

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

RECEIVED OGD

2011 JUL 13 P 3:38

**APPLICATION OF COG OPERATING, LLC
FOR CANCELLATION OF OPERATOR'S
AUTHORITY AND TERMINATION OF SPACING
UNITS, YESO ENERGY, INC. DOW "B" 28
FEDERAL WELL NO. 1, EDDY COUNTY, NEW
MEXICO**

CASE NO. 14472 (De Novo)

**APPLICATION OF THE NMOC, THROUGH THE
COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MANAGER,
FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE DIVISION
TO RECOGNIZE AN OPERATOR OF RECORD
FOR WELLS CURRENTLY OPERATED BY YESO
ENERGY, INC.; LEA, EDDY AND CHAVES
COUNTIES, NEW MEXICO**

CASE NO. 14547

**COG OPERATING LLC'S
PROPOSED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
SUPPLEMENTAL**

COG Operating LLC, ("COG"), submits the following proposed findings and conclusions in this matter:

FINDINGS:

(1) In Case No. 14,472, COG Operating, LLC, ("COG"), seeks an order cancelling the authority of Yeso Energy, Inc., ("Yeso"), as operator of the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1 (API No. 30-015-28676), the termination of all spacing and proration units dedicated to the well, and allowing COG to make application to convert and utilize the abandoned well for salt water disposal operations instead of the plugging the well by the Oil Conservation Division ("Division").

(2) In Case No. 14,547, the Division seeks an order authorizing the Division to recognize an operator of those wells where Yeso is currently shown on Division records as the operator of record in view of the earlier termination of Yeso's authority to operate in New Mexico.

(3) On May 13, 2010, the Division convened an examiner hearing on COG's Application in Case No. 14,472. On July 13, 2010, the Division entered Order No. R-13294 granting COG's Application in Case 14,472. Subsequently, on August 9, 2010, Yeso filed its

Application for Hearing De Novo asserting that it was a party of record adversely affected by Order No. R-13294. Case No. 14,472 was consolidated with Case No. 14,547 for a single hearing before the Commission on June 29, 2011.

(4) Division Records currently identify Yeso as operator of record of the following three wells:

- *Dalton Federal Well No. 001, 30-015-25259
- *Dow B 28 Federal Well No. 001, 30-015-28676
- *Morgan Federal Well No. 001, 30-005-20667

(5) Judah Oil, LLC, ("Judah"), seeks to acquire and produce the Dalton Federal Well No. 1 and utilize the Dow B 28 Federal Well No. 1 and the Morgan Federal Well No. 1 for disposal operations in connection with its Cedar Lake Project commercial disposal facility to be located in Section 29, Township 17 South, Range 31 East, NMPM in Eddy County. COG seeks only to acquire and utilize the Dow B 28 Federal Well No. 1.

(6) The Division, COG and Judah appeared through counsel in both cases and presented witness testimony and evidence. Yeso Energy, Inc., the de novo applicant, did not appear at the Commission hearing and no evidence was offered in support of its stated position that it was adversely affected by Order No. R-13294 entered by the Division on July 13, 2010.

(7) Yeso Energy, Inc. ("Yeso") has a long history of operator non-compliance with the Division's rules, regulations and orders. It has been party to a number of agreed compliance orders, violations of compliance orders and subsequent enforcement actions brought by the Division in examiner adjudicatory hearings.

(8) In 2007, the Division filed an enforcement action in Case No. 14008 asserting that Yeso had, among other matters, failed to file production reports and had operated wells and conducted injection operations following the suspension of its authority. On April 7, 2008, after hearing, the Division entered Order No. R-12930, which contained the following significant findings, conclusions and directives to Yeso Energy:

- a. Yeso knowingly and willfully violated Division Rule 701 by injecting into Courtland Myers Wells No. 2 and 5 and the Knight Wells No. 9, 10 and 11, in each of the months of December 2006 and January through May, 2007. Rule 701 provides that 'the injection of water into any formation for the purpose of water disposal shall be permitted only by order of the division' The termination of Yeso's injection authority pursuant to Rule 1115.C effectively cancelled any order of the Division authorizing injection of water into these wells, and, accordingly, injection subsequent to November 20, 2006 violated Rule 701.

Order No. R-12930, Findings ¶ 18 (April 7, 2008).

(9) Accordingly, in Order No. R-12930, the Division made the following determinations:

a. The authority of Yeso Energy, Inc. (OGRID 221710) to transport from or inject into all wells that it operates in the State of New Mexico was properly terminated by the Division effective November 20, 2006, AND was not reinstated at any time on or prior to June 1, 2007.

b. A civil penalty in the amount of \$3,000 is assessed against Yeso Energy, Inc. on account of its knowing and willful failure to file production reports (Form C-115) for all wells operated by it for the month of May, 2006. This penalty is assessed by reason of Yeso's failure to file such reports at any time during the period from September 8, 2006 through and including November 29, 2006.

c. A civil penalty in the amount of \$30,000 is assessed against Yeso Energy, Inc. on account of its knowing and willful injection of water without a valid permit into the Courtland Myers well No. 2 (API No. 30-025-11195), Courtland Myers Well No. 5 (API No. 30-025-11119), Knight Well No. 9 (API No. 30-025-20352), Knight No. 10 (API No. 30-025-20351), and Knight No. 11 (API No. 30-025-20350), for the period from December 1, 2006 through May 31, 2007.

Order No. R-12930, Conclusions ¶¶ (1), (2) and (3) (April 7, 2008).

(10) Following a further failure by Yeso to abide by the requirements of Order No. R-12930, in 2009 the Division initiated an enforcement proceeding in Case No. 14294. On March 31, 2009, an examiner hearing was held on the Division's Application. Yeso failed to appear for the hearing. On June 17, 2009, the Division accordingly entered Order No. R-12930-A. That order contained the following significant findings, conclusions and directives:

a. The Division seeks an order finding Yeso Energy, Inc. [OGRID 221710] ("Yeso" or "Operator") in violation of Division Rules 7.24 (failure to timely file production reports) and 25.8 (inactive wells). The Division further seeks an order pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 70-2-14(B) requiring Yeso to plug and abandon all its wells by a date certain, and if it does not do so, allowing the Division to plug the wells and forfeit applicable financial assurance.

b. Yeso was not represented by counsel and did not appear at the hearing or file any response. No other party entered an appearance in this case or otherwise opposed this application.

c. On November 20, 2006, due to Yeso's failure to comply with then Division Rule 1115.C (lack of reporting production, failure to file form C-115), the Division cancelled the authority of Yeso to transport from or inject into any of its wells.

d. On August 20, 2007, the Division heard a compliance case involving six wells operated by Yeso (including at least two of the wells that were the subject of ACOI-137) and issued Order No. R-12801 requiring those six wells to be returned to compliance with then Division Rules 201 (concerning inactive wells) and allowing the Division to plug those wells in the event of non-compliance.

e. In addition, the Division presented testimony and exhibits as follows:

1. As of February 17, 2009, Yeso Energy, Inc. was the operator of record of . . . 12 wells (the subject wells) . . .

2. Yeso has failed to file production reports (required by Rule 7.24) for wells with approved form C-104. The Division presented Exhibit 16 showing approved C-104's for selected Yeso operated wells.

Order No. R-12930-A, Findings ¶¶ (2), (4.b), (4.d), (6.a) and (6.b) (June 15, 2009).

(11) Accordingly, in Order No. R-12930-A, the Division made the following determinations:

a. Yeso Energy, Inc. (OGRID 221710) is hereby ordered to appear at the examiner hearing on August 20, 2009, or later date agreed upon by the Division, and ordered to present evidence of compliance with Division Rules 7.24, 8.9, and 25.8.

b. If Yeso fails to appear on August 20 as hereby ordered, and Division records then demonstrate that Yeso is in violation of one or more Division rules applicable to any well it then operates, the Division Director may then issue an order directing Yeso to plug all of the wells that it operates by a date certain, and further directing that if Yeso fails to comply with that order, the Division is authorized to plug and abandon the subject wells and forfeit all applicable financial assurance.

Order No. R-12930-A, Conclusions ¶¶ (1) and (3) (June 15, 2009).

(12) Yeso again failed to obey the directives of the previous compliance orders. Consequently, the Division initiated a "show cause" proceeding in Case No. 14294. A "show cause" hearing was convened before one of the Division's examiners on August 20, 2009, and again Yeso failed to attend. Accordingly, on September 15, 2009, the Division entered Order No. R-12930-B which provided, *inter alia*, as follows:

a. The Division seeks an order finding Yeso Energy, Inc. [OGRID 22170] (Yeso) in violation of Division Rule 25.8 (inactive wells), and requiring Yeso to plug and abandon all of its wells, or transfer its wells to another unaffiliated operator, by a date certain, and, in the event Yeso fails to comply with that order, authorizing the Division to plug the wells, and forfeiting any applicable financial assurance.

b. Yeso wholly failed to appear at the hearing on August 20, 2009.

c. In addition to being out of compliance with Division Rule 25.8, Yeso is out of compliance with Division Rule 5.9 because 100% of the wells that it operates are inactive, and because it violated the specific directive of Order No. R-12930-A directing that it appear at the hearing on August 20, 2009.

Order No. R-12930-B, Findings ¶¶ (2), (4), (6) (September 15, 2009).

(13) Accordingly, in Order No. R-12930-B, the Division made the following determinations:

a. Yeso Energy, Inc. [OGRID 22170] shall properly plug and abandon each of the wells described in Finding Paragraph 6.a of Order No. R-12930-A, or transfer each of said wells to another operator, *not affiliated with Yeso and approved by the Division*, not later than March 15, 2010.

Order No. R-12930-B, Order ¶ 1 (September 15, 2009) (emphasis added).

(14) Yeso ignored the directives of the Division in Order No. R-12930-A to either plug and abandon its wells or transfer them to an unaffiliated operator by March 15, 2010. The Division accordingly placed the Yeso wells on its plugging list. The plugging of the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1 was imminent.

(15) By failing to comply with the Division's orders to either plug the wells or transfer them, Yeso effectively abandoned the wells and all regulatory permits and authorizations.

(16) The Division's Enforcement and Compliance Bureau Chief, Daniel Sanchez, testified that the State of New Mexico has incurred \$259,833.88 in costs to plug seven wells abandoned by Yeso Energy, Inc. Yeso Energy has ignored the Division's demands for payment of these costs. He further testified that the cost to the State to plug the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1 would be approximately \$45,000.00.

(17) On March 22, 2010, Yeso Energy and Chica Energy attempted to effect an online transfer of Yeso's wells to Chica. On April 1, 2010, the Division rejected the transfer and the wells remained on the plugging list.

(18) COG's landman witness testified that COG has been very active in the vicinity of the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1, having drilled over 50 wells in the nearby Skelly Unit. COG has development plans, which have been submitted to the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM), to drill another 50 wells in the unit. Correspondingly, COG has an immediate need for additional capacity for the disposal of produced water. COG's witness testified that the company's engineering division estimates the cost of drilling a new well for disposal purposes would exceed \$3,000,000.00. It further estimated that it would cost approximately \$60,000.00 to plug the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1.

(19) In April of 2010, COG learned that the abandoned Dow "B" 28 well was about to be plugged within a matter of days. COG made inquiry of the Division as to what steps should be taken to assume operatorship of the well and convert it to injection operations. By correspondence dated April 5, 2010, COG requested the Division delay plugging of the abandoned well and the Division agreed.

(20) COG then filed its application in Case No. 14472, Application of COG Operating, LLC for Cancellation of Operator's Authority and Termination of spacing Units, Yeso Energy, Inc. Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1, Eddy County, New Mexico. A hearing on COG's Application was held on May 13, 2010 before one of the Division's examiners. Yeso was represented at the hearing by counsel, but produced no witnesses, testimony or evidence. Both COG and OCD appeared at the hearing and presented evidence.

(21) On July 13, 2010, the Division entered Order No. R-13294. The order found, inter alia, at paragraph 5, that OCD had presented the following testimony:

a. OCD found that Yeso had abandoned the subject well and ordered Yeso to either properly plug and abandon the well, or transfer operations to a nonaffiliated Division-approved operator on or before March 15, 2010 (Order No. R-12930-B, issued in Case No. 14294 on September 15, 2009).

Order No. R-13294, Findings ¶ 5(a) (July 13, 2010).

(22) Accordingly, in Order No. R-13294, the Division made the following determinations:

a. The Division hereby terminates the authority of Yeso Energy to act as operator of the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1 (API No. 30-015-28676) located in Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 31 East, (Unit P) NMPM, in Eddy County, New Mexico.

b. The Division shall not plug the subject well prior to July 30, 2011 unless COG advises that it is no longer pursuing its plan to obtain the right to use this well.

c. COG shall file an application with the Division to use the subject well for disposal operations without the necessity of a change of operator that would be ordinarily required.

Order No. R-13294, Order ¶¶ (1), (2) and (3) (July 13, 2010).

(23) On August 9, 2010, Yeso Energy, Inc. filed its Application for Hearing De Novo in Case No. 14472.

(24) The State's Underground Injection Control program is authorized under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SWDA) of 1974. In 1982, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency delegated primacy authority to the State of New Mexico for the regulation of all underground injection operations in the state, including on federal lands. Therefore, utilization of the Dow "B" 28 well for disposal operations by any operator cannot proceed without the Division's approval.

(25) On approximately August 31, 2010, COG filed with the Division its C-108 Application for Authorization to Inject in order to convert the Dow "B" 28 well to a disposal well. COG changed the name of the well to the "Skelly Federal 28 SWD No. 1". COG's C-108 Application also provides for operation of the well as a private "closed" facility and reflected COG as the operator of the well.

(26) The Division's Enforcement and Compliance Bureau Chief testified that COG possesses the requisite OGRID, is bonded and in good-standing with the Division and otherwise qualifies to become operator of the proposed disposal well. Mr. Sanchez further testified that the submission of the C-108 reflecting COG as operator of the well suffices an application to become operator of record for the well.

(27) On September 2, 2010, COG signed and subsequently submitted to the BLM an Application for Transportation and Utility Systems and Facilities on Federal Lands in order to use the Dow "B" 28 well and adjacent surface as a disposal facility.

(28) Previously, on August 16, 2010, Yeso executed a C-145 Change of Operator form, purporting to change operations to Judah Oil, LLC ("Judah Oil"), "Effective on the date of approval by the OCD". However, Order No. R-13294 terminated all authority of Yeso to act as operator of the Dow B 28 well, including the authority to apply for permits and to obtain approvals of a change of operator. Consequently, the Division did not approve Yeso's C-145.

(29) On August 17, 2010, Judah Oil filed a C-108 Application for Authorization to Inject with the Division, seeking approval to use the Dow "B" 28 Well as a commercial salt water disposal well.

(30) Subsequently, on August 25, 2010, Yeso and Chica Energy, LLC ("Chica") entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Judah Oil for the sale and transfer of the wells formerly operated by Yeso, including the Dow "B" 28 well. However, on September 10, 2010, Yeso executed a Conveyance of Oil and Gas Leases in favor of Levi Oil and Gas, LLC. The Conveyance described the S/2 of Section 28, Township 17 South, Range 31 East, among other lands and purported to convey all personal property, including the wells located thereon. Levi Oil and Gas, LLC is a separate operator with a different OGRID number from Judah Oil, LLC.

(31) The August 25, 2010 Purchase and Sale Agreement among Yeso and Chica as Sellers and Judah Oil as Buyer, provided for, inter alia, the transfer to Judah Oil of "[a]ll Sellers' right, title and interest in all permits and licenses . . . to the extent the same are used or obtained in connection with the Leases ("Permits")".

(32) The Purchase and Sale Agreement made specific provision for the transfer of the Dow "B" well, on the condition that ". . . in the event it is successfully permitted as a salt water disposal (SWD) well . . .".

(33) Under the Purchase and Sale Agreement, if a disposal permit is issued to Judah Oil for the Dow "B" well, Yeso and Chica are to receive \$50,000.00. In addition, Yeso and Chica reserve the following interests in the well:

- a. a fee of \$.05 per barrel of water disposed into the SWD;
- b. a 10% overriding royalty interest on recovered and sold oil;
- c. the right to receive 20% of the proceeds in the event of a sale of the well; and
- d. the right to receive 20% of the proceeds in the event of a sale of the Cedar Lake Project disposal system.

(34) Judah's president, James B. Campanella, testified that based on the estimate of average daily volumes of water anticipated to be injected in the well reflected on Judah's C-108 Application (10,000 BWPD), Yeso would receive \$500.00 per day, or \$182,500.00 per year. In addition, Mr. Campanella estimated that two to three loads of skim oil would be recovered at the well each week, with Yeso receiving 10% of the revenues from the sale of the oil.

(35) Mr. Campanella testified that at some undetermined point during the course of negotiations on the Purchase and Sale Agreement, he became aware that Yeso's authority to operate wells in New Mexico had been terminated and the Division had ordered the wells to be plugged. He also learned that Yeso Energy was under a regulatory disability from transferring its permits.

(36) Judah Oil's president confirmed that those provisions of the Purchase and Sale Agreement for the sale of the Dow B well were contingent on the successful permitting of the well as a salt water disposal well. Mr. Campanella also testified that Judah had made no outlay of capital under the Purchase and Sale Agreement and that Yeso did not warrant title or its performance under the agreement. He further testified that the Cedar Lake Disposal Facility would proceed even if the Dow B well was not available to Judah as four or five other wells would be made part of the Cedar Lake facility.

(37) The contributions of Yeso Energy and Chica Energy to Judah Oil's Cedar Lake Project, along with their overriding royalty interest and the rights to injection fees and future payments from Judah under the Purchase and Sale Agreement, although contingent on obtaining regulatory permits, show sufficient intent of the parties to establish an ongoing joint enterprise and affiliation.

(38) On September 7, 2010, Judah Oil filed with the BLM a sundry notice of intent to convert the Dow B well to commercial disposal which indicated "[t]his well will be converted upon approval of the NMOCD." The BLM approved the sundry notice on December 7, 2010. However, on cross-examination, Mr. Campanella acknowledged that he was informed by the BLM that its approval was subject to the approval of the NMOCD.

(39) Judah's president testified that the Dow B wellbore would not be utilized for the further exploration or production of oil and gas from the federal lease on the S/2 of Section 28 and further acknowledged that the well would be used to dispose of off-lease produced water.

(40) On September 30, 2010, Judah Oil submitted to the BLM its own Application for Transportation and Utility Systems and Facilities on Federal Lands in order to use the Dow B well and other wells as a commercial disposal facility.

(41) Both the COG and Judah Oil BLM right of way applications remain pending before that agency, but approvals of a change of operator are subject to the like approval of the NMOCD.

(42) Yeso has purposefully avoided its responsibilities as a well operator under its permits and under the Division's rules, regulations and orders. Further, Yeso's attempts to transfer the wells and change operators, first to Chica, and subsequently to Judah, after Yeso's authority to act as operator was terminated clearly demonstrate an intentional effort to circumvent the Divisions rules, regulations and orders. Approving the request of Yeso Energy and to transfer the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1 would result in a substantial economic benefit for that former operator, but does nothing to resolve Yeso's past violations or assure the recovery of plugging costs incurred by the State of New Mexico.

(43) The August 25, 2010 Purchase and Sale Agreement was undertaken in derogation of the Division's operator compliance and enforcement authority under the Oil and Gas Act. For

this reason, the agreement is not enforceable and cannot constitute the basis for a claim of entitlement to utilize the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1. The Commission should therefore refuse to recognize it.

(44) The Commission and the Division have a duty to uphold the integrity of the Division's Enforcement and Compliance regulations. It would be inconsistent with that duty to permit Yeso Energy to effect the transfer of the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1 in view of its repeated violations of the Division's regulations, its ongoing disregard for the agency's orders and after its authority to act as operator was terminated. Therefore, while it is not clear that the Commission may convey title to an abandoned wellbore, it is fully within the Commission's jurisdiction to direct the Division to continue to withhold approval of Yeso Energy, Inc.'s Request for Change of Operator to Judah Oil, LLC and Judah's C-108 application to utilize the Dow B well for injection.

(45) COG should be allowed to proceed with its C-108 application for authorization to utilize the Dow B well for injection and to become operator of record of the Dow "B" 28 Federal Well No. 1. Doing so will avoid the plugging of an otherwise usable wellbore and establish additional disposal capacity in an area of increasing demand. As a result, the interests of conservation will be served and waste will be prevented.

(46) Yeso Energy, Inc. did not file a motion with the Commission seeking an order allowing it to withdraw its de novo appeal and did not seek concurrence from the other parties to do so. *See* Order No. R-12649-B, Case No. 13868, *Application of DKD, LLC For An Order Directing Gandy Corporation to Show Cause, Lea County, New Mexico* (February 8, 2007). Yeso Energy, Inc. further failed to attend the meeting of the Commission convened on its own Application for Hearing De Novo or offer any evidence supporting its stated position that it is a party adversely affected by Order No. R-13294. The Commission therefore finds that Yeso Energy is in default and that all forms of relief that Yeso Energy could have sought should be denied and that the Application for Hearing De Novo should be dismissed. The Commission further regards Order No. R-13294 as final and it should not be the subject of a stay or further appeal.

CONCLUSIONS:

(1) The jurisdiction and the authority of the Division are broad in scope. Among other matters, Section 70-2-12(B) of the Oil and Gas Act provides:

Apart from any authority, express or implied, elsewhere given to or existing in the oil conservation division by virtue of the Oil and Gas Act or the statutes of the state, the division is authorized to make rules, regulations and orders for the purposes and with respect to the subject matter stated in this subsection:

to prevent crude petroleum oil, natural gas or water from escaping from strata in which it is found into other strata;

to require wells to be drilled, operated and produced in such manner as to prevent injury to neighboring leases or properties;

to regulate the disposition of water produced or used in connection with the drilling for or producing of oil or gas or both and to direct the surface or subsurface disposal of the water, including disposition by use in drilling for or production of oil or gas, . . . in a manner that will afford reasonable protection against contamination of fresh water supplies designated by the state engineer;

[and]

to regulate the disposition of nondomestic wastes resulting from the oil field service industry, the transportation of crude oil or natural gas, the treatment of natural gas or the refinement of crude oil to protect public health and the environment, including administering the Water Quality Act [74-6-1 NMSA 1978] as provided in Subsection E of Section 74-6-4 NMSA 1978.

N.M.S.A. 1978, § 70-2-12(B)(2), (7), (15) and (22) (2004).

(2) Section 70-2-11(A) of the Oil and Gas Act provides:

The division is hereby empowered, and it is its duty, to prevent waste prohibited by this act and to protect correlative rights, as in this act provided. To that end, the division is empowered to make and enforce rules, regulations and orders, **and to do whatever may be reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of this act**, whether or not indicated or specified in any section hereof.¹

N.M.S.A. 1978, § 70-2-11(A) (1935) (emphasis added).

(3) In past cases, the Division and Commission have cited to this specific provision of the Oil and Gas Act as authority supporting the Agency's broad construction of its powers to act as "cumulative and not exclusive." See, e.g., Order No. R-11573-B, Case No. 12601, *Application of Bettis, Boyle and Stovall To Re-Open Compulsory Pooling Order No. R-11573* (February 15, 2002), Conclusion of Law.

(4) Specifically as to the plugging of abandoned wells, under Section 70-2-12(B)(18) of the Oil and Gas Act, the Division has broad authority to "do all acts necessary and proper to plug dry and abandoned oil and gas wells . . . including disposing of salvageable equipment and material removed from oil and gas wells being plugged by the state[.]" N.M.S.A. 1978, § 70-2-12(B)(18) (2004). The Division is also authorized by Section 70-2-38(B) of the Act to make expenditures from the reclamation fund for the plugging of wells "in accordance with the provisions of the Oil and Gas Act and the rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to that act." N.M.S.A. 1978, § 70-2-38(B) (2010).

¹ See also N.M.S.A. 1978, § 70-2-6(A) (1935) ("[The Division] shall have jurisdiction, authority and control of and over all persons, matters or things necessary or proper to enforce effectively the provisions of this act . . .").

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on July 13, 2011, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent via e-mail to the following parties:

Sonny Swazo, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
New Mexico Oil Conservation Division
1220 S. St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87505
sonny.swazo@state.nm.u

Phil Brewer, Esq. (via mail)
P.O. Box 298
Roswell, NM 88202-0298
pbrewer@pegasusplace.com

Michael Feldewert, Esq.
Ocean Munds-Dry, Esq.
Holland & Hart
P.O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, NM 87504-2208
mfeldewert@hollandhart.com
omundsdry@hollandhart.com



J. Scott Hall

291473-7