OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

CASE NO. 14294

EXHIBIT 3

1 2 3 4 5	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION								
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	APPLICATION OF THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION, THROUGH THE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE MANAGER, FOR A COMPLIANCE ORDER AGAINST YESO ENERGY, INC. FINDING THAT THE OPERATOR IS IN VIOLATION OF 19.15.7.24 NMAC, 19.15.8.9 NMAC AND 19.15.25.8 NMAC, REQUIRING OPERATOR TO PROPERLY PLUG AND ABANDON ALL ITS WELLS BY A DATE CERTAIN, AND IN THE EVENT OF NON-COMPLIANCE AUTHORIZING THE DIVISION PLUG AND ABANDON THE WELLS AND FORFEIT THE APPLICABLE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE, EDDY, LEA AND CHAVES COUNTIES, NEW MEXICO.								
18	CASE NO. 14294								
19 20 21 22	TESTIMONY OF DANIEL SANCHEZ								
23	My name is Daniel Sanchez.								
24	Since November 22, 2004, I have been the Compliance and Enforcement Manager of the								
25	Oil Conservation Division (OCD) of the Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department.								
26	My duties as Compliance and Enforcement Manager include supervising the four district								
27	offices of the OCD and the Environmental Bureau of the OCD, and overseeing the enforcement								
28	and compliance actions of the OCD.								
29	I have researched the compliance history of Yeso Energy, Inc. (Yeso), and the allegations								
30	made in the application in Case 14294.								
31	OCD Exhibit 4 is a printout of the Well List for Yeso taken from the OCD's website.								
32	The Well List contains all wells that have not been plugged and released, and compiles								
33	information about the wells from the regulatory filings of the operators. OCD personnel								
34	routinely rely on the Well List in conducting their normal business operations, and the Well List								

is also routinely used and relied upon by operators and members of the public. A search of the 35 Well List for wells operated by "Yeso Energy, Inc." shows that Yeso is the operator of record for 36 the following wells under OGRID 221710: 37

Connie C State #001, 30-015-25366, G-25-19S-28E 38 39 Connie C State #002, 30-015-02301, H-25-19S-28E Connie C State #003, 30-015-25587, K-25-19S-28E 40 Connie C State #004, 30-015-25648, B-25-19S-28E 41 42 Connie C State #017, 30-015-02302, D-25-19S-28E Dalton Federal #001, 30-015-25259, H-29-17S-29E 43 Dow B 28 Federal #001, 30-015-28676, P-28-17S-31E (pool 74605) 44 45 Dow B 28 Federal #001, 30-015-28676, P-28-17S-31E (pool 96591) Gulf McKay Federal #001, 30-025-25471, N-34-18S-32E 46 47 Laguna Grande #001, 30-015-21636, I-28-23S-29E 48 Lambchop 20 #1, 30-015-27220, B-20-24S-25E Morgan Federal #001, 30-005-20667, 3-6-10S-30E 49 Shirley Kay State #001, 30-015-25855, B-32-19S-31E 50 51

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

NMSA 1978, Section 70-2-14(B) provides, in relevant part, "If any of the requirements 52 53 of the Oil and Gas Act [70-2-1 NMSA 1978] or the rules promulgated pursuant to that act have 54 not been complied with, the oil conservation division, after notice and hearing, may order any well plugged and abandoned by the operator or surety or both in accordance with division rules."

In Case 14294, the OCD is asking for an order requiring Yeso to plug and abandon all its wells, or transfer all its wells to another operator, by a date certain. This request is made pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 70-2-14(B), based on Yeso's history of non-compliance with OCD rules. The OCD also asks that the order authorize the OCD to plug and abandon Yeso's wells and forfeit the applicable financial assurances if Yeso fails to transfer or plug the wells by the deadline set in the order.

<u>Violation of 19.15.7.24 NMAC (production reporting requirements):</u>

Rule 19.15.7.24 NMAC requires operators to file a monthly production report for each non-plugged well completion for which the division has approved a form C-104.

According to the affidavit of Jane Prouty, OCD's Automation and Records Bureau Chief, Yeso has not filed monthly production reports for the production months of May, June, July or August of 2006, and has filed no monthly production reports after May 2007. And during those months that are missing production reports, Yeso had wells with approved C-104s.

Violation of 19.15.8.9 NMAC (financial assurance requirements):

Rule 19.15.8.9 NMAC requires operators to post financial assurances for wells on privately owned or state owned lands in New Mexico that have not been plugged and released, conditioned that the well will be plugged and abandoned and the location restored and remediated in compliance with OCD rules.

Effective January 1, 2008, the operator of a state or fee well that has been inactive for a period of more than two years must post a one-well financial assurance for the well, even if the well is also covered by a blanket financial assurance. See Rule 19.15.8.9.C NMAC.

Also effective January 1, 2008, the amounts required under Rule 19.15.8.9.D NMAC for single well financial assurances increased. The current amount required for a well in Eddy County is \$5,000 plus \$1 per foot of measured depth. See 19.15.8.9.D(2) NMAC.

The financial assurances posted by Yeso for the wells it operates are identified in the affidavit of Dorothy Phillips, and copies of the financial assurances are attached as exhibits to Ms. Phillips' affidavit.

Yeso has posted a \$50,000 blanket bond, and three single well bonds. However, five of its wells require single well financial assurances, and the single well bonds that it has posted for two of those wells are not in the amounts required by the current rule.

OCD Exhibit 5 is a copy of the Inactive Well Additional Financial Assurance Report for Yeso, taken from the OCD's website. The OCD posts the Inactive Well Additional Financial

Assurance Report to help operators check their compliance with the new single well financial assurance requirements. The report lists each well for which the operator is the operator of record, and provides information from the OCD's databases about that well that will help the operator determine if additional financial assurances are due.

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

The column marked "Last Prod/Inj" gives the date of the last reported production or injection for the well. The column marked "Inactive Additional Bond Due" will tell the operator which wells are subject to the single well financial assurance requirements. If there is a date in that column, it means that the well is a state or fee well that has reported production at some time. (If a state or fee well is listed that has never reported production, the computer does not assume that the well requires a single well financial assurance. It is possible that the listing indicates that a permit to drill was issued at some point in the past, but the well was not drilled.) The date in the column is simply a date two years from the last reported date of production or injection – the date a single well financial assurance will be required if the well does not report any additional production or injection. In Yeso's case, five wells have dates in the "Inactive Additional Bond Due" column, and all have been inactive for more than two years. The "Measured Depth" column lists the measured depth of the well, as reported by the operator, which is used to calculate the amount of the single well financial assurance required. The "Required Bond Amount" column shows the amount of the single well financial assurance required, based on the depth and location of the well. A "Y" in the "Bond Required Now" column means that the well should be covered by a single well financial assurance now. If a financial assurance in the correct amount has been posted by the operator, that amount will appear in the "Bond in Place" column. If the operator has not posted a single well financial assurance for the well, or if the operator has posted a single well financial assurance that is less

111	than	the	required	amount,	a	"0"	will	appear.	Finally,	a	"Y"
112	in the	"In Vio	olation" colu	mn indicates	s that	the ope	rator is i	n violation	of the single we	ll fir	nancial
113	assura	nce rea	uirements as	to that well							

According to OCD Exhibit 5, Yeso has 5 wells that currently require a single well financial assurance, and Yeso is in violation of the single well financial assurance requirements on all 5 of the wells. All 5 of the wells are located in Eddy County, so they all require a single well financial assurance in the amount of \$5,000 plus \$1 per foot of measured depth.

I have reviewed the single-well financial assurances posted by Yeso. Copies of the single well financial assurances are attached to the affidavit of Ms. Dorothy Phillips. The following summarizes the single well financial assurance requirements for the 5 wells identified on OCD Exhibit 5 as being out of compliance with the single well financial assurance requirements:

- a. The Connie C State #001, 30-015-25366, has a measured depth of 3,500 feet, and requires a single well financial assurance in the amount of \$8,500. Yeso Energy Inc. has not posted a single well financial assurance for this well.
- b. The Connie C State #002, 30-015-02301, has a measured depth of 3,500 feet, and requires a single well financial assurance in the amount of \$8,500. Yeso Energy Inc. has not posted a single well financial assurance for this well.
- c. The Connie C State #003, 30-015-25587, has a measured depth of 3,525 feet, and requires a single well financial assurance in the amount of \$8,525. Yeso Energy, Inc. has posted a financial assurance in the amount of \$5,000; it needs \$3,525 in additional financial assurance for this well.
- d. The Connie C State #004, 30-015-25648, has a measured depth of 3494 feet, and requires a single well financial assurance in the amount of \$8,494. Yeso Energy, Inc. has posted a financial assurance in the amount of \$5,000; it needs \$3,494 in additional financial assurance for this well.
- e. The Connie C State #017, 30-015-02302, has a measured depth of 2037 feet, and requires a single well financial assurance in the amount of \$7,037. Yeso Energy Inc. has not posted a single well financial assurance for this well.

Violation of 19.15.25 NMAC (inactive well requirements):

Rule 19.15.25.8 NMAC requires an operator to plug and abandon or temporarily abandon a well in accordance with Division rules within 90 days after a period of one year of continuous inactivity.

Rule 19.15.25.10.D NMAC provides that, as soon as practical, but not later than one year after the completion of plugging operations, the operator shall level the location, removed deadmen and other junk, and take other measures necessary or required by the OCD to restore the location to a safe and clean condition. In addition, the operator is required to close all pits and below-grade tanks. See 19.15.25.10.E NMAC.

Rule 19.15.25.11 NMAC provides that within 30 days after completing all restoration work the operator shall file with the OCD a record of the work done. The OCD shall not approve the record of plugging or release a bond until the operator has filed the necessary reports and the OCD has inspected and approved the location.

All of the wells operated by Yeso Energy, Inc. have been inactive for a continuous period in excess of one year plus 90 days, and are neither plugged and abandoned in accord with 19.15.25.10 NMAC nor on approved temporary abandonment status in accord with 19.15.25.13 NMAC.

OCD Exhibit 5, the Inactive Well Additional Financial Assurance Report, also identifies the last reported production or injection for Yeso's wells.

Ten of Yeso's wells have reported production or injection at some point. However, those ten wells have not reported production or injection for at least one year plus ninety days. In fact, the most recent reported production or injection is from April 2006. I have reviewed the well

files for the ten Yeso wells that have reported production or injection. None of the ten wells is on approved temporary abandonment status, or properly plugged and abandoned.

Two of Yeso's wells have never reported production or injection: the Lambchop 20 #001 and the Shirley Kay State #001. According to the well files for those wells, both wells have been drilled and they are not properly plugged and abandoned and they are not on approved temporary abandonment status.

The most recent documents in the well file for the Lambchop 20 #001 are a C-103 filed by Yeso on July 10, 2003, indicating that remedial work had been done on the well and that it was shut in pending gas contract and right of way. A C-105 Well Completion or Recompletion Report and Log filed by Yeso on July 15, 2003 states that Yeso re-entered the well in 2003. Copies of the C-103 and C-105 are **OCD Exhibits 6 and 7**. It is clear from the well file that the Lambchop 20 #001 has been drilled, and has been inactive for a continuous period in excess of one year plus ninety days. It is not on approved temporary abandonment status, and has not been plugged and abandoned.

The Shirley Kay State #001 was drilled in 1988, according to the C-105 from the well file OCD Exhibit 8. It has never reported production or injection. The OCD issued a Notice of Violation to Yeso regarding the well's inactivity on June 21, 2005. A copy is OCD Exhibit 9. It is clear from the well file that the Shirley Kay State #001 has been drilled, and has been inactive for a continuous period in excess of one year plus ninety days. It is not on approved temporary abandonment status, and has not been plugged and abandoned.

Rule 19.15.8.13 NMAC authorizes the Director to order the operator to plug and abandon any well not in compliance with 19.15.25.8 NMAC and restore and remediate the location by a date certain.

NMSA 1978, Section 70-2-12(B)(18) and NMSA 1978, Section 70-2-38 authorize the OCD to plug and abandon wells, and restore and remediate the location of abandoned wells.

History of compliance actions by the OCD against Yeso:

ACOI 137

On July 10, 2006, the OCD entered into Inactive Well Agreed Compliance Order (ACOI) 137 with Yeso Energy, Inc. A copy of ACOI 137 is **OCD Exhibit 10**. The order covered four wells, including two of the wells at issue in this case: The Connie C State #003 and the Connie C State #004. Under the terms of the order, Yeso acknowledged that the wells were out of compliance with the inactive well rule, and agreed to bring them into compliance by December 31, 2006.

Yeso transferred one of the four wells to another operator, but did not return the remaining three wells to compliance. By letter dated January 8, 2007, the OCD notified Yeso that its ACOI had expired, and that it owed a penalty of \$3,000. A copy of the letter is **OCD Exhibit 11**. Yeso paid the penalty. The Connie C State #003 and the Connie C State #004 remain out of compliance.

Cancellation of authority to transport or inject

By letter dated November 20, 2006, the OCD cancelled the authority of Yeso to transport from or inject into the wells it operates. A copy of the letter is **OCD Exhibit 12**. The cancellation was issued pursuant to 19.15.13.1115.C NMAC, which has been renumbered as 19.15.7.24 NMAC. The letter was issued because of Yeso's failure to submit monthly production reports for a specific month: May 2006. Yeso still has not submitted reports for May 2006.

Case No. 13921, Order R-12801

The OCD brought plugging case No. 13921 on six inactive wells operated by Yeso, including the Connie C State #003 and the Connie C State #004. Order R-12801, issued August 20, 2007, required Yeso to return the wells to compliance within 30 days, and authorized the OCD to plug the wells and forfeit the applicable financial assurance if Yeso missed that deadline The order also imposed a penalty of \$6,000. A copy of Order R-12801 is **OCD Exhibit 13**. Yeso paid the penalty but has not returned the Connie C State #003 or the Connie C State #004 to compliance.

Case No. 14008, Order R-12930

The OCD brought compliance case No. 14008 against Yeso in 2007, alleging that Yeso had failed to file timely production reports, and had continued to transport and inject after the OCD had cancelled its authority. Order R-12930, issued April 7, 2008, found that Yeso had knowingly and willfully failed to file production reports, and had injected after its authority to inject had been cancelled. A copy of the order is **OCD Exhibit 14**. The Order imposed penalties totaling \$33,000. Those penalties have not been paid.

By letter dated August 26, 2008, the OCD notified the attorney for Yeso that Yeso had not paid the penalty. The letter also notified the attorney for Yeso that Yeso was out of compliance with the inactive well rule, the financial assurance requirements and the reporting requirements. A copy of the letter is **OCD Exhibit 15**.

Requested Relief:

The OCD requests an order finding Yeso in violation of the OCD's rules requiring monthly production reports, inactive wells, and financial assurances, requiring Yeso to plug and abandon all the wells it operates by a date certain, and authorizing the OCD to plug and abandon

236	the wells and forfeit the applicable financial assurances if Yeso fails to meet the deadline set in							
237	the order.							
238	Such an order would require Yeso to plug and abandon its wells or transfer them to							
239	another operator. The goal of this proceeding is to prevent Yeso from operating wells in New							
240	Mexico. This relief is sought because of Yeso's history of non-compliance, and because all or							
241	the OCD's other efforts to obtain compliance from Yeso have failed.							
242	I, Daniel Sanchez, swear that the foregoing is true and correct.							
243								
244	0 08 X							
245	Dint							
246	Daniel Sanchez							
247248	Compliance and Enforcement Manager Oil Conservation Division							
249	On Conservation Division							
250								
251								
252	in th							
253	Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18 day of March 2009 by Daniel Sanchez.							
254								
255								
256								
257258	to Daise W. Landel							
259	Notary Public							
260	riotally rubile.							
261	My commission expires:							
262								
263	O(-12-472012							