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:

CASE NO. 13,526

APPLICATION OF CHESAPEAKE OPERATING,

INC., FOR APPROVAL OF A UNIT AGREEMENT,

LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

)

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

July 28th, 2005

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, DAVID R. CATANACH,
Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, July 28th, 2005, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department,
1220 South Saint Francis Drive, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7
for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

INDEX

July 28th, 2005 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 13,526

PAGE

APPEARANCES

3

APPLICANT'S WITNESS:

MICHAEL S. BRAUN (Landman)

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin

7 18

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

21

* * *

Examination by Examiner Catanach

EXHIBITS

Applicant's		Identified	Admitted
Exhibit	1	8	18
Exhibit	2	9	18
Exhibit	3	9	18
Exhibit	4	10	18
Exhibit	5	11	18
Exhibit	6	14	18
Exhibit	7	14	18
Exhibit	8	15	18
Exhibit	9	16	18
Exhibit	10	15	18
Exhibit	11	16	18

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE DIVISION:

GAIL MacQUESTEN
Deputy General Counsel
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department
1220 South St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

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

* * *

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 1 8:27 a.m.: 2 3 4 EXAMINER CATANACH: At this time I will call Case 5 13,526, the Application of Chesapeake Operating, Inc., for 6 approval of a unit agreement, Lea County, New Mexico. 7 Call for appearances. 8 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, I'm Tom Kellahin of 9 the Santa Fe law firm of Kellahin and Kellahin, appearing 10 this morning on behalf of the Applicant, and I have one 11 12 witness to be sworn. 13 EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, can I get the witness to please stand to be sworn in? 14 (Thereupon, the witness was sworn.) 15 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Catanach, Mr. Braun and I were 16 asked to take on a task that I had thought was impossible, 17 and it appears that it might be possible now. 18 We were asked at the last minute to form a state 19 exploratory unit. Chesapeake holds two expiring state 20 They're due to expire on August 1st. 21 leases. 22 With the assistance of Pete Martinez at the State Land Office, we have obtained preliminary approval. 23 24 with the assistance of Yates Petroleum Corporation, Chuck

Moran, we've received this morning from Ocean the necessary

partial joinder of the unit, so that Chesapeake will have the required 75-percent commitment of the working interest ownership.

And with that document, then, Mr. Martinez assures us that we are eligible for final approval of the unit.

I've asked Mr. Braun, who's done all the detailed land work, to come this morning and to be available to answer any questions and help me describe to you what we have done with this case.

In addition, we have some geologic exhibits that were prepared by Mr. Doug Bellis of Chesapeake. Mr. Bellis is on vacation, and I do not have his testimony in the form of an affidavit. I do, however, have his exhibits and what he e-mailed to me as his geologic write-up. If you desire to have that attested to by Mr. Bellis, I can do that subsequent to the hearing.

In addition, because of the time constraints, the Land Office has requested that we impose upon the Division in order to obtain an approved order by the Division of this unit before the end of the day tomorrow. I know that's highly unusual, and we would appreciate you considering accommodating us.

The last exhibit I have presented to you is a suggested draft form of approval, using the Division's

normal format for approval of state units, and with your 1 permission we'll submit that shortly. 2 **EXAMINER CATANACH:** Okay. 3 MR. KELLAHIN: With that introduction --4 EXAMINER CATANACH: By the way, after speaking 5 with you yesterday I checked on the status of the Director, 6 and I am told by Ms. Florene Davidson that he will not be 7 8 in today or tomorrow. However, he's supposedly coming in on Saturday 9 morning to check to see if there's anything that needs to 10 be done. So I told Florene that we could just leave the 11 order ready to be signed on Saturday, if that's suitable to 12 you guys. 13 That'll be fine. I'll be at work MR. KELLAHIN: 14 on Saturday, and I'll contact him and make sure that I can 15 get a copy of it. 16 17 EXAMINER CATANACH: MR. KELLAHIN: But we're going to go ahead today 18 19 and file for final approval with the Land Office, and I'll 20 tell Mr. Martinez that the plan is to hopefully have the 21 approved order on Saturday for his files, and we'll see if 22 that satisfies his requirements. 23 With your permission, then, I'll ask Mr. Braun 24 some questions, and we'll proceed through the information.

Okay.

EXAMINER CATANACH:

MICHAEL S. BRAUN, 1 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon 2 his oath, was examined and testified as follows: 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. KELLAHIN: 5 Mr. Braun, for the record, sir, would you lease 6 Q. 7 state your name and occupation? Michael S. Braun. I'm a consulting landman. 8 On prior occasions have you testified and 0. 9 qualified as an expert petroleum landman before the 10 Division? 11 A. Yes. 12 And pursuant to your employment and that 13 Q. expertise, have you been retained by Chesapeake Operating, 14 Inc., to consolidate the necessary land matters and deal 15 with those details in order to attempt to form what they 16 17 have called the South Chavlea State Exploratory Unit? Α. Yes. 18 And at this point in time, do you believe you've 19 accomplished those necessary tasks? 20 21 Α. Yes. 22 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr. Braun as an expert 23 petroleum landman. 24 EXAMINER CATANACH: He is so qualified.

(By Mr. Kellahin) Let's start with what is

25

Q.

marked as Exhibit Number 1, Mr. Braun. Would you identify for the Examiner what this document is?

- A. This is the State Land Office form, State

 Exploratory Unit agreement, and it has been prepared naming

 Chesapeake as the unit operator, describing the lands

 within the unit, and including Exhibits "A", "B" and "C",

 which are standard form exhibits to the unit agreement.
- Q. To the best of your knowledge, has this particular copy of the State-approved unitization agreement form been modified to incorporate the changes that the Commissioner of Public Lands requested be made based upon the preliminary application?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. When we turn through the exhibit, do you have an Exhibit "A" that outlines the tracts to be included within the exploratory unit?
- A. Yes. Exhibit "A", the dashed line indicates the unit boundary. Within the dashed line, or within the unit boundary or the separate tracts or individual leases, all of which are State of New Mexico oil and gas leases, they're enumerated by tract number. It correlates to Exhibit "B", which indicates each individual lease. It's lessor/lessee serial number, expiration date, et cetera.
- Q. Turning past Exhibit Number 1, would you identify for us what is marked as Exhibit Number 2?

A. Exhibit Number 2 is the unit operating agreement,
and this is for our proposed South Chavlea State

Exploratory Unit. It describes the lands covered by the
unit the various operating procedures that would govern the
parties who would commit to the unit agreement and lists in
Exhibit A the working interest owners, their percentage
interest, if so committed to the unit.

Exhibit "B" is -- I mean, excuse me, Exhibit "A"

1 is an exhibit very similar to Exhibit "B" of the unit

agreement. It details each of the leases. And then

various other exhibits. COPAS, Exhibit "C"; gas-balancing

agreement, Exhibit "D". Excuse me, Exhibit "D" is the

insurance provision for the operator, the nonoperators.

Exhibit "E" is the gas-storage and balancing agreement.

And Exhibit "F" is a form of memorandum of operating

agreement to be filed in the county.

- Q. Do you have a subsequent exhibit that breaks out all the interests so that -- We'll talk about that in a minute, but do you have a spreadsheet that shows all the individual tract interests?
 - A. Yes.

Q. And we can talk about the status of commitment based upon that exhibit.

Let's turn now, Mr. Braun, to Exhibit Number 3.
Would you identify for us what this letter is?

associated with this well. Has there been an amendment

When I look at the locator map, there's a C-102

24

25

Q.

that's being processed and filed for the acreage dedication associated to the initial unit well?

- A. Yes, this original form C-102 was filed with a dedicated acreage plat indicating the south half of Section 19 to be dedicated to the initial well. However, Chesapeake intends to, and I believe is in the process of, amending that acreage dedication plat to include the west half of Section 19 as the dedicated acreage to the initial well.
- Q. That's one of the requests that Chuck Moran of Yates asked Chesapeake to make, is to re-orient the spacing unit so that the Yates tract, which was the east half of Section 19, does not have acreage dedicated to the initial discovery well?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Let's turn now to the spreadsheet, and let's describe to Mr. Catanach what the status is with regards to the various tracts. It may be helpful, Mr. Braun, if you go back and, in association with Exhibit Number 5, let's take the unit agreement, Exhibit 1, fold it back until you can get the unit map, Exhibit "A", which will give us a visual reference of how these tracts are organized.
- A. This spreadsheet is a worksheet that I have used to calculate the total acres proposed within the unit. If I could start with the first column, it lists the tract

number, which is correlative to the Exhibit "A" Tract number on the unit agreement. Column B is the number of acres within that tract.

Column C -- or column 3, is the participation percentage that that tract would represent in comparison to the total unit acreage.

Column 4 is an indication of whether that particular tract has been committed to the unit and its gross acres committed to the unit. Therefore you end up with a column total at the bottom of total number of acres committed to the unit.

The next column is the Chesapeake share of the unit, based upon acreage owned by Chesapeake within the unit boundaries, as a percentage of the total acres within the unit.

The next column is Chesapeake's committed acreage to the unit, as a percentage of the total unit. And likewise, you have similar two-column sections for each of the parties that own a leasehold within the unit: Yates, the Roderic Crandall Testamentary Trust, Me-Tex Oil and Gas, Inc., and Marshall and Winston, Inc.

And in each case Yates has indicated in the first
-- their first column as their share of the unit, would be
the total acreage owned by Yates within the unit boundary.
And then the next column for Yates is Yates' committed

share, wold be only those tracts that they have agreed to commit to the unit, and that percentage and how it bears to the total acreage within the unit.

To summarize, Chesapeake has committed all their acreage within the unit boundary to the unit, providing them with a 73.326220-percent interest within the unit.

Yates did own 17.782520-percent acreage leasehold within the unit, has committed not all of their acreage but some of it, which gives them a 4.521307-percent interest within the unit.

The Crandall interest, they have not made up their mind whether they're going to -- they're still contemplating whether to commit to the -- any acreage to the unit.

The same is with Me-Tex Oil and Gas, Inc., still in the process of making a decision.

And Marshall and Winston, Inc., has committed their one-only tract to the unit, and providing them a 2.260653-percent interest in the unit, and that's a percentage of the total tracts committed to date.

So if I haven't totally confused you, I hope that with this -- to date this morning, we have Chesapeake with 93.218040-percent interest within the unit as to tracts committed to the unit, Yates with 4.521307 percent, and Marshall and Winston with 2.260653 percent, representing

approximately 80 percent of the tracts within the unit that have been committed to the unit.

- Q. Is it your understanding from Mr. Martinez at the State Land Office, if you can get signatures for ratifications of at least 75 percent of the working interest ownership, then the Commissioner of Public Lands will give you final approval for a unit?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And you have met that threshold here?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Let's turn now to the technical documents, Mr. Braun. Describe for us what is identified as Number 6.
- A. Exhibit 6 is the authorization for expenditure estimate of Chesapeake, the proposed unit operator, in the drilling of the initial test well for the unit. It describes the drilling of an 11,400-foot Morrow test with a total completed well cost of \$1.587 million.
- Q. Turn to Exhibit Number 7. Have you reviewed Exhibit Number 7, Mr. Braun?
- A. Yes.
- Q. To the best of your knowledge, does it now include all the additional details that Mr. Martinez asked Chesapeake to describe in its geologic summary when we submit this for final approval by the Commission of Public Lands?

A. Yes, it does.

MR. KELLAHIN: By way of explanation, Mr. Catanach, if you'll take a moment and unfold Exhibit Number 10, you can see a Morrow isopach. I think that's the cross-section, Mr. Catanach. That is the cross-section of -- if you'll look at the cross-section first, that is Mr. Bellis's cross-section of this area where he's tied in key component wells. And from this information he was able to construct an isopach. So if you'll turn to Exhibit Number 8, you can see from Exhibit Number 8 how he has organized the technical data to show you this Morrow channel and its orientation through this area.

The outline of the unit itself is the area shaded in purple. There's an old noncommercial attempt in the north half of Section 24. It shows 28 feet and it shows a small volume of gas produced. When you look at Mr. Bellis's geologic summary, there's a paragraph that describes and discusses that well.

And so when Mr. Bellis is looking at formulating a proposed unit area, he's identified with open black circles five potential location within the outline of the unit. And you can see most of those open black circles are within the 20-foot-or-greater isopach thickness of the channel that he has depicted on the exhibit.

Of these potential locations, Mr. Bellis's

summary will show you that he has keyed in on his preference to pick the location in Section 19, which is in the southwest southwest of 19. You'll see that circle is right towards the eastern edge of the 30-foot contour line.

A STATE OF STATE OF STATE

His reason for doing this is explained by looking at Exhibit Number 9. Exhibit 9, then, is -- and I believe your copy is a colored copy, Mr. Catanach -- it is the same isopach that has been geologically overlaid on a 3-D seismic timeline.

The point here is to illustrate Mr. Bellis's opinion that there is a structural component to the channel and that it's necessary for him to move towards the eastern edge of the thickness in order to gain structural elevation, which has a particular random pattern as you look at the timeline for the 3-D seismic pattern. But that random pattern shows that among the opportunities in the channel, the point of highest structural position is going to be the well in the southwest southwest of 19, if you're choosing among the five locations to choose from.

So that's his argument, and that's his preference.

And then finally, Mr. Examiner, Exhibit 11 is my attempt to draft a proposed order for the Division to approve this unit and allow us, then, to go back to the Commissioner of Public Lands and get the unit finally

approved and move forward. We have made plans to put a spudder on the location on Sunday so that we can have drilling activities occurring across the end of the expiration period of the two expiring leases that are associated with the unit.

Live to the garage of the same of the

- Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) And for the record, Mr. Braun, if you'll take a moment and help me remember the tracts on Exhibit "A" of Exhibit 1 that are associated with the expiring leases --
- A. Tracts Number 6 and 7 are two separate State of New Mexico leases with an expiration date of August the 1st, 2005. So if you would look at Exhibit A to the unit agreement, you would notice Tract 6 to include the northern part of Section 24 and the tract in the southern part of Section 24. And then Tract 7 being the north half -- in our plat here, being the north half of Section 25. Those two leases are slated to expire August the 1st.

MR. KELLAHIN: With your permission, Mr.

Catanach, if you'll allow me after the hearing to make copies of Mr. Braun's letter that Ocean provided this morning, so that we can include that as Exhibit Number 10, we will then have Yates' ratification of the tract they've chosen to commit to the unit.

And with doing so, that would then conclude our presentation.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay. What do we want to 1 admit, Exhibits 1 through 9 at this time? Oh, I'm sorry --2 MR. KELLAHIN: It would be 1 through 11. 3 EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 1 through 11 will be 4 admitted, and you may provide that Yates letter after the 5 6 hearing. **EXAMINATION** 7 BY EXAMINER CATANACH: 8 Do you anticipate any further joinder from these 9 0. parties? 10 I really don't have a feeling yet as to their 11 decision. I've had some verbal conversations with the 12 Crandall Trust, and I just don't have an indication whether 13 they -- I have not talked to any representative of Me-Tex 14 Oil and Gas. 15 MR. KELLAHIN: Those two companies have been 16 provided with documentation --17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 MR. KELLAHIN: -- concerning their choice? 19 20 THE WITNESS: Yes, they have. EXAMINER CATANACH: Did we provide them notice of 21 the hearing, Mr. Kellahin? 22 23 MR. KELLAHIN: I don't have any indication that I 24 provided notice from my office. But they were sent Federal 25 Express packages showing all their elections and advised

11. 大块块有一块的人的复数

that this matter is a voluntary matter in which they have the absolute right not to participate, and if they do so, it's on a voluntary basis.

No. 19 国籍自己基础设置 2000年

right offhand what the Rule says about the notice on voluntary units. If their interest -- If they choose not to participate in the unit, they're not affected at all?

MR. KELLAHIN: That's right, and we've always taken that attitude. I've struggled for years with the fact that I'm not clear why we bring these to you anymore. Historically, before the Land Office had a technical staff, way back in the days of Johnnie Walker and Pete Porter, the Land Office imposed upon the Commission to have a hearing process where issues about unitization could be discussed with your technical staff. And now that the Land Office has their own geologists and engineers, I'm at a loss to understand why we do this.

But to directly answer your question, this is a voluntary matter, and the decision you make on our Application does not affect them. If they choose not to participate, then we must come back later. And if their tract is in a spacing unit, then we'd have to pool their interest.

As with the Yates interest, they've made an election as to one tract. The agreements -- the State unit

1	agreement, provides a mechanism within the contract that
2	Yates can change their mind and come in later and make an
3	election as to the east half of Section 19.
4	So the answer to your question is, there's
5	nothing that we understand that you're about to do that
6	adversely affects those parties.
7	EXAMINER CATANACH: And normally in this
8	situation, we would include the application and include all
9	of the acreage that you proposed, but still that wouldn't
10	have any effect on them, even if we included them in the
11	unit.
12	MR. KELLAHIN: That's exactly right.
13	EXAMINER CATANACH: So Okay. All right, we'll
14	just let it go. I think it's okay. I mean, I don't see
15	that it's a problem.
16	MR. KELLAHIN: I'd be the first to tell you, Mr.
17	Catanach, if I didn't think this would work.
18	EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay. Anything further?
19	Okay, there being nothing further, Case Number
20	13,526 will be taken under advisement.
21	And this hearing is adjourned.
22	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
23	8:55 a.m.)
24	* * ** complete record of the proceedings in the fearth by means b
25	heard by me on 1996 Case No. 1352
	STEVEN T BRENNESS COS

AND STATE OF STATE OF

STEVEN T. BREANES CER Colandon Division Exeminer

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

and the same

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL July 28th, 2005.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 16th, 2006