

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 NOS: 21273, 21274

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MARATHON OIL
PERMIAN LLC FOR COMPULSORY POOLING,
EDDY COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS
COMMISSIONER HEARING, VOLUME 3
August 20, 2020
Santa Fe, New Mexico

BEFORE: ADRIENNE SANDOVAL, CHAIRWOMAN
JORDAN KESSLER, COMMISSIONER
DR. THOMAS ENGLER, COMMISSIONER
MIGUEL LOZANO, ESQ.

This matter came on for virtual hearing before
the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission on Thursday,
August 20, 2020 through the New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and
Natural Resources Department, Webex Platform, Santa Fe, New
Mexico.

Reported by: Irene Delgado, NMCCR 253
PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS
500 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 105
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-843-9241

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

APPEARANCES

FOR MARATHON OIL PERMIAN LLC:

DEANA BENNETT
LANCE HOUGH
MODRALL SPERLING ROEHL HARRIS & SISK PA
500 4th Street, NW, Suite 1000
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-848-9710
deana.bennett@modrall.com

FOR BTA OIL PRODUCERS:

DANA HARDY
ANDY BLANCO
HINKLE SHANOR LLP
P.O. Box 0268
Santa Fe, NM 87504
505-982-4554

EXHIBITS (Admitted)

Marathon Exhibits 18-20 and all attachments	09
Marathon Exhibits 21-24 and all attachments	27

1	WITNESSES	
2	CHASE RICE	
3	Direct by Ms. Bennett	05
4	Cross by Ms. Hardy	09
5	YURI RODIONOV	
6	Direct by Ms. Bennett	11
	Cross by Ms. Hardy	27
7	Commission Examination	31
8	BRITTON McQUIEN	
9	Direct by Ms. Hardy	32
	Cross by Ms. Bennett	39
10	CLOSINGS	
11	By Ms. Bennett	58
12	By Ms. Hardy	62
13		
14	Reporter Certificate	48
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Good morning, everybody.
2 It is 11:13, and we will continue hearing the cases from
3 Thursday and Friday last week. As we stated last week, we
4 will start today's hearing with an hour of, of the new
5 exhibits that were presented in the Marathon and BTA case.

6 I know that there was an objection from BTA
7 regarding the admission of any of these records. This is an
8 administrative hearing which means, you know, we are trying
9 to take all of the information into -- into account as we
10 make a ruling.

11 So we feel like we need this information in order
12 to make an accurate ruling on these cases. We will, as we
13 deliberate, you know, look at exhibits with the appropriate
14 weight depending upon, you know, when they were submitted
15 throughout the deliberations, so that's something we will
16 look at.

17 In addition there was no objection during the
18 initial hearing when mentioned that these exhibits would be
19 added to the record, and therefore we are going to accept
20 them and go ahead and discuss them very briefly today during
21 the hearing.

22 Really, you know, all you need to do is introduce
23 them, provide some very brief context, and again, very brief
24 cross. I think I mentioned last week that if we do not
25 finish today we will be finishing in November. So if

1 either, you know, if any of the either parties have any
2 sense of urgency, we need to get through this today, we feel
3 like we can, while not unnecessarily rushing things.

4 We are expecting it's going to take a
5 considerable time to deliberate, so, you know, we need to
6 also take into account that that time will be needed today
7 towards the end of the day.

8 With that, let's go ahead and get started,
9 reconvene the BTA versus Marathon case with the new
10 exhibits. We have an hour allotted for this, and no more,
11 so it is 11:15 now, by 12:15 we need to be moving back into
12 the BTA and Novo case.

13 MS. BENNETT: Understood.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Ms. Bennett, would you like
15 to recall any of your witnesses?

16 MS. BENNETT: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. At
17 this time I would like to recall Mr. Chase Rice, the
18 landman.

19 MR. RICE: I am on the hearing, on the mic.

20 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: We can hear you. Court
21 reporters, will you swear him in again.

22 CHASE RICE

23 (Recalled and sworn, testified as follows:)

24 DIRECT EXAMINATION

25 BY MS. BENNETT:

1 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chase -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Rice.
2 Mr. Rice, you testified at the August 13, 2020 hearing;
3 right?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. And you heard the instructions from the chair a
6 moment ago to be brief in our presentation of our new
7 exhibits; is that right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. So let's quickly go through the two exhibits that
10 we are going to talk about. Let's, first of all, for the
11 benefit of the Commissioners and Ms. Hardy and my witnesses,
12 we are going to work through our supplemental exhibit packet
13 in order, and so let's start with Exhibit Number 18.

14 Mr. Rice, can you explain what Exhibit Number 18
15 is?

16 A. Sure. This is just approval from the BLM
17 approving Marathon's development area. The Commissioners
18 requested that Novo provide it, so we ended up providing
19 that just for (unclear).

20 Q. Thank you. Let's talk about Exhibit 19 now. Can
21 you explain to the Commissioners what Exhibit 19 is, please?

22 A. Sure. This is just a high-level location map of
23 various spacing units in relation to the green box which is
24 the Novo, BTA, Marathon Valkyrie area. This is just a --
25 this will tie into the the well list that's in a later

1 exhibit. It's just a kind of a reference map.

2 Q. And so you provided this map to give the
3 Commissioners a sense of where the Valkyrie unit is in
4 relation to the other wells that are part of the slides that
5 are to follow?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay, thank you. Let's look at Exhibit 20 now.
8 Could you please describe to the examiners what Exhibit 20
9 is.

10 A. Yes, it's an exhibit that originally was
11 (unclear) setback that -- setback that would be created
12 between -- created by the BTA one half mile proposals. As
13 you can see, it would result in one unnecessary setback.
14 This is for the Wolfcamp which would equate to 120 all
15 undeveloped and/or stranded acres.

16 So the first page of 20 is BTA one half mile
17 plan. The second page is simply the currently approved Novo
18 2-mile plan and Marathon 2-mile plan showing the setback
19 that has been eliminated.

20 Q. And just to be clear, on Page 20, you are showing
21 two sets -- the red rectangles are two sets of setbacks?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. Are you -- is it your understanding that only
24 one -- one set of those setbacks is an additional setback
25 that's unnecessary under the Marathon Novo plan?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Is that what you are trying to show on the second
3 page of Exhibit 20?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So you're not trying to (unclear) two additional
6 setbacks on page -- Exhibit 20?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. Okay.

9 MS. BENNETT: Those are the only questions I have
10 for, for Mr. Rice. At this point I would --

11 Q. Well, Mr. Rice, were Exhibits 18 through 20
12 either compiled from company business records or prepared by
13 you or prepared under your supervision?

14 A. Yes.

15 MS. BENNETT: At this time I would like to move
16 the admission of Exhibits 18 through 20.

17 MS. HARDY: I noted BTA's objection and filing,
18 and also I would not object to 19 or 18, but we did object
19 to 20. And I also wanted to note that with respect to the
20 lack of an objection during the initial public hearing, Ms.
21 Bennett had just asked her witness if he could provide the
22 information, hadn't actually requested that the Commission
23 allow it, and I ask for clarification of that today on
24 information that would be provided, and to confirm it was
25 all new information by Dr. Engler. And Ms. Bennett

1 indicated that Commissioner Kessler had also requested
2 information, but when I looked back at the video,
3 Commissioner Kessler actually didn't ask for a supplemental
4 exhibit, so I just wanted to note those for the record.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Those are noted.

6 MS. HARDY: Thank you.

7 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Commissioners, do you have
8 any objection entering 18 through 20 into the record?

9 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: No.

10 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: No objection.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Marathon supplemental
12 Exhibits 18 through 20 are entered into the record.

13 (Exhibits Marathon 18-20 admitted.)

14 MS. BENNETT: Thank you. I have no further
15 questions.

16 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Ms. Hardy, do you have any
17 questions?

18 MS. HARDY: I do have a couple of very quick
19 questions.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MS. HARDY:

22 Q. Mr. Rice, with respect to Exhibit 18 --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- the development area was approved based on OCD
25 Order 21251 which is the subject of this hearing; correct?

1 A. I'll agree that those numbers are the correct,
2 yes.

3 **Q. And on Exhibit 20, do you have that in front of**
4 **you?**

5 A. Oh, yes, sorry.

6 **Q. Okay. Is Marathon asserting that the setback**
7 **areas create stranded acreage?**

8 A. It creates areas where acreage is not going to be
9 efficiently or effectively produced because you won't be
10 able to fracture stimulate in that 660 area.

11 **Q. But it's not actually stranded; is that right?**

12 A. Stranded in the sense it's not going to be
13 produced, so it's not stranded in the sense that you are
14 saying they can't -- it's stranded because you are not
15 producing out of it, so you could consider it stranded, but
16 I'm just a landman.

17 **Q. Thank you. Those are all of my questions for**
18 **you.**

19 A. Okay, thanks.

20 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Commissioners, do you have
21 questions for Mr. Rice?

22 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: No.

23 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: No questions.

24 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: All right. Thank you. Ms.
25 Bennett, do you have any more witnesses?

1 MS. BENNETT: Yes, Madam Chair, at this time I
2 would like to call or recall, I guess, Mr. Rodionov. He is
3 the engineer from Marathon.

4 THE WITNESS: I'm here.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Court reporter, would you
6 please reswear the witness.

7 YURI RODIONOV

8 (Recalled and sworn, testified as follows:)

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MS. HARDY:

11 Q. Thank you, Mr. Rodionov. You testified at the
12 hearing on August 13, 2020; correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And the exhibits that you and I are going to talk
15 about next are Exhibits 21 through 24 in the Marathon
16 supplemental exhibit packet; is that correct?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And were you on the line a moment ago when the
19 chair asked the parties to be brief?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. So we will quickly move through these, but
22 please feel free to add any color or nuance that you think I
23 may be skipping over if you feel like that's important to
24 you.

25 Let's start with Exhibit 21. Can you briefly

1 describe Exhibit 21 for the Commissioners?

2 A. Yes. Exhibit 21 reflects analysis of the
3 potential reserves under the setbacks that would be () under
4 the Marathon 2-mile plan.

5 Q. And are the setback lengths that are in the
6 columns on the first two tables, are those taken from the
7 information in Mr. Rice's Exhibit 20?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And in the second column of each of the tables on
10 the first page of 21, you have (unclear) number of wells
11 needed to cover the acreage, where did you get that
12 information from?

13 A. Those information came from Marathon and BTA's
14 exhibits with the development proposals.

15 Q. Okay. And then the setback feet per well, how
16 did you calculate that 200 feet or what is that 200 feet,
17 660 feet represent?

18 A. That represents the footage which will, which
19 will be required in each of those setbacks. And essentially
20 for the Second Bone, it's 100 feet, and because it's both
21 sides, it's 200 multiplied by the number of wells.

22 Q. So that's the final column is the setback feet
23 multiplied by the number of feet?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. And here you -- the table includes Upper

1 **Wolfcamp and Lower Wolfcamp. Is there a reason for**
2 **combining those -- the XY, Upper Wolfcamp, in Marathon**
3 **lingo, is XY and A, and Lower Wolfcamp, in Marathon**
4 **terminology, is C and D. Is there a reason why you combined**
5 **or why those are combined in this chart?**

6 A. Yes. That was done to streamline the process to
7 make the comparison easier.

8 Q. Okay. Now, the second table, what does that
9 table represent?

10 A. Sorry, I'm sorry. Yeah, the second table
11 essentially has the same information as the previous table
12 for the look at the setbacks, and the table shows the
13 difference or well pad between setback footages between two
14 proposals, BTA proposals and Marathon proposal.

15 Q. Hold on a second, Mr. Rodionov. Let's stay on
16 the first page of Exhibit 21. Is that what you were talking
17 about, or were you talking about the second page of Exhibit
18 21?

19 A. I was talking about the second page of Exhibit
20 21, and I was going column by column.

21 Q. Okay. Let's, just for the sake of completion,
22 let's look at the first page of Exhibit 21.

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. Could you just briefly describe the second table
25 there that's labeled setback feet under the Marathon 2-mile

1 **plan?**

2 A. Yeah, I'm sorry, I skipped over a page. So that
3 table is similar to the first table we looked at, and it
4 shows the setback feet under the -- under the Marathon
5 2-mile plan, it shows the setback length and number of wells
6 required and total footage for those setbacks.

7 Q. Okay. And is there a reason why the Second Bone
8 Spring wells showed a number -- showed two wells to cover
9 the acreage there instead of one which is what Marathon is
10 proposing?

11 A. Yes, because in this proposal, Marathon would
12 have to drill one well in the N/2 N/2 section, and I recall
13 from a BTA witness saying that under that proposal, BTA will
14 still drill a 1-mile Bone Spring well covering N/2 N/2
15 Section 7.

16 Q. So the second well there is the BTA 1-mile
17 lateral?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. If they decided to choose that route?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Thank you for that. Now let's turn to the meat
22 of the exhibit, and -- which is on Page 2. And please
23 describe for the examiners -- for the Commissioners what
24 exhibit -- the second page of Exhibit 2 shows.

25 A. The second page of the exhibit shows the

1 difference between setback footages between BTA and Marathon
2 proposals, which you can see in the column called Delta. So
3 essentially it's the difference between the first two
4 columns, and the fourth column represents the average one
5 year BOE per foot which we calculated from the wells which
6 you can see underneath the table.

7 We used RTI, Longview wells, Ogden wells, those
8 are four Ogden wells and the (unclear) wells, same wells BTA
9 used for their exhibits. And we multiplied by Delta of the
10 footages to come up with potential reserves which would be
11 not recovered.

12 Q. And when you say the average one year BOE per
13 foot, did you calculate that average?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And did you base that off of the publicly
16 available information?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And is that based on the first year production or
19 subsequent year productions?

20 A. First year production.

21 Q. So that's the average of the first year
22 production for the wells that you have identified below the
23 table; is that right?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. And what's the total that you calculated would be

1 the additional average BOE that could be recovered under
2 Marathon's proposal?

3 A. It's 134,282.

4 Q. Okay. And let's see, I think -- let me just take
5 a quick look at my questions. I'm trying to go quickly, but
6 I want to make sure I haven't forgotten anything.

7 When you say average, what do you mean by average
8 one year BOE per foot?

9 A. So we look at cumulative volume oil produced by
10 this well and average that number between all wells in that
11 footage.

12 Q. So like for the Second Bone Spring there were
13 four wells that you used; is that right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And so the number in the first column there
16 represents the average of those four wells. Is that what
17 you are saying?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And same for the other two sets of wells?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Is there a typo in the third -- the final column
22 about additional average BOE recovered?

23 A. Yes. This comma is in the wrong place, it should
24 be placed after four, not after five.

25 Q. So it should -- what should the total be for the

1 Upper Wolfcamp then?

2 A. It's 54,952, so essentially the number doesn't
3 change, just the comma is in the wrong place.

4 Q. Okay. Thank you. Let's go ahead and look at
5 Exhibit 22. Do you have that in front of you?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And Exhibit 22 has two pages; right?

8 A. Yes. Can you explain what the first page of
9 Exhibit 22 is?

10 A. Yes. So this first page of Exhibit 22 shows the
11 cumulative barrels of oil per foot comparison between Ogden
12 wells and the child wells and Trebuchet, Mariner, Hermes and
13 Gravel Grinder.

14 Q. And do you recall at the hearing on August 13
15 your discussion with Commissioner Engler where he asked if
16 you had done modeling on the parent-child effect in, in
17 preparation for this hearing?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And is this the modeling -- excuse me -- did you
20 answer yes to that question?

21 A. Correct. Yes.

22 Q. Is this the modeling that you were referring to
23 in part in your response to Commissioner Engler's question
24 about prior modeling you had done?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Does this first page of Exhibit 22 -- or what
2 does this first page of Exhibit 22 tell you about the
3 parent-child effect?

4 A. So when we look at the cumulative volume of
5 parent Ogden wells which were developed first, we can see
6 that the volume is higher and the child wells have lower
7 volume.

8 Q. Are the -- is the Ogden well a north-south or an
9 east -- I'm sorry -- are the Ogden wells north-south wells
10 or east-west wells?

11 A. North-south.

12 Q. And so which -- so the Ogden parent, which part
13 of the sections are those in?

14 A. Ogden parents were in the west -- I'm sorry --
15 E/2 section.

16 Q. And the Ogden child?

17 A. West half.

18 Q. So the -- so the parent -- did you -- so there
19 a relationship there that you have noted between the E/2 and
20 W/2; is that right?

21 A. Correct. So parent wells were developed in the
22 E/2 first, and then child wells were drilled in the W/2 and
23 they were impacted by the production of the parent wells.

24 Q. Can look at the second page of Exhibit 22?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Are those additional examples of the parent-child
2 effect that you supplied to me?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Did I inadvertently leave in two wells from the
5 table that you supplied to me?

6 A. Yes, the (unclear) and White Snake well should
7 have been removed.

8 Q. Okay. Other than that, though, the table that
9 you provided to me shows parent-child wells?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Is that what you mean by infill wells?

12 A. Yes. Infill means child.

13 Q. And what is your take-away from the parent-child
14 couple that you have identified on the second page of
15 Exhibit 22?

16 A. When we look at the barrels per foot comparison
17 between parent and child wells, this table shows that parent
18 wells have higher barrels per foot compared to the child
19 wells.

20 Q. And what do you attribute that difference in
21 production to?

22 A. You can attribute it due to the -- to depletion
23 caused by the parent wells which result in sub-optimal
24 stimulation of the child wells.

25 Q. Okay. And, in your opinion, does your modeling

1 of the Ogden wells, along with your review of the wells that
2 we just discussed on Page -- on the second page of 22, in
3 conjunction with your experience support Marathon's concerns
4 that unless the N/2 and S/2 that we are discussing in these
5 cases are co-developed, there could be a parent-child
6 effect?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And would Marathon's plans of co-developing the
9 N/2 and the S/2 ameliorate or minimize the parent-child
10 effect?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Would BTA's plan -- could BTA's proposal lead to
13 the parent-child effect?

14 A. Yes, it will.

15 Q. Thank you. Let's turn now to -- the next
16 exhibits we are going to talk -- two exhibits are Exhibits
17 23 and 24, but I just want to talk a little bit about what
18 led to the creation of Exhibits 23 and 24. Were you asked
19 by the Commissioners to provide backup data for the Exhibit
20 16 that Mr. Moore prepared?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And what happened when you went to the drawing
23 board to access his information?

24 A. Yeah. Unfortunately I was not able to access the
25 data Mr. Moore used because he is no longer with the

1 company, so we decided to do this additional analysis.

2 Q. And so despite your best efforts -- so I
3 understand that Marathon may have tried to reach out to Mr.
4 Moore to ask for his data, where it was stored on the
5 Marathon files. Do you know if anyone at Marathon did that?

6 A. Yes, we did our best effort, but we couldn't
7 retrieve that information.

8 Q. So after you realized you couldn't access Mr.
9 Moore's data, did you try to come up with -- what did you
10 do after you realized you couldn't access Mr. Moore's data?

11 Did you try to come up with some exhibits that
12 would be responsive to Commissioner Engler's request?

13 A. Yes. So we decided to create the Exhibit 23,
14 which essentially shows the volume produced by laterals with
15 the different lateral lengths.

16 Q. And was this based on data that Marathon had in
17 its files?

18 A. Yes. We used a public data.

19 Q. Uh-huh. So that's Exhibit 23, and can you just
20 briefly explain what the first page of Exhibit 23 shows and
21 specifically identify part of your legend that you used to
22 differentiate the wells, and then the type of curve that you
23 have used here and what sort of data you used in your method
24 for calculating?

25 A. Yes. This plot shows the 12 -- the first 12

1 months' cumulative oil production versus the percentile.
2 And it's color coded by the lateral length, and it shows
3 that five producing wells are -- of the wells which are
4 above a certain percentile are laterals which are 1.5 and
5 2-mile wells.

6 Q. And so your Exhibit 23 shows that, for example,
7 there are 2-mile laterals out at the very end of the
8 S-curve, but there are also 1.5 miles that outperform 2-mile
9 laterals?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. And this is based on cumulative oil; is that
12 right?

13 A. That's right.

14 Q. And did you apply any sort of interpretations or
15 any sort of judgment call to this plot, or is it just raw
16 data?

17 A. No, this is raw data from public sources.

18 Q. And so you just plotted the production values
19 against the time to create this?

20 A. Again, the percentile.

21 Q. The percentile, thank you.

22 A. Yes, uh-huh.

23 Q. And speaking of time, what is -- let's look at
24 exhibit -- the spreadsheet you have attached to Exhibit 23.

25 A. Okay.

1 Q. Can you briefly describe the different columns on
2 this spreadsheet?

3 A. Yes. This is the older wells which were used to
4 create the first page of Exhibit 23. It has well, API
5 number, well name, operator, lateral length (unclear) volume
6 and the fluid volume used in stimulation and landing zone
7 and data completion.

8 Q. Okay. Thank you. The -- this spreadsheet,
9 though, does not -- well, first of all, this spreadsheet
10 covers multiple zones; is that right?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. And but it doesn't cover or it doesn't include
13 the first year of production information that you used to
14 plot the -- the red dots or the dots on the S-curve on Page
15 23, does it?

16 A. No, this particular table does not.

17 Q. Where did you get the first year of production
18 information?

19 A. We got it from the public data, IHS.

20 Q. Okay. And so this -- is this slide based on
21 first year production information?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. By this slide, I mean Exhibit 23, first page.

24 A. Yes, correct, that's first 12 months' production.

25 Q. So if there is a well in the spreadsheet that you

1 have attached to Exhibit 23 that doesn't have a first year's
2 worth of production, would that well have been included in
3 the plot on the first page of 23?

4 A. No, it will not.

5 Q. Okay. (Pause.) Just make sure I asked you all
6 the questions I wanted to. Oh, the wells that are
7 identified on Pages 1 through 15 of the spreadsheet, which
8 is the entire spreadsheet, is it your understanding that the
9 locator map that Mr. Rice prepared and testified to, which
10 is Exhibit 19, was -- that locator map was intended to
11 include most of the wells, the units that encompass these
12 wells on your spreadsheet?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. So just as a final question, what is your
15 takeaway from Exhibit 23?

16 A. So Exhibit 23 shows that out of the wells which
17 which were sampled, longer laterals have higher cumulative
18 oil volume produced.

19 Q. Okay. Thank you. And you understand -- or you
20 are not suggesting that Slide 23 shows that 2-mile laterals
21 are more efficient than 1.5 mile laterals, right, just that
22 they have a higher cumulative oil --

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. -- percentage? Let's look then at Exhibit 24.

25 A. Okay.

1 Q. Did you prepare Exhibit 24 and the chart that
2 accompanies it?

3 A. I didn't do it personally. We did it in
4 collaboration with our team.

5 Q. Have you reviewed Exhibit 24 and the data that's
6 in the chart that accompanies it?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And do you know, who did prepare this chart?

9 A. So this chart was prepared by the development
10 director of permian.

11 Q. And he calculated the drilling cost per foot?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And you coordinated with him about where those
14 costs came from and how he calculated those costs; right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. So when you look at this Exhibit 24, can you
17 please explain to the Commissioners what DRL cost per
18 lateral foot means?

19 A. It means drilling cost per lateral foot.

20 Q. And then underneath that is a bracket that says
21 percentage of SL. What does that mean?

22 A. So SL, XL and XXL is our internal abbreviation of
23 1-mile, 1.5-mile and 2-mile laterals. And percentages means
24 that everything is normalized versus 1-mile lateral.

25 Q. So when you say normalized versus 1-mile lateral,

1 can you explain that a bit more? Does that mean that the
2 100 percentile was the starting point and then each
3 subsequent calculation was based off or calibrated to the
4 100 percent?

5 A. Yeah. If one mile -- if cost for 1-mile lateral
6 per foot well is 100 percent, everything else will be
7 referenced with that 1 mile. You see all the percentages
8 that reflects those percentages in relation to 1 mile.

9 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Just so that you know that
10 you have an hour for both parties.

11 MS. BENNETT: Yes, I'm sorry, I'm was trying to
12 finish up. Just one more question.

13 Q. What's your takeaway from this slide, Mr.
14 Rodionov?

15 A. This slide shows that longer laterals are more
16 capital efficient.

17 Q. Okay. Thank you. Were Exhibits 21 through 24
18 prepared by you or under your supervision or compiled from
19 company business records?

20 A. Yes.

21 MS. BENNETT: At this time I would move to
22 have Exhibits 21 through 24 admitted into the record

23 MS. HARDY: I object for the reasons stated that
24 I gave earlier.

25 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: That has been noted.

1 Commissioners?

2 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: I have no questions.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: No. Or no objection.

4 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: No objection.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Marathon Exhibits 21

6 through 24 are now entered into the record.

7 (Exhibits Marathon 21-24 admitted.)

8 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Ms. Hardy, do you have any
9 questions for the witness?

10 MS. HARDY: I do have a couple of questions.

11 Thank you.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MS. HARDY:

14 Q. Mr. Rodionov, on 21 regarding setbacks, the
15 analysis is based on the assumption that the Division and
16 Commission's rules strand reserves underlying the setbacks;
17 is that right?

18 A. No. I wouldn't say those exact words. I would
19 say it's based on the understanding that the sufficient (
20 those reserves under those setbacks, those reserves, it all
21 has to be effectively stimulated. And if it is not
22 effectively stimulated, it will affect the recovery.

23 Q. Setbacks are required by the rules; correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Do you believe it was the intent of the setback

1 rules to strand or prohibit development of the reserves
2 underlying the setbacks?

3 A. I cannot quite answer the question because I
4 don't know the background behind the rationale for those
5 rules.

6 Q. Can you look at Exhibit 22, please?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And specifically with respect to the additional
9 examples that are listed on Page 2 of Exhibit 22, these
10 wells are mostly in the Lower Wolfcamp; is that right?

11 A. No. It's not correct. Those are not Lower
12 Wolfcamp wells.

13 Q. Are those most of the wells in the Lower
14 Wolfcamp?

15 A. No.

16 Q. And the exhibit uses 12 months barrels of oil per
17 foot for comparison; correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And with respect to the Haroun Ranch 4H
20 well, it's a mile and a half from the 2H; isn't that right?

21 A. I need to look at the map, I do not recall the
22 actual distance.

23 Q. Do you recall whether the 3H Haroun Ranch well is
24 between 2H and the 4H?

25 A. Which one?

1 Q. The Haroun Ranch 3H is in between the 4H and 2H?

2 A. I need to check that. I don't remember.

3 Q. Okay. But you have listed the Haroun Ranch 4 as
4 a child well; right?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. On Exhibit 23, with respect to the chart listing
7 the wells, I think you said earlier that this exhibit does
8 not address recovery efficiency in barrels of oil per foot;
9 is that right?

10 A. Exhibit 24?

11 Q. 23.

12 A. Oh, sorry, 23. Correct, it shows that absolutely
13 BOE recovery is higher, yes.

14 Q. But not efficiency?

15 A. But not efficiency.

16 Q. And the list of wells includes multiple horizons
17 from the Third Bone Spring through the Lower Wolfcamp;
18 correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q. And it provides information regarding multiple
21 operators on multiple projects; correct?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. And it doesn't provide information regarding
24 spacing or completion practices; correct?

25 A. Correct. Well, spacing, no, but completion

1 volumes are provided in the table.

2 Q. Okay. With respect to your Exhibit 24, the
3 exhibit only includes 30 1-mile wells; is that right?

4 A. I didn't -- I need to count it, but I don't know
5 exact number, but those, those wells, everything which
6 wasn't used is in the table on the second page Exhibit 24.

7 Q. And are you aware that it includes only six
8 1.5-mile wells?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And two 2-mile wells; correct?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. Okay. And Exhibits 23 and 24 are additional
13 analyses regarding your prior testimony; is that right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. And so when you testified previously about
16 Exhibit 16, you hadn't reviewed the underlying data
17 reflected in that exhibit because it wasn't available;
18 correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. So you were just testifying about that exhibit
21 without the underlying data; correct?

22 A. I didn't have a chance to raw data which was used
23 to create the exhibit, but I had access to conclusions
24 provided by that exhibit, correct.

25 Q. Those are all of my questions. Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Commissioners, do you have
2 any questions?

3 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: No.

4 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Yeah.

5 Mr. Rodionov, again, to clarify, your Exhibit 16
6 was from a well database that you don't have access to that
7 was Upper Wolfcamp only; is that correct?

8 THE WITNESS: That is correct.

9 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: And your new Exhibit 23 is
10 from a database that you do have access to that encompasses
11 multiple horizons; is that correct?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Okay. One last question.
14 In your Exhibit 16, the comparison was related to the EUR
15 and EUR per foot. In your new Exhibit 23 you are just
16 talking about 12 months cume oil. Do you believe that 12
17 months cume oil is a good reflection of EUR?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, we have internal data to
19 support that, that first year cumulative oil reflects higher
20 ultimate recovery.

21 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Do you have data or
22 knowledge that the EUR per lateral foot as your Exhibit 16
23 was trying to prove also then is true for these wells that
24 you just presented?

25 THE WITNESS: Can you say that again? I didn't

1 quite hear you, the end of your question.

2 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: For your data, for your new
3 Exhibit 23, do you have knowledge or information to say that
4 the EUR per lateral foot for those wells, do you have that,
5 and is there a relationship between lateral length and that
6 recovery?

7 THE WITNESS: I don't have that information
8 readily available, but it can be obtained, calculated, yes.

9 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Thank you. No more
10 questions.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: No questions for me. Ms.
12 Bennett, do you have any more witnesses?

13 MS. BENNETT: No, I do not, thank you.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Thank you. Ms. Hardy, do
15 you have any witnesses?

16 MS. HARDY: I do have one witness to address the
17 supplemental exhibits and that's Britton McQuien.

18 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Mr. McQuien, are you there?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

20 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Yes. Court reporter, will
21 you please swear him in?

22 BRITTON MCQUIEN

23 (Recalled and sworn, testified as follows:)

24 DIRECT EXAMINATION

25 BY MS. HARDY:

1 **Q. Mr. McQuien, on Marathon's Supplemental Exhibit**
2 **18 from the BLM, did BTA ever receive a notice that the**
3 **development area was approved?**

4 A. We did not.

5 **Q. Has BTA communicated with the BLM regarding**
6 **Marathon's APDs and the status of those APDs?**

7 A. Yes, we have.

8 **Q. And what is the result of those communications?**

9 A. Jim Rutley with the BLM says in the () by
10 Marathon that they will cooperate with the OCD's
11 implementation of the rules and the order that's the subject
12 of the hearing. He also said that they will not grant any
13 APDs until the ruling -- the hearings are resolved.

14 **Q. Let's go to Marathon's Supplemental 19. Did you**
15 **have any comments on that exhibit?**

16 A. No, no, I don't.

17 **Q. On Exhibit 20, Marathon asserts that the setbacks**
18 **create stranded acreage. Do you agree with that assertion?**

19 A. I disagree with that assertion. I don't --

20 **Q. Why?**

21 A. -- to establish that for that purpose.

22 **Q. And why do you disagree?**

23 A. You know, we believe that over the life of the
24 project that you will drain the lease -- or my previous
25 testimony shows very consistent recovery, even at the one-

1 year point from the different developments and implying that
2 there was a fixed amount of oil and even with the setbacks
3 those different projects consistently recovered the same
4 amount of oil.

5 Q. And with respect to Exhibits 20 and 21, is it
6 your opinion that setbacks were established to allow each
7 operator their ability to recover their fair share of
8 reserves, not to strand acreage?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Do you have any other comments on Exhibits 20 or
11 21?

12 A. I would just like to point out on the second page
13 of Exhibit 21, in the calculation of additional BOE
14 recovered, that implicitly assumes there was no drainage
15 past the first and last take points on the wells listed here
16 (unclear). For the reasons already stated, I don't believe
17 that's a correct assumption, so I think that BOE or
18 additional BOE is misleading.

19 Q. On Exhibit 22 regarding the Ogden parent-child
20 effect --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- can you provide your comments on that exhibit,
23 please?

24 A. Yes. I think the previous version of this, the
25 Ogden child was not included on this chart. While it's

1 still -- those child wells are still outperforming or two
2 child wells are outperforming the three wells per half
3 section developments Marathon executed at the Mariner and
4 Trebuchet, as well as the five wells per half section
5 Hermes.

6 The Gravel Grinder was the first one drilled in
7 this area and have not been able to replicate the results of
8 that one since, even though the Trebuchet and Mariner were
9 adjacent to it.

10 On a project basis, you know, the Ogden parents
11 and Ogden child have recovered just as much as the
12 Trebuchet, Mariner and Hermes. And just the Ogden child
13 wells, you can see by the time they were located in between
14 the Ogden or what Marathon labeled the Ogden parents and the
15 Hermes. So, you know, we are seeing some depletion there,
16 which I think does explain why those wells are performing
17 while the Ogden parent line, drilling more wells is not
18 going to remedy that problem.

19 **Q. And did BTA provide information regarding the**
20 **developed half sections that performed similarly?**

21 A. Yes, we did. The seven half sections had a very
22 consistent recovery. And the Gravel Grinder was the () and
23 certainly an outlier. As I said in the previous testimony,
24 we are going to base our development plan on the seven
25 (unclear) cases.

1 Q. Do you have any other comments on that exhibit?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Did you have any comments on Page 2 of Exhibit
4 22?

5 A. Exhibit 22, yes. You know, I just want to point
6 out that the Haroun Ranch wells, those are wells that BTA
7 operates. I wouldn't consider the 4H a child well. The 2H
8 was drilled first, and then we drilled a two-well pad that
9 3H and 4H, and the 4H is located a half mile away and the 3H
10 is in between the 2H and 4H.

11 So that, that -- you know, maybe you can see the
12 3H as the child well, but certainly not 4H, you know. And
13 then, you know, one thing I would like to point out, our
14 Haroun Ranch wells, those are Lower Wolfcamp. You also have
15 a Speedwagon on here. The W2 designation, that's
16 Mewbourne's designation for Lower Wolfcamp or Wolfcamp B.

17 However, you know, the -- you know, and the
18 Lower Wolfcamp, if you remember, is a gas primary phase,
19 although they're trying to show the effect of the
20 parent-child in barrels of oil per foot, I think that -- I
21 wouldn't call that very reliable. You certainly have to
22 look at the primary phase to see that -- potentially see
23 that.

24 Q. Mr. McQuien, to summarize, is it your opinion
25 that the additional examples of the parent-child effect that

1 **have been provided by Marathon are not a fair**
2 **representation?**

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. **And that's for the reasons you have discussed?**

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. **Can you look at Exhibit 23, please?**

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. **And with respect to the first page, which is the**
9 **plots on the graph, can you provide your comments on that,**
10 **please?**

11 A. Yes. I think we have already looked at that.
12 This all originated from Dr. Engler's question about the
13 recovery efficiency, whether 2-miles were more efficient
14 than 1.5 miles barrels of oil per foot. You know, obviously
15 you would expect longer laterals to have higher cume, so I
16 don't think that you really gain anything from this chart.
17 I would not dispute that longer laterals would recover more.

18 It's not recovery efficiency, and you know, I
19 don't think that's the case that longer laterals necessarily
20 are more efficient, and you know, that this chart certainly
21 doesn't speak to that. Also, I mean, I have a real problem
22 with the, you know, source data as well shown in the table,
23 you know.

24 Once again, if we are looking at Third Bone
25 Spring, XY, A, you know, which are kind of all in the upper

1 Wolfcamp oil resource. And then there is quite a few
2 Wolfcamp or Lower Wolfcamp -- I think that's Marathon's
3 Wolfcamp C and D in that section, you know, we are looking
4 at different operators with different completion practices.

5 The cases, you know, the low end on the first
6 page, they show a well completed with 1350 pounds per foot
7 of proppant, and then I saw some cases where you are up to
8 over 3000 pounds per foot on the proppants. So it needs to
9 be normalized for completion practices. Spacing is not
10 addressed here, so I think that, you know, any -- you can't
11 draw any reliable conclusions from the graph.

12 **Q. Mr. McQuien, can you look at Exhibit 24, please?**

13 A. Yes.

14 **Q. And can -- do you have comments on that exhibit?**

15 A. Yes. Main thing, you know, I just don't think
16 that this is a statistically rigorous analysis here. You
17 know, on the second page there are 30 1-mile wells, six
18 1.5-mile wells and two 2-mile. So, you know, we need quite
19 a bit more of the longer length laterals to make a -- you
20 know, a fair comparison between the efficiency of the
21 lateral lengths.

22 One thing I would, you know, if you did take this
23 away, Marathon, the 68 percent divided by -- of the XXL
24 divided by 88 percent of the XLs, or I guess that's 2 miles
25 over 1, or 1.5 mile gives you 77 percent efficiency,

1 Mr. Eaton, last week on Slide 20 showed that BTA in a
2 comparable 1 mile development is 25 percent more efficient.
3 So even if this were correct, it doesn't appear any of this
4 benefits BTA.

5 Q. So to summarize, Mr. McQuien, is it your opinion
6 that this Exhibit 24 doesn't provide a basis for any type of
7 a conclusion regarding capital efficiency with respect to
8 lateral length?

9 A. I agree with that.

10 MS. HARDY: Thank you. I have no further
11 questions.

12 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Ms. Bennett, do you have
13 any questions?

14 MS. BENNETT: Yes, I do. Thank you. Just a
15 couple, and I will make them quick.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. BENNETT:

18 Q. Mr. McQuien, a moment ago you testified that you
19 do not consider the setbacks, or that the Division's rules
20 regarding setbacks does not consider them to be stranded.
21 Is that -- I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but
22 is that more or less your testimony?

23 A. Would you mind asking that again?

24 Q. Sure.

25 A. I want to make sure I understand.

1 Q. Sure, and I appreciate you asking for
2 clarification because it's not always easy. So on setbacks
3 when Ms. Hardy was asking about the purpose of the setbacks,
4 I believe she asked you if it was your understanding that
5 the purpose of the Division's setbacks is to create or
6 strand acreage. Is that a question that she asked you or a
7 fair restatement of question she asked you?

8 A. The purpose of the setbacks was not to strand
9 oil. I agree with that statement.

10 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the fact that in
11 2018, the Commission changed the setbacks for a number of
12 the -- for all wells or all pools except the Purple Sage
13 Wolfcamp to 100 feet precisely based on testimony is that
14 the additional setbacks at the time which were 330 feet
15 resulted in stranding and waste?

16 A. Yeah, I knew they were (unclear) but they did not
17 apply, or they were not applied to the Purple Sage Wolfcamp
18 pool which represents the both of the data we are looking at
19 here.

20 Q. But you're aware that the setbacks were reduced
21 for all other pools from 330 to 100.

22 A. You will have to remind me again. Isn't there a
23 difference for oil and gas?

24 Q. I'm sorry, for oil pools.

25 A. Okay, yes.

1 Q. Thank you for clarifying that. A moment ago you
2 discussed the communications that you have had with BLM
3 about the APDs.

4 A. Well, I didn't have them. Mr. Price had them.

5 Q. When were those communications?

6 A. Late yesterday.

7 Q. Oh, okay. And then when -- a moment ago you
8 mentioned -- while you were discussing Exhibit 24.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And from Exhibit 24, are you aware that this
11 Exhibit 24 only is addressing Marathon wells and not wells
12 other than Marathon wells?

13 A. I'm aware of that.

14 Q. So it's an internal look at Marathon's own
15 capital efficiencies?

16 A. Correct.

17 MS. BENNETT: Thank you. I have no other
18 questions for Mr. McQuien. Thank you.

19 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Thank you. Commissioners,
20 do you have questions for the witness?

21 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: I do not.

22 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Neither do I. Thank you
23 Mr. McQuien.

24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

25 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: It is 12:13. We will take

1 a 12-minute break and come back at 12:25. But before that
2 we are going to close the record on the hearing, Marathon
3 and BTA, and then after this break we will come back and
4 resume the BTA and Novo case.

5 MS. HARDY: Thank you.

6 MS. BENNETT: Thank you very much.

7 (Proceedings for Case Numbers 21273 and 21274
8 adjourned. Case numbers 21275 and 21276 commenced.)

9 (Deliberations were held and a decision was
10 provided as follows:)

11 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Do we have all the parties?

12 MS. HARDY: I am here.

13 MR. BRUCE: This is Jim Bruce.

14 MS. BENNETT: Good morning, this is Deana
15 Bennett.

16 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Okay, great. It's 5:49 and
17 the Commission meeting on the record is now open. The
18 discussion during the closed session was limited to the
19 cases 21273, 21274, 21275 and 21276.

20 We will first discuss case 21273 and 21274.

21 Is there a motion?

22 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Yes, there is, Madam Chair,
23 in the case 21273 and 21274, the Commission motion is to
24 deny Marathon Oil's pooling application.

25 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: I would second that.

1 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Is there any discussion
2 which should be had as to why the application of Marathon
3 Oil is being denied?

4 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Yes, Madam Chair, there is
5 several statements I would like to start off with.

6 We found that the BTA has the best opportunity to
7 minimize waste. It also provides the opportunity for each
8 party to develop its own area or acreage.

9 During the testimony there was insufficient and
10 contradictory evidence to prove the effect of the
11 parent-child effect. There was insufficient evidence about
12 the appropriate lateral length and about what was the best
13 number of wells for development or spacing. That's what I
14 have.

15 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Thank you. I also thought
16 that there was insufficient evidence really quantifying what
17 the difference is in surface waste of the plan was, and
18 therefore, that, you know, was negligible.

19 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: In addition to prevention
20 of waste, the Commission also considered other factors that
21 are relevant, (unclear) pooling application, the good faith
22 negotiations. The parties, we did not feel one direction or
23 another (unclear) Marathon or BTA's as facility operator, we
24 did not feel there was enough evidence one way or another.

25 The AFEs and operational costs seem (unclear)

1 working interest favored BTA (unclear).

2 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Thank you. Mr. Lozano,
3 would you do a roll call vote --

4 MR. LOZANO: Yes, Madam Chair. Commissioner
5 Kessler?

6 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: -- for the motion to deny
7 Marathon Oil's application.

8 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: I approve the motion to
9 deny.

10 MR. LOZANO: Commissioner Engler?

11 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: I approve.

12 MR. LOZANO: Chair Sandoval?

13 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: I approve the motion to
14 deny.

15 So there was a unanimous vote to deny the
16 application by Marathon Oil. The Commission directs Ms.
17 Hardy to draft and circulate a proposed written order for
18 the Commission and send the order to the Commission clerk,
19 Florene Davidson, at least ten days prior to the September
20 17 hearing.

21 MS. HARDY: Thank you, I will do that.

22 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Thank you. We will now
23 continue and discuss Cases 21275 and 21276. Is there a
24 motion regarding this application?

25 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Yes, there is, Madam Chair.

1 Again, in the cases of 21275 and 21276, the Commission
2 decision is to deny Novo's pooling application.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Is there a second?

4 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: Second, Madam Chair.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Is there any discussion
6 regarding the motion?

7 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: Again, yes, there is, Madam
8 Chair. Again, similarly to the previous one, and I will
9 state them again, again we feel like BTA provides the best
10 opportunity to minimize waste and at the same time to
11 provide the opportunity for each party to develop its own
12 acreage.

13 Again, there was insufficient and contradictory
14 evidence to prove parent-child effect, best lateral length
15 to be developed and the number of wells or spacing of wells
16 to develop the acreage.

17 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: And again, there was really
18 not enough information or direct clarification to the
19 difference in surface waste, and so that was an apparent
20 factor in this discussion.

21 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: Finally, we incorporated
22 discussion of geology and the purview of prevention of waste
23 that has been the factor around the geology, we incorporated
24 that discussion, and the good faith negotiations prior to
25 pooling we did not believe that either party failed to meet

1 the good faith negotiations. In terms of capabilities as an
2 operator, we did not find evidence presented regarding that
3 factor took place in direction or another (unclear) and
4 working (audio interference) working interest, and so that
5 was not a major factor.

6 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: Commission counsel, would
7 you do a roll call vote, please.

8 MR. LOZANO: Yes, Madam Chair. Commission
9 Kessler?

10 COMMISSIONER KESSLER: I approve the motion to
11 deny Novo's application.

12 MR. LOZANO: Commissioner Engler?

13 COMMISSIONER ENGLER: I approve the denial of
14 Novo's application.

15 MR. LOZANO: Chair Sandoval.

16 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: I approve the motion to
17 deny.

18 MR. LOZANO: The motion passes unanimously.

19 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: The Commission directs Ms.
20 Hardy to draft and circulate the order of the Commission and
21 send the order to Commission Clerk, Florene Davidson, at
22 least ten days prior to the September 17, 2020 meeting.

23 And with that, it is 5:57 and I hope everybody
24 has a lovely evening.

25 MR. LOZANO: Madam Chair --

1 CHAIRWOMAN SANDOVAL: No, I'm wrong again.
2 MR. LOZANO: I apologize.
3 (Cases 21273 and 21274 concluded.)
4 (Agenda hearing reconvened.)
5
6
7
8
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
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, IRENE DELGADO, New Mexico Certified Court Reporter, CCR 253, do hereby certify that I reported the foregoing virtual proceedings in stenographic shorthand and that the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of those proceedings that were reduced to printed form by me to the best of my ability.

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

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

Dated this 20th day of August 2020.

/s/ Irene Delgado

Irene Delgado, NMCCR 253
License Expires: 12-31-20