

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 NGL WATER SOLUTIONS CASE NO. 16508
PERMIAN, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF SALTWATER
DISPOSAL WELL IN LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

January 11, 2019

Santa Fe, New Mexico

BEFORE: PHILLIP GOETZE, CHIEF EXAMINER
 TERRY WARNELL, TECHNICAL EXAMINER
 DAVID K. BROOKS, LEGAL EXAMINER

 This matter came on for hearing before the
New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, Phillip Goetze,
Chief Examiner, and David K. Brooks, Legal Examiner, on
Friday, January 11, 2019, 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 NGL WATER SOLUTIONS PERMIAN, LLC:

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

ALSO PRESENT: Deana Bennett, Esq.

INDEX

PAGE

Case Number 16508 Called	3
NGL Water Solutions Permian, LLC's Case-in-Chief:	
Witnesses:	
NEEL L. DUNCAN:	
Direct Examination by Mr. McMillan	4
Cross-Examination by Examiner Warnell	19
Cross-Examination by Examiner Goetze	20
Cross-Examination by Examiner Brooks	21
Proceedings Conclude	26
Certificate of Court Reporter	27

EXHIBITS OFFERED AND ADMITTED

NGL Water Solutions Permian, LLC Exhibit Numbers 1 through 7	14
---	----

1 (1:23 p.m.)

2 EXAMINER GOETZE: Back on the record.

3 Application of NGL Water Solutions Permian,
4 LLC to approve a saltwater disposal well in Lea County,
5 New Mexico, Case 16508.

6 Call for appearances.

7 MR. McMILLAN: Seth McMillan, Montgomery &
8 Andrews, here on behalf of NGL Water Solutions Permian,
9 LLC.

10 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay. Very good.

11 Any other appearances?

12 All right. Proceed.

13 MR. McMILLAN: Mr. Examiner, I have a
14 witness here today to walk us through the affidavits and
15 other information we'll be submitting. I suppose we
16 might want to swear him in.

17 EXAMINER GOETZE: Not right this moment.

18 MR. McMILLAN: Okay.

19 EXAMINER GOETZE: EOG filed a protest, is
20 that correct, and a continuance? So we want to make
21 sure on the record. They're not here.

22 Yes. Please state your name for the record
23 and be sworn in, please.

24 THE WITNESS: Neel Duncan.

25 (Mr. Duncan sworn.)

1 MR. McMILLAN: As there are quite a few NGL
2 applications on the docket, many of which have been
3 continued, I'll clarify right at the onset here that we
4 are dealing with the Patriot SWD #1 well. I'm going to
5 start walking us through these materials with
6 Mr. Duncan's help.

7 NEEL L. DUNCAN,
8 after having been previously sworn under oath, was
9 questioned and testified as follows:

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. McMILLAN:

12 Q. If you could, please, sir, state your name for
13 the record.

14 A. Neel Lawrence Duncan.

15 Q. For whom do you work?

16 A. Integrated Petroleum Technologies as a
17 consultant for NGL Water Solutions.

18 Q. Great.

19 So you have been retained by NGL.

20 A. Yeah.

21 Q. What are your responsibilities for NGL?

22 A. To support them at hearing, to do engineering
23 and to run the drilling completion operations for NGL.

24 Q. Great.

25 Do your responsibilities include management

1 and oversight of drilling saltwater disposal wells?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Have you previously testified before the Oil
4 Conservation Division or the Commission?

5 A. Yes, starting back with Case 10273 in 1991.

6 Q. Well, that's a great memory. Must have been a
7 great day for you, like the birth of your first child.

8 (Laughter.)

9 A. It was 20 years ago.

10 Q. Were your credentials accepted as a matter of
11 record?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And were you qualified as an expert for
14 purposes of that hearing?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. Does your area of responsibility at NGL
17 include the areas of southeastern New Mexico?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Are you familiar with the application having
20 been filed by NGL in this matter?

21 A. I am.

22 Q. And you're familiar with the Patriot WD well,
23 which is the subject of this application?

24 A. I am.

25 MR. McMILLAN: Mr. Examiner, I would tender

1 Mr. Duncan as an expert in operations and engineering
2 matters.

3 EXAMINER GOETZE: He is so qualified.

4 And I will put a caveat that we did meet
5 prior to this application. We went through,
6 essentially, what was a pre-review of what was going to
7 be submitted. This location, I believe, was not
8 contested, that we felt satisfactory with it. So in
9 many respects, this is a finalization of the package
10 that was already presented, for your edification.

11 MR. McMILLAN: Right. And perhaps by way
12 of clarification, we did, at one juncture, have an
13 opposition from EOG to the location, and we'll get to it
14 in a second. But the surface location has changed, and
15 an amended C-102 has been submitted. We'll get there in
16 just a moment.

17 Q. (BY MR. McMILLAN) Mr. Duncan, could you please
18 turn to Exhibit 1 with me?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Does this look like the final application
21 originally filed?

22 A. Yes, the original C-108.

23 Q. I'm sorry?

24 A. Yes, the original C-108.

25 Q. Yes. Okay. Great.

1 Now, has the surface location for the
2 Patriot well changed since the original C-108 was filed?

3 A. Yes, it has.

4 Q. And why did it change?

5 A. It was in the way of a horizontal well proposed
6 by EOG, and I worked with EOG and moved the location
7 closer to the section line.

8 Q. Great.

9 Is Exhibit 2, attached in our exhibit
10 packet, a copy of the amended C-102 showing the new
11 surface location?

12 A. Yes, it is.

13 Q. And can you give us a sense of about how far
14 the location has moved? Has it moved 100 miles?

15 A. It has not moved 100 miles. It's moved within
16 the section.

17 Q. Within the section, just down into Unit --

18 A. It's now 235 feet, I believe, from the west
19 section line. So the idea is to be in the setback area
20 where no wells will be drilled.

21 Q. So it's just a few hundred feet that the well
22 has moved, correct, the surface?

23 A. I don't recall exact footages. I don't know if
24 it's relevant, but -- but we did -- we did move it.
25 It's within the same AOR.

1 EXAMINER GOETZE: Basically, what our
2 concern would be is how has that shifted around that
3 three-quarter mile.

4 THE WITNESS: Right.

5 MR. McMILLAN: Right.

6 EXAMINER GOETZE: But it looks like, based
7 upon what you've provided here, we would have the same
8 AOR, as well as three-quarter-mile buffer.

9 THE WITNESS: Yes.

10 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay. We'll ask you that
11 question.

12 THE WITNESS: Okay.

13 Q. (BY MR. McMILLAN) I note from the application
14 that NGL is requesting a somewhat larger tubing size,
15 correct?

16 A. That is correct.

17 Q. Can you explain to the Examiner why NGL is
18 making that request, please?

19 A. It reduces friction and thus reduces the
20 horsepower required to dispose of water in the well.

21 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any Devonian disposal
22 wells for which the Division has recently approved the
23 use of a 7-inch, 5-1/2-inch tubing?

24 A. Yes. It's been approved for NGL, as well as
25 Mesquite in the past.

1 Q. Okay. Are there other wells currently
2 injecting into the Devonian and/or the Silurian in the
3 general area of the Patriot well?

4 A. In the general area, yes, but not inside the
5 1.7 -- 1.5-mile buffer.

6 Q. Excellent.

7 Has NGL retained a reservoir engineer to
8 conduct a study of the injection zone for the Patriot
9 well?

10 A. Yes, we have.

11 Q. Was that engineer Scott Wilson?

12 A. Scott Wilson of Ryder Scott.

13 Q. Has Mr. Wilson previously testified before the
14 Division?

15 A. Yes. He has been qualified as an expert, I
16 believe.

17 Q. Did he provide NGL with an affidavit discussing
18 his study?

19 A. Yes, he did.

20 Q. Is that affidavit included as Exhibit 3?

21 A. Yes, it is.

22 Q. In that affidavit, does Mr. Wilson confirm that
23 increasing the tubing size for the Patriot well will
24 reduce friction in the wellbore?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Does Mr. Wilson also confirm that using
2 increased tubing sizes will only have a small impact on
3 the pore pressures in the formation?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Is it Mr. Wilson's opinion that the increased
6 tubing sizes will not cause fractures in the formation?

7 A. Yes, it is.

8 Q. Did Mr. Wilson also perform a study looking
9 at -- modeling the migration of fluids to be injected
10 into the Patriot well?

11 A. Yes, he did.

12 Q. And in that study, did Mr. Wilson conclude that
13 over a period of 20 years, the majority of fluids
14 injected will stay within a mile of where the Patriot
15 well is located?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Has NGL retained a geologist to review the
18 geology in the area where the Patriot well will be
19 located?

20 A. Yes. And that is Kate Zeigler.

21 Q. Has Ms. Zeigler previously testified before the
22 Division?

23 A. Yes, she has.

24 Q. Has she provided an affidavit which outlines
25 her study and conclusion?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Is that Exhibit 4?

3 A. Yes, it is.

4 Q. Does Ms. Zeigler find that the areas where the
5 Patriot well -- the area where the Patriot well will be
6 located is suitable for injection at increased rates?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Did Ms. Zeigler find that there is a
9 permeability barrier both above and below the Patriot
10 well's injection zone which will prevent the migration
11 of fluids injected into the reservoir?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Could you please turn to Exhibit 5? Is Exhibit
14 5 an affidavit that NGL has obtained from Dr. Steven
15 Taylor?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Can you tell us who Dr. Taylor is?

18 A. He's a geophysicist in Los Alamos who studies
19 induced seismicity.

20 Q. Did he look at prior seismic activity in the
21 area where the Patriot well is to be located?

22 A. Yes, he did.

23 Q. And he found that there is not a lot of seismic
24 activity in the vicinity, correct?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Did NGL also work with consultants at FTI Platt
2 Sparks to run a fault slip probability tool analysis?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And did Mr. Taylor review those studies?

5 A. Yes, he did, and they're attached to his
6 affidavit.

7 Q. Did Mr. Taylor and FTI Platt Sparks find that
8 there is very little risk of induced seismicity caused
9 by the Patriot well?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Could you please turn to Exhibit 6? Is Exhibit
12 6 a declaration obtained by NGL from Steve Nave?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. Who is Steven Nave?

15 A. He owns a fishing service and tool rental
16 company in Artesia.

17 Q. And has Mr. Nave previously testified before
18 the Division?

19 A. Yes, he has.

20 Q. In his declaration, does Mr. Nave conclude that
21 fishing operations will be possible in the Patriot well
22 if NGL is permitted to use the tubing it requests?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Can you please turn now to what has been marked
25 as Exhibit Number 7? Does this appear to be an

1 **Affidavit of Notice completed by yours truly?**

2 A. Yes, it does, prepared by Seth McMillan.

3 **Q. That's me.**

4 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. And I will just
5 briefly state that what happened here is I was asked to
6 sub in as conflict counsel when EOG popped up. Notice
7 had previously been sent by prior counsel, by the
8 Modrall, Sperling Law Firm. I have attached their work,
9 as well as the Affidavit of Publication from the "Hobbs
10 News-Sun." And in my review of these materials, in my
11 opinion, service was completed. Specifically, the
12 mailing materials show that delivery was made to each of
13 the recipients except for the apparently difficult to
14 locate Bureau of Land Management. That letter was lost.
15 However, BLM was listed in the legal notice published
16 October 19, 2018. So I am satisfied that notice was
17 properly done. I hope the Division shares my analysis.

18 **Q. (BY MR. McMILLAN) Were Exhibits 1 through 6**
19 **created by you or prepared under your supervision or**
20 **direction or compiled from company business records?**

21 A. Yes.

22 MR. McMILLAN: Exhibit 7 was, of course,
23 created by me with some help from prior counsel.

24 **Q. (BY MR. McMILLAN) In your opinion, Mr. Duncan,**
25 **can -- does the granting of this application promote the**

1 **prevention of waste and the protection of correlative**
2 **rights?**

3 A. Yes, it does.

4 MR. McMILLAN: I would move, Mr. Examiner,
5 for the admission of Exhibits 1 through 7.

6 EXAMINER GOETZE: Exhibits 1 through 7 are
7 so entered in the record.

8 (NGL Water Solutions Permian, LLC Exhibit
9 Numbers 1 through 7 are offered and
10 admitted into evidence.)

11 MR. McMILLAN: And that concludes
12 examination of my witness.

13 EXAMINER GOETZE: Mr. Brooks?

14 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I'm a little
15 concerned about the BLM. Do they have actual notice?

16 MR. McMILLAN: Well, no. The letter was
17 lost in the mail, as reflected in the attachment to the
18 Affidavit of Notice, but the BLM received notice by
19 publication.

20 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I don't know if
21 they look at those or not. If they do, they're the only
22 people that do.

23 Why was the BLM on the notice list for
24 this?

25 MR. McMILLAN: I'm sorry?

1 EXAMINER BROOKS: Why was the BLM on the
2 notice list?

3 MS. BENNETT: They must have -- there might
4 be some federal land within the 1.5-mile buffer. The
5 BLM is routinely on our notice list for NGL, and they
6 routinely do not accept service -- or service is not
7 completed to the BLM, for whatever reason. I don't know
8 the answer to that.

9 EXAMINER GOETZE: And would you identify
10 yourself for the --

11 MS. BENNETT: My name is Deana Bennett, and
12 I am alternative non-conflict counsel for NGL.

13 (Laughter.)

14 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I can speculate
15 that there may be some concern among federal attorneys
16 that accepting notice of service from the state court --
17 from a state tribunal of any kind would be waiving
18 federal immunity. I don't know that. They did at one
19 time -- somebody from the BLM did one time tell me that
20 they monitored our dockets regularly, and they would
21 comment on anything they were concerned about, but I
22 don't know. If this is the procedure, we need to work
23 that out with the BLM because I don't think that you can
24 satisfy the requirement that you've made a diligent
25 effort to find them but have been unable to do so or the

1 BLM -- we know where they are.

2 THE WITNESS: The BLM has responded in the
3 past to applications, and that was when they were
4 concerned about the potash area and ensuring the
5 location of the well wasn't going to affect that. But
6 other than that, we've never heard from them, to my
7 knowledge.

8 MS. BENNETT: And I do have some contacts
9 at the BLM and the state office, and I'm happy to give
10 them a call and see if there is an alternative procedure
11 that we should be using for notice. But as I mentioned,
12 we -- on almost all of our notices, our mailings that we
13 do, we either -- we aren't able to get it to the BLM,
14 for whatever reason.

15 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I guess I won't
16 raise a matter in an uncontested case that no nobody
17 else is concerned about. But I think ongoing I'm going
18 to recommend that our management, once we get
19 management, is going to contact the BLM and work out how
20 we're going to do this because I think that we're
21 vulnerable on that. I don't think -- I'm very leery of
22 the idea that the BLM is properly served by publication.
23 I'm not going to rule that they're not, but that worries
24 me.

25 MR. McMILLAN: Okay.

1 MS. BENNETT: Thank you.

2 MR. McMILLAN: Well -- thank you.

3 (Laughter.)

4 EXAMINER GOETZE: So evidently we're not as
5 satisfied as you are.

6 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. But barely satisfied,
7 yes?

8 EXAMINER GOETZE: Barely satisfied.

9 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, of course, I'm sure
10 it's kind of like Mr. Capulet and Juliet. Her
11 consent -- "my will to her consent is but a part," and
12 his satisfaction is kind of dependent on ours.

13 (Laughter.)

14 EXAMINER GOETZE: So noted. In the future,
15 make sure the BLM, we get something solid in response to
16 an application.

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, if you have
18 contacts with BLM, you should -- I would recommend that
19 you contact those contacts and see how they want to do
20 things. And if our management can't establish some kind
21 of rapport on this, I'm going to recommend we revise our
22 rules to -- to eliminate all -- all requirements that
23 the BLM be served with anything.

24 MR. McMILLAN: I mean, if I may note, from
25 sitting in this room especially the last few months, it

1 seems like this is hardly an isolated issue. Is it not
2 the case that BLM is hard to get a letter to?

3 EXAMINER GOETZE: Not necessarily.

4 EXAMINER BROOKS: I don't think they're
5 hard to get a letter to.

6 MR. McMILLAN: Just go knock on the front
7 door?

8 EXAMINER GOETZE: Yeah. Some people
9 actually do physically deposit a copy of the
10 application. But many of the consultants are down there
11 present. It has been a rarity to hear back from them,
12 especially now with the procedure we have for the
13 Devonian wells, but we've never really gone back and
14 asked, "Is this satisfactory as far as being noticed,
15 our involvement with these deep injection wells; are you
16 satisfied?" So that is something we'll have to address.

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yeah. We do need to
18 cover this.

19 EXAMINER GOETZE: Because as well as you
20 know, as I do, there are a lot of them, and once we
21 start injecting --

22 EXAMINER BROOKS: And there is a lot of
23 federal land in this state.

24 EXAMINER GOETZE: Any more questions?

25 EXAMINER BROOKS: No.

1 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY EXAMINER WARNELL:

4 Q. Well, just to kind of continue on with the
5 question about the Feds, I take it this is mostly fee
6 land?

7 A. Yes. This is fee land.

8 Q. No State Trust Land?

9 A. Not in this case.

10 Q. I'm kind of new to this case, so I looked
11 through this material. I didn't see a well sketch or
12 anything. Am I to assume that it's a vertical well?

13 A. It's in the C-108, but if you'd like, I've got
14 a blow-up of that same sketch here.

15 Q. It's a vertical?

16 A. Vertical, yeah.

17 Q. Oh, I see it.

18 A. Yeah. Yeah. It's very fine print in the
19 C-108.

20 Q. So you calculated your 3,300 psi based on the
21 top perf?

22 A. Yeah. The standard gradient of .2.

23 Q. Yeah, of .2.

24 A. Uh-huh.

25

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY EXAMINER GOETZE:

3 Q. And to this point, this has been a design that
4 has come about from several sources of late, both
5 Chevron and Matador. As far as three casings and then a
6 liner drop through the Wolfcamp -- below the Wolfcamp
7 seems to be the best approach at this point, and then
8 open hole below the liner. Variations have been made to
9 accommodate the four string as required by our agreement
10 with the BLM, as well as the potash. Other than that,
11 this is a fairly consistent design that we see.

12 A. Yeah. And in the reef area, there is still one
13 more casing string, when we get to those.

14 Q. Yes. Attention has been brought to the fact
15 that drilling through the Capitan, we can't have the
16 Salado mixing. So we've requested additional casing to
17 isolate the Salado and the Capitan, and they've been --
18 the Galaxy responded.

19 A. The first one and the Raptor, yeah. Not
20 Raptor. There are three of them.

21 EXAMINER GOETZE: Nothing else?

22 I thank you for coming back and redoing the
23 3D grids, the pressure test, with actually putting well
24 names on them.

25 So it is my understanding that both

1 bottom-hole and surface-hole location are adequately
2 covered by your notice?

3 MR. McMILLAN: That's true.

4 THE WITNESS: Yeah. That is correct.

5 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay. Both counsel and
6 witness confirm that?

7 THE WITNESS: Confirm, yes.

8 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay. Yes, sir.

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY EXAMINER BROOKS:

11 Q. And there are no tracts that were in the
12 original -- that were original AOR -- that are in the
13 AOR for the present location that weren't in the
14 original?

15 A. I think the C-102 addresses that, doesn't it?

16 MR. McMILLAN: Let's take a look.

17 EXAMINER WARNELL: Which example are you
18 looking at?

19 EXAMINER GOETZE: I believe Tab Number 2.

20 MR. McMILLAN: Yes, Tab Number 2.

21 THE WITNESS: Since the well moved west 400
22 feet and south a little bit, I think that's -- yeah. It
23 doesn't -- you wouldn't have changed anything in this
24 picture.

25 Q. (BY EXAMINER BROOKS) Well, the AOR is a half

1 **mile, right?**

2 A. One mile for the big Devonian well.

3 MR. McMILLAN: The blue line.

4 THE WITNESS: Yeah, thin blue line.

5 EXAMINER GOETZE: So if you go back almost
6 to the last page of Exhibit Number 2, we have the
7 leases.

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 **Q. (BY EXAMINER BROOKS) My concern would be if**
10 **there would be anybody that wasn't noticed because of**
11 **change of location.**

12 A. We do check that out. Lonquist has a land
13 group that checks that out at the time when these things
14 are revised.

15 Does that comport with your --

16 MR. McMILLAN: That comports with my
17 understanding and with the last page of Exhibit 2 as
18 well.

19 Mr. Examiner, if you have any concerns
20 about this, maybe we can have it double-checked and have
21 it submitted by supplemental affidavit or something that
22 we're in good shape.

23 EXAMINER BROOKS: I'm going to look here
24 just a minute. I found out yesterday that I still have
25 the old version of Part 26 in my rule book, which for

1 this purpose is a good thing because the old version
2 applies, although I don't think this particular matter
3 has changed. The notice provision is so hard to find in
4 Rule 26 (reading).

5 Okay. It's in B2. One-half mile is the
6 notice area.

7 **Q. (BY EXAMINER BROOKS) And in this section --**
8 **let's see. You moved the well how far? These footages**
9 **don't seem to --**

10 A. It was moved west 435 feet.

11 **Q. Moved west 435 feet.**

12 EXAMINER GOETZE: That's surface-hole
13 location and bottom-hole location. The original 102 put
14 it farther to the west -- or towards the east. Excuse
15 me.

16 EXAMINER BROOKS: But it didn't move across
17 the line into the adjacent section. This is 31, so this
18 is on the township line. The adjacent section would be
19 Section 36 of 33 East, I think, and you would still have
20 the same -- I think you still have exactly the same
21 tracts in the notice area, but without a plat that shows
22 it, I can't definitively make that decision. But when
23 we can take the case under advisement, we can check that
24 out.

25 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. And if you'd like

1 confirmation supplementally, I'm happy to provide it.

2 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yes. If you -- if you
3 could provide a plat that shows the tracts that were
4 noticed, and then we can see where the well location is
5 in relation thereto.

6 THE WITNESS: I thought -- and, Deana, you
7 can correct me if I'm wrong -- we were noticing a mile
8 based on the guidance by OCD.

9 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, that would cover
10 all of them because the rule only requires notice -- the
11 rule doesn't say AOR. The rule says one-half mile.

12 THE WITNESS: So that was done in September
13 originally.

14 EXAMINER BROOKS: Did they notice all
15 the --

16 EXAMINER GOETZE: That's where the circle
17 is. It's one mile.

18 EXAMINER BROOKS: Did you notice everybody?

19 EXAMINER GOETZE: Well, we'll go ahead and
20 take a look at the list and verify.

21 MR. McMILLAN: Yes. It does appear that a
22 full mile was noticed.

23 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yeah. And a mile is not
24 required. Only half mile is required under the rule
25 here.

1 MR. McMILLAN: Right. So a change of a few
2 hundred feet should --

3 EXAMINER BROOKS: And this was the rule in
4 effect at the time this case was filed, so it would --

5 MR. McMILLAN: So where should we leave
6 this notice question? Tell me what to do.

7 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, we'll look at it,
8 but I'm pretty sure it's okay.

9 EXAMINER GOETZE: We'll confirm. We'll
10 find you.

11 MR. McMILLAN: Yeah. You know where I am.

12 EXAMINER BROOKS: I'm not really that
13 concerned about it at this point. If you noticed a full
14 mile, you'd get every possible tract within it --

15 MR. McMILLAN: That's what I thought.

16 EXAMINER BROOKS: -- that you're required
17 to.

18 EXAMINER GOETZE: And you just didn't use
19 Midland Maps.

20 MR. McMILLAN: No.

21 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay.

22 EXAMINER BROOKS: You know my opinion about
23 Midland Maps.

24 MR. McMILLAN: Any more questions?

25 EXAMINER WARNELL: No.

1 EXAMINER GOETZE: With that, we'll take
2 Case 16508 under advisement.

3 Thank you very much.

4 And we'll go get you a real hearing
5 examiner. So let's take a break.

6 EXAMINER BROOKS: I thought you were a real
7 hearing examiner.

8 (Case Number 16508 concludes, 1:51 p.m.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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 29th day of January 2019.

21

22

23 MARY C. HANKINS, CCR, RPR
24 Certified Court Reporter
25 New Mexico CCR No. 20
Date of CCR Expiration: 12/31/2019
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters