Lave
------

1

## NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

-

;

COMMISSION HEARING

SANTA FE , NEW MEXICO

Hearing Date\_\_\_\_\_

<u>SEPTEMBER 21, 1989</u> Time: 9:00 A.M.

NAME REPRESENTING LOCATION he a base alle la ſ I SA ANT 1 lun

P	ag	е	2	

## NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

.

۰.

COMMISSION HEARING

SANTA FE , NEW MEXICO

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_ SEPTEMBER 21, 1989 Time: 9:00 A.M.

NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATIO

STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT 1 OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING 2 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 3 21 September 1989 4 5 COMMISSION HEARING 6 IN THE MATTER OF: 7 In the matter of the hearing called by CASE 8 the Oil Conservation on its own motion 9768 to amend Rules 0.1, 106, 111, 117, 118, 9 301, 303, 309-C, 503, 505, 506, 509, 1100, 1113, 1122, and 1304 of the General Rules 10 and Regulations for the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division. 11 12 13 BEFORE: William J. Lemay, Chairman 14 William W. Weiss, Commissioner 15 16 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 17 18 APPEARANCES 19 20 For the Division: Robert G. Stovall Attorney at Law 21 Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Building 22 Santa Fe, New Mexico 23 24 25

3 ۱ MR. LEMAY: We'll now call 2 Case Number 9768. 3 Case Number 9768, in the mat-4 ter of the hearing called by the Oil Conservation Divi-5 sion on its own motion to amend Rules 0.1, 106, 111, 117, 6 118, 301, 303, 309-C, 503, 505, 506, 509, 1100, 1113, 1122, 7 and 1304 of the General Rules and Regulations for the New 8 Mexico Oil Conservation Division. 9 These changes are primarily to 10 clarify language and do not change the impact of the rules. 11 Appearances in Case 9768. 12 MR. STOVALL: Robert G. Sto-13 vall of Santa Fe, New Mexico, on behalf of the Oil Conser-14 vation Division. 15 MR. LEMAY: Mr. Stovall. Are 16 there any other appearances in this case? 17 MR. STOVALL: I have one wit-18 ness. 19 MR. LEMAY: Okay, if that 20 witness will stand and be sworn in. 21 22 (Witness sworn.) 23 24 25

4 1 VICTOR T. LYON, 2 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his 3 oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 4 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. STOVALL: 7 Please state your name and place of 0 8 employment. 9 А I'm Victor T. Lyon, Chief Engineer for 10 the Oil Conservation Division. 11 Have you testified before this Commis-Q 12 sion and had your qualifications accepted as a matter of 13 record? 14 А Yes, I have. 15 0 And are you familiar with the applica-16 tion in this case? 17 А Yes, I am. 18 Q Would you please describe the background 19 of how this application came about and the purpose of the 20 application? 21 Α From time to time it's necessary for us 22 to print additional copies of our rules and regulations and 23 it has got to the point that there are -- we've noticed a 24 large number of small, insignificant changes which need to 25 be made, but also including the changes in the statute

5 1 which we thought should be incorporated into any future 2 printings of the -- of the rules, and in contemplation of 3 through the entire set of rules and made that I went 4 to those changes which obviously need to be notations as 5 made. 6 Now, what is -- what is the nature of Q 7 most of those changes? 8 А Most of them are correction of words. 9 In one case there is the repeat of a line which should be 10 eliminated, and there are some changes, such as the rules 11 refer to U. S. Geological Survey and that is now the U. S. 12 Bureau of Mines. 13 It also refers to the --14 Excuse me, Mr. Lyon, is that U.S. Q 15 Bureau of Mines or Bureau of Land Management? 16 Bureau of Land Management, excuse me. А 17 Thank you for correcting it. 18 And also, the name of our department has 19 changed from New Mexico Minerals -- or Energy and Minerals 20 to New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources, and 21 those changes certainly should be made. 22 Let me ask you, have you before you what Q 23 has been identified as Exhibit One in this case? 24 А Yes. 25 MR. STOVALL: At this time --

would you now go through Exhibit One and identify what has been -- tell the Commission about the more significant, what you consider significant changes, which actually change words or correction, major word corrections other than just punctuation and spellings?

1

25

7 A All right. The first change in the definitions changes the word "prorationing" to "proration", since "prorationing" is not the proper word and "proration" is.

The second one is the change from "Oil Conservation Division of the New Mexico Energy and Minerals Department" to the "Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department."

The next one, the proration period, the 15 definition does not conform to our current usage of the 16 In Order R-8170 proration period is proration period. 17 defined as the 12-month period beginning April 1st and 18 which is clearly inconsistent with this definition; how-19 if we were to change it to April 1st, it -- and we ever, 20 for some reason made another change in the proration 21 period, then it would be inconsistent again, and therefore 22 I added the language "or other period designated by general 23 or special order of the Division." 24

Q Are there any other significant changes in the definitions?

6

7 1 А Well, on the second page, Rule 118, it 2 seems that it is a little awkward in the 1, 2, 3, 4, fifth 3 line down, it reads much more clearly if we just add "H<sub>2</sub>S" 4 in there and I'm not sure whether the period -- the comma 5 preceding that should be in there. There is a phrase after 6 it says, "The operator of a lease producing, or a gas pro-7 cessing plant handling,  $H_2S$  . . .". 8 I think probably we can eliminate that 9 comma and it would be --10 Q And that particular thing is over and 11 above the changes that have been marked on the exhibit, is 12 that correct? 13 А Yes. 14 On the third page, Rule 301, the rules 15 use the term "proration department". We really don't have 16 a proration department. I think what -- what they had had 17 in mind when they wrote that was that each district office 18 has a proration group who handle certain functions and it 19 just seemed more appropriate to strike that "proration 20 department" and put in "Division". 21 And Division, as defined in the rule 0 22 refers to the general -- to the Oil Conservation Division, 23 is that correct? 24 Yes. А 25 Q Continue, please.

1 А A11 right. Toward the bottom of the 2 Rule page, the second paragraph of 303-B, there was a 3 repeated line in there and it made it very awkward to read 4 and it's much better when you take that line out. 5 The last paragraph is a substitute of 6 "Bureau of Land Management" for "geological survey". 7 On the next page, Rule 503, obviously it 8 was a typographical error but I'm sure that they intended 9 say 100 percent rather than 10 percent because we've to 10 been at 100 percent for the last eight or nine years. 11 In Rule 505 the word "available" did not 12 seem to fit in there and I'm not sure what the original 13 intent was, but "appropriate" seems to be much more appro-14 priate in this case. 15 On the next page, Rule 509, paragraph 2, 16 obviously the word "allowable" had been left out of the 17 rule and should be placed back in there. 18 And on the last page, the first para-19 graph, when that rules was written we did not have the "Gas 20 Well Testing Manual for Northwest New Mexico". We now have 21 that and I think it is appropriate to insert that addition-22 al manual in there in this rule. 23 Q Do you have anything further to add with 24 respect to the proposed rule changes in this case? 25 No, I think not. А

8

9 1 Q And Exhibit One was prepared by you or 2 under your supervision and you've reviewed it for accu-3 racy? 4 А Yes. 5 MR. STOVALL: Move the admis-6 sion of Exhibit One and have nothing further to offer in 7 this case. 8 MR. LEMAY: Without objection 9 Exhibit One will be admitted into the evidence. 10 Are there additional questions 11 of the witness? 12 Did you qualify the witness 13 earlier? 14 MR. STOVALL: Yes. 15 MR. LEMAY: If not, the wit-16 ness may be excused. 17 Is there anything additional 18 in Case 9768? 19 MR. STOVALL: No, nothing 20 further in this case. 21 MR. LEMAY: Does anyone have 22 any testimony, comments, statements, for Case 9768? 23 If not, the Commission will 24 take Case 9768 under advisement. 25 (Hearing concluded.)

CERTIFICATE I, SALLY W. BOYD, C. S. R. DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division (Commission) was reported by me; that the said transcript is a full, true and correct record of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my ability. Sally W. Bayd CSR