicates that delivery was appropriately
10 made to all parties.

11 Paragraph 18, Devon requests overhead and
12 administrative rates of \$6,000 a month for drilling and
13 600 a month for producing. Ms. Miller testifies that
14 those rates are fair and comparable to the rates charged
15 by operators in this area and requests that the rates be
16 adjusted periodically as provided in the COPAS
17 accounting procedure. Devon also requests the 200
18 percent risk charge and requests that it be designated
19 operator.

20 Ms. Miller notes that the exhibits were
21 prepared by her or compiled from Devon's company
22 business records, and, of course, includes the magic
23 statutory language that the application is in the
24 interest of conservation, the prevention of waste and
25 the protection of correlative rights.

1 Thus concludes my quick breeze-through of
2 Ms. Miller's land affidavit for Case 16427. I don't
3 know if now is a good time to take questions. Of
4 course, I didn't do the affidavit. If you need
5 additional information, I can certainly get that back to
6 my client and we can submit straightaway.

7 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Any unlocatables?

8 MR. McMILLAN: There were not with respect
9 Ms. Miller's piece.

10 When we get to my Notice of Affidavit,
11 there were a couple of folks who did not return green
12 cards. There was a trust and another override that did
13 not return green cards. We also have yet to receive a
14 green card back from EOG. However, also attached to my
15 affidavit is the Affidavit of Publication. We published
16 to all of these entities, is the long answer. Sorry. I
17 think you wanted a yes or no there. The answer is yes,
18 and we published to them.

19 EXAMINER McMILLAN: I don't really have any
20 questions.

21 Do you?

22 EXAMINER BROOKS: No.

23 MR. McMILLAN: Great. Let's move on to the
24 geologist's affidavit in Case 16427. Thankfully, the
25 geology is essentially uniform between Cases 16427 and

1 16428, so we can adopt the geology testimony here for
2 purposes of both cases.

3 In any event, the geologist, J. Russell
4 Goodin. He also has not been qualified by the Division
5 as an expert petroleum geologist. His credentials are
6 set forth in paragraphs five and six here.

7 Mr. Goodin has attached as Exhibit A his
8 Wolfcamp structure map. He notes, with respect to this
9 exhibit, that he's drawn a red rectangle around the unit
10 to be pooled, that the strata dips approximately 100
11 feet eastward across the Jayhawk sections. The apparent
12 structural dip along the wellbores is just about zero
13 degrees, and he notes no major structural hazards at
14 this location.

15 Exhibit A also shows a cross-section line,
16 A to A prime, and demonstrates again that the structure
17 dips down to the east just slightly.

18 Moving to Exhibit B, that's Mr. Goodin's
19 strat cross section hung on the top of the Wolfcamp.
20 He's seeing consistent target thickness in these
21 horizons. He testifies that the well log shown on the
22 cross section do, in fact, give a representative sample
23 of the Upper Wolfcamp Formation here and demonstrate
24 reasonable well control. The target zone is helpfully
25 identified by a blue line in Exhibit B, and he testifies

1 the target zone is continuous across the well unit.

2 Finally for Mr. Goodin's exhibits, Exhibit
3 C is a gross isochore of the Upper Wolfcamp. The map
4 shows a thickness with a target interval, again
5 designated in Exhibit B. The Upper Wolfcamp,
6 Mr. Goodin testifies, is uniform across the proposed
7 well unit. Mr. Goodin's conclusions, from the attached
8 exhibits, are that the unit is justified from a geologic
9 standpoint, that there are no structural impediments or
10 faulting that will interfere with horizontal development
11 and that each quarter-quarter section in the unit will
12 contribute more or less equally to production.

13 He finally notes that the preferred well
14 orientation in this area is the north to south, and
15 that's because the preferred orientation of maximum
16 horizontal stress here is roughly east-west, that the
17 granting of the application is in the interest of
18 conservation, the prevention of waste and the protection
19 of correlative rights.

20 And that does it for Mr. Goodin's geology
21 affidavit on Case 16427. Are there any questions I can
22 address?

23 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay. So each of these
24 proposed wells are for different targets within the
25 Wolfcamp?

1 MR. McMILLAN: Each of these proposed wells
2 is within -- I think it's the same -- it should be the
3 same target -- let's see. I believe it's the same
4 target zone, but it's all within the Wolfcamp, to be
5 certain.

6 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Then why would you have
7 three wells on top of -- three wells on top of each
8 other?

9 MR. McMILLAN: That's a great question. It
10 seems to me that they may, in fact, be going to
11 different --

12 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay. Then you can
13 supplement the record with that.

14 MR. McMILLAN: Yes. Why don't we do that?
15 Would it be helpful to have an additional exhibit from
16 Mr. Goodin showing -- breaking out the target intervals
17 for each of the wells?

18 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Yeah. I mean, I'm just
19 looking at this, and it would be nice if he had put a
20 green dot or a red dot or something where the different
21 targets are. You can supplement the record with that.

22 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. Okay. We'll do
23 exactly that.

24 Anything else for Mr. Goodin?

25 EXAMINER BROOKS: I don't think so for

1 Mr. Goodin.

2 You told us there were no depth severances.

3 MR. McMILLAN: That's right.

4 EXAMINER BROOKS: That's the important
5 part.

6 MR. McMILLAN: That's the issue of the day.

7 And maybe what I'll do now is, although I
8 kind of did it before -- I hate to repeat myself -- just
9 a quick walk-through of my Affidavit of Notice, which
10 applies to all three cases and is at the bottom of the
11 pile of affidavits that I provided.

12 EXAMINER BROOKS: Did you notice -- are
13 there overrides?

14 MR. McMILLAN: Yes, indeed.

15 EXAMINER BROOKS: And did you notice --

16 MR. McMILLAN: There were three overrides,
17 one -- two of whom we did not receive a green card back
18 from, so they received notice by publication.

19 EXAMINER BROOKS: Okay. And the fee
20 leases -- this is fed fee, so I assume there are some
21 fee leases involved. And do they all have pooling
22 clauses?

23 MR. McMILLAN: The overrides?

24 EXAMINER BROOKS: No. I'm talking about
25 the fee leases.

1 MR. McMILLAN: In the leases, right.

2 EXAMINER BROOKS: Fee leases. Do they all
3 have pooling clauses?

4 MR. McMILLAN: That, I don't know.

5 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, you're going to
6 need to get your land witness to supplement on that
7 subject. If that's true, then there is no need to
8 notice. That's why I always try to --

9 MR. McMILLAN: Sure. That's my
10 understanding as well. More often than not, we err on
11 the side of caution, and we overnotice these folks.

12 EXAMINER BROOKS: Most fee leases --
13 practically all fee leases within the last 50 years have
14 pool clauses.

15 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. I will confirm that
16 and get something on that.

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: Okay. There is no notice
18 requirement if they have pool clauses.

19 MR. McMILLAN: I understand.

20 Any additional questions as to my Notice of
21 Affidavit?

22 EXAMINER BROOKS: No.

23 EXAMINER McMILLAN: I don't have anything.

24 MR. McMILLAN: Thank you.

25 Turning now to Case 16428, this is very

1 similar. Again, this is the west half of the east half.
2 We're still in the Wolfcamp. The first affidavit, the
3 land affidavit, is again from Melissa Miller. I won't
4 repeat her credentials and why she should be qualified
5 to provide this affidavit.

6 She again sets forth the reasons why no
7 opposition was expected, and I already represented that
8 no opposition has materialized.

9 She has attached to her affidavit here
10 Exhibit A showing, again, the plat and the location of
11 the proposed wells.

12 Her Exhibit B, once again, lists the
13 parties to be pooled, the nature of their interests and
14 the last known addresses. She also helpfully included
15 the results of her mail-ins of the well-proposal letters
16 and shows that they were all successfully delivered.

17 Mr. Brooks, there are no depth severances
18 here.

19 EXAMINER BROOKS: Good.

20 MR. McMILLAN: The limitation of the depths
21 of the wells are shown in paragraph 13.

22 I need to make a statement for the record
23 as to the names of the wells in this case. In our --
24 and I just noticed this last night or the night before.
25 That's why I'm having to do this on the record. But in

1 our application, we flip-flopped the numbers 6 and 7 in
2 the well names. They are correctly set forth here in
3 this affidavit, which is to say that the first well
4 listed in paragraph 13 is the Jayhawk 7-6 Fed Fee Com
5 6H. That's the correct well name. In our application
6 way back when, we misnamed the well as the Jayhawk 6-7
7 Fed Fee Com 6H. Of course, we are hopeful that this is
8 not fatal to our application. We just wanted to get it
9 out there and cut off any potential confusion at the
10 pass.

11 Ms. Miller continues on to say that she
12 conducted a diligent search and that Devon made a
13 good-faith effort to obtain voluntary joinder of the
14 working interest owners.

15 The proposed C-102s are attached as Exhibit
16 C, and the C-102s also set forth the correct well names.

17 Exhibit D is a sample proposal letter and
18 the AFE that was sent with the sample proposal -- or
19 with the well-proposal letters, and Ms. Miller testifies
20 that these costs are fair and reasonable and comparable
21 to other similar wells. Overhead and administrative
22 rates are the same as requested in the last case, 6,000
23 a month for drilling and 600 for producing. These rates
24 are fair and comparable, and Devon requests that they be
25 adjusted periodically. Devon requests the 200 percent

1 risk charge. Devon asks that it be designated operator.

2 And the exhibits to the affidavit were
3 prepared by Ms. Miller, compiled from Devon company
4 records, and the granting of the application is in the
5 interest of conservation, the prevention of waste and
6 the protection of correlative rights.

7 Questions I can field as to Ms. Miller's
8 affidavit?

9 EXAMINER BROOKS: No.

10 EXAMINER McMILLAN: What about
11 unlocatables?

12 MR. McMILLAN: Same. Same as in the last
13 case.

14 EXAMINER BROOKS: I should say same as to
15 overrides, I assume?

16 MR. McMILLAN: Exactly. So it will confirm
17 the same information with respect to the last case.

18 EXAMINER BROOKS: Okay.

19 MR. McMILLAN: Mercifully, we can
20 incorporate the geology discussed in 14627 here in
21 16428.

22 EXAMINER McMILLAN: So the east half-east
23 half and the west half-east half, the surface locations
24 are in opposite sections; is that right?

25 MR. McMILLAN: The surface location --

1 that's right; thus the 6 to 7 and 7 to 6.

2 EXAMINER McMILLAN: You had me confused on
3 that.

4 MR. McMILLAN: That's exactly right. Yes.

5 EXAMINER McMILLAN: And -- okay. Go ahead.

6 MR. McMILLAN: Well, frankly, I was just
7 going to incorporate by reference the discussion as to
8 the geology and field any questions specific to this
9 case.

10 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay. All
11 quarter-quarter sections will contribute equally?

12 MR. McMILLAN: Yes, indeed. I believe --
13 yes. Paragraph 12C of Mr. Goodin's affidavit states
14 exactly that.

15 Moving on to Case 16429, this is the Bone
16 Spring. We are only in the east half-east half, and all
17 that's being proposed at this time in the Bone Spring is
18 a single well, which I suppose -- we don't call it the
19 defining well. We call it the well that defines the
20 unit? Is that right?

21 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yeah. I'm okay with
22 either.

23 MR. McMILLAN: There was something about
24 this two weeks ago.

25 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yeah. Well, "defining

1 well" was -- is a term that should be defined, but it's
2 not.

3 MR. McMILLAN: Right.

4 EXAMINER BROOKS: Some people don't like me
5 to use it.

6 MR. McMILLAN: Next time. Next rulemaking,
7 we'll get to it.

8 In any event, this is once again
9 Ms. Miller. Her credentials are set forth in her
10 affidavit. She identifies that there's no opposition
11 here either, identifies the location and the extent of
12 the proposed unit, provides a plat as Exhibit A showing
13 the unit and the proposed wells.

14 Exhibit B identifies the parties to be
15 pooled, the nature of their interests and their last
16 known addresses. She also includes the results of her
17 mailing of the well-proposal letters. Everybody
18 received those. There are no depth severances in the
19 Bone Spring Formation.

20 Paragraph 13 sets forth the locations of
21 the proposed depths, including the total depth for the
22 Jayhawk 6-7 Fed Fee Com 15H well. Ms. Miller conducted
23 a diligent search of the public records, et cetera, and
24 also made a good-faith effort to obtain voluntary
25 joinder.

1 The proposed C-102 for the proposed well is
2 attached as Exhibit C. In paragraph 16, Ms. Miller
3 identifies the formation and the pool name and pool
4 code. It's an oil and gas pool.

5 Exhibit D is her sample well-proposal
6 letter and AFE. She testifies that the costs are fair
7 and reasonable and comparable. Administrative and --
8 overhead and administrative rates, again, are 6,000 a
9 month for drilling a well and 600 a month for producing.
10 Those are fair and comparable rates. Devon requests the
11 200 percent risk charge and asks that it be designated
12 operator.

13 The exhibits were prepared by Ms. Miller,
14 and the granting of the application is in the interest
15 of conservation, the prevention of waste and the
16 protection of correlative rights.

17 Any questions on Ms. Miller's affidavit in
18 Case 16429?

19 EXAMINER McMILLAN: No.

20 EXAMINER BROOKS: No.

21 MR. McMILLAN: Great.

22 Well, let's get to the geology here, and I
23 will walk you through this. We have just slightly
24 different geology because it's the Bone Spring. We also
25 have a different geologist. This gentleman's name is

1 Spencer Rolfs. Mr. Rolfs has not been qualified
2 previously. However, his credentials are set forth in
3 paragraphs five and six of his affidavit.

4 Mr. Rolfs provides, as Exhibit A, his
5 structure map outlining the pool, noting that the strata
6 dip just 100 feet or so eastward across the section.
7 The structural dip along the wellbores is about zero
8 degrees, and he identifies no major structural hazards.

9 Exhibit A also identifies wells in the
10 vicinity of the proposed well and provides a
11 cross-section line running from A to A prime.

12 Exhibit B is that stratigraphic cross
13 section running A to A prime. It's hung on the base of
14 the 3rd Bone Spring Sand. Mr. Rolfs testifies that he's
15 seeing consistent target thickness in these wells near
16 the Jayhawk proposed well. The well logs are a
17 representative sample of the formation in the area and
18 demonstrate reasonable well control. He's indicated the
19 target zone in a blue line on Exhibit B, and he notes
20 it's continuous across the well unit.

21 Finally for the exhibits here's -- oh, boy.
22 Ah, yes. Exhibit C is the gross isochore of the 3rd
23 Bone Spring Sand. He notes from this exhibit that the
24 3rd Bone Spring Sand is uniform across the proposed well
25 unit. Mr. Rolfs' conclusions are that the unit is

1 justified from a geologic standpoint, that there are no
2 structural impediments or faulting interfering with
3 horizontal development, that each quarter-quarter
4 section in the unit will contribute more or less equally
5 to production. He notes that the preferred well
6 orientation is north-south and provides the magic
7 statutory language.

8 Is there anything I can address with
9 respect to Mr. Rolfs' affidavit or exhibits?

10 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Based on the quality of
11 work and the education, he's an expert witness.

12 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. Great. I'll let him
13 know. He was worried (laughter).

14 EXAMINER McMILLAN: And the same statement
15 in 427 and 428. That's part of the record.

16 MR. McMILLAN: Great. Appreciate that.

17 EXAMINER McMILLAN: So in 16427, is the 3H
18 the well that is going to define the unit?

19 MR. McMILLAN: It is.

20 EXAMINER McMILLAN: In 16428, is it the 8H,
21 the well that defines the unit?

22 MR. McMILLAN: Yes, indeed.

23 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Go ahead, David. Do
24 you have any questions?

25 EXAMINER BROOKS: Nothing.

1 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay.

2 MR. McMILLAN: Great.

3 Well, I'd ask that pending submission of a
4 couple of pieces of additional information, that this
5 case be taken under advisement.

6 EXAMINER McMILLAN: Okay. So Cases 16427,
7 16428, 16429 will be taken under advisement at this
8 time.

9 (The court reporter reminded the parties to
10 offer the exhibits.)

11 MR. McMILLAN: Oh. I move to re-open the
12 cases we just took under advisement, and I'd move the
13 admission of, well, all three affidavits of Melissa
14 Miller and associated exhibits. I'd move the admission
15 of the affidavits of J. Russell Goodin and associated
16 exhibits, and I move the admission of the affidavit of
17 Spencer Rolfs and his associated exhibits. And finally
18 I'd move the admission of my Affidavit of Notice and the
19 exhibits thereto.

20 EXAMINER McMILLAN: All affidavits and
21 exhibits associated with Cases 16427, 16428 and 16429
22 may now be accepted as part of the record.

23 And, once again, all the cases shall be
24 taken under advisement.

25 Thank you.

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

(Devon Energy Production Company, LP's
Affidavits of Melissa Miller, J. Russell
Goodin and Spencer Rolfs and Exhibits A, B,
C and D associated with those affidavits
are offered and admitted into evidence.)
(Case Numbers 16427, 16428 and 16429
conclude, 3:14 p.m.)

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3

4 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

5 I, MARY C. HANKINS, Certified Court
6 Reporter, New Mexico Certified Court Reporter No. 20,
7 and Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify
8 that I reported the foregoing proceedings in
9 stenographic shorthand and that the foregoing pages are
10 a true and correct transcript of those proceedings that
11 were reduced to printed form by me to the best of my
12 ability.

13 I FURTHER CERTIFY that the Reporter's
14 Record of the proceedings truly and accurately reflects
15 the exhibits, if any, offered by the respective parties.

16 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
17 employed by nor related to any of the parties or
18 attorneys in this case and that I have no interest in
19 the final disposition of this case.

20 DATED THIS 25th day of October 2018.

21

22

23 MARY C. HANKINS, CCR, RPR
24 Certified Court Reporter
New Mexico CCR No. 20
Date of CCR Expiration: 12/31/2018
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters

25