1 2 3	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO  21 September 1989			
4				
5	COMMISSION HEARING			
6	IN THE MATTER OF:			
7				
8	In the matter of the hearing called by CASE the Oil Conservation on its own motion 9769			
9	to amend General Rules 312 and 711 to require bonds for treating plants to be			
10	in place prior to the commencement of construction instead of at the time of			
11	application.			
12				
13	DEPOND William T. Lawrence Cl. 1			
14	BEFORE: William J. Lemay, Chairman William W. Weiss, Commissioner			
15				
16	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING			
17				
18				
19	APPEARANCES			
20	For the Division: Robert G. Stovall			
21	Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division			
22	State Land Office Building Santa Fe, New Mexico			
23				
24				
25				

		2	
1	INDEX		
2			
3	ROGER C. ANDERSON		
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Stovall	3	
5	Questions by Mr. Weiss	9	
6	Redirect Examination by Mr. Stovall	9	
7			
8	·		
9	EXHIBITS		
10			
11	Exhibit One, Document	5	
12	Exhibit Two, Document	6	
13 14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 MR. LEMAY: We'll call next 2 Case 9769. In the matter of the hearing called by the Oil 3 Conservation Division of the Energy, Minerals and Natural its own motion to amend General Resources Department on 5 Rules 3, 12 and 711 to require bonds for treating plants to 6 be in place prior to the commencement of construction 7 instead of at the time of application. Appearances in this case? MR. STOVALL: Robert G. 10 Stovall of Santa Fe, New Mexico, on behalf of the Division. 11 I have one witness. 12 MR. LEMAY: Thank you. Are 13 there additional appearances in the case? 14 If not, you may call your 15 witness and have him sworn in. 16 17 (Witness sworn.) 18 19 ROGER C. ANDERSON, 20 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his 21 oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 22 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. STOVALL: 25 Q Please state your name and place of employment?

A Roger C. Anderson. I'm an Environmental Engineer for the Oil Conservation Division.

Q Have you previously testified before the Division or Commission and had your credentials accepted as a matter of record?

A No. I have not.

Q Would you please tell the Commission your educational background?

A I obtained a Bachelor of Science in chemical engineering from New Mexico State University in 1975.

Q Thank you. Would you describe briefly your work experience since that time?

A Since that time I've worked -- I worked 11 years Dowell Division of Dow Chemical as a district engineer, service manager, and manager, and 3-1/2 years for the Oil Conservation Division as an environmental engineer.

Q And as an environmental engineer, what have been your responsibilities?

A The permitting and compliance with environmental rules for the Oil Conservation Division and the Water Quality Control Commission.

Q Are you familiar with the application for changes to Rule 312 and 711-C?

5 1 Α Yes, I am. 2 MR. STOVALL: Are the wit-3 ness' qualifications acceptable? 4 They're accept-MR. LEMAY: 5 able. 6 Mr. Anderson, I'm going to hand you what Q 7 been marked as Exhibit Number One and ask you to ex-8 plain, please, the purpose of the rule change as contained 9 in Exhibit Number One, the amendments to Rule 312. 10 The purpose of the rule change is to 11 make the bonding requirements more consistent with other 12 rules in the rule book and change the timing of the bonding 13 requirement on a treating plant from at the time of appli-14 cation to prior to construction. 15 Okay, under the current rules an appli-16 is required to post a bond at the time he applies for 17 a treating plant permit, is that correct? 18 Α Yes, he is. 19 0 And what is the impact upon that upon an 20 operator? 21 Α Ιf an operator is planning to construct 22 a treating plant and he has to financially obtain a \$25,000 23 bond before he even knows that he's going to get that ap-24 plication, it could be a financial burden on him.

And what is the purpose of the treating

25

Q

6 1 plant bond? 2 To assure clean up of the treating plant Α 3 cessation of operations. At the time that he applies 4 treating plant permit he has no operations to clean 5 up. 6 Q And when, from the Division's stand-7 point, when is it necessary that this bond be in place? 8 When anything is being constructed on 9 the site. If there's something that has to be cleaned up, 10 it could be a construction of a pit or a tank or --11 Q And that can't take place, that con-12 struction can't take place until a permit is issued, is 13 that correct? 14 Α They obtain a permit, that's right. 15 Q So this rule change simply says we need 16 bond when it serves it's purpose and not prior to that 17 time, is that --18 Α Yes, sir. 19 -- the effect of it? Q 20 Α Yes, sir. 21 I hand you now what's been marked Ex-Q 22 hibit Two in this case and ask you to -- let me, before I 23

further question on -- on Exhibit

do that, let me back up.

Number One.

One

24

\_ ·  I observe that there have been -- appear to be some redesignations of paragraphs under Exhibit Number One. Would you briefly describe what is going on there?

A Yes, sir. Rule 312(a) is the requirements for what must accompany a treating plant bond.

The Division proposes to delete subparagraph 6, that paragraph (a), which reads "a surety or
cash bond in the amount of \$25,000 in a form approved by
the Division conditioned upon compliance with the statutes
of the State of New Mexico and rules of the Division and
the satisfactory cleanup of the site upon cessation of
operation in accordance with part (i) of this rule."

I believe that subparagraph entirely changed subparagraph 7 to subparagraph 6 without any changes in the paragraph, and add a new subparagraph, or a new paragraph (c), which will read "before commencing construction..."

Q Excuse me, Mr. Anderson, I think it's not necessary to read the entire rule.

A Okay, add the new paragraph (c) and then change the present paragraph (c) through (i) down by one letter.

Q Thank you. Now let's turn to Exhibit Number Two, Rule 711, and will you please explain the

8 1 nature of the change in that rule? 2 Α It is changing paragraph -- Rule 711, 3 Paragraph C, adding in the beginning of the paragraph, 4 "Before commencing construction", that all surface waste 5 disposal facilities shall have a surety or cash bond. 6 And why, why is that change important? Α In the present rule there's no time at 8 which a bond is required. It just states that a \$25,000 9 bond is required, and to make it consistent with the other 10 bonding rules in Rule 312, inserting the "before commencing 11 construction". 12 And is it similar logic to that in 312 0 13 14 Α Yes, sir. 15 -- that a bond is needed for cleanup and 16 there's no cleanup needed until construction is commenced? 17 Correct. Α 18 Q And have you reviewed Exhibits One and 19 Two in this case as to accuracy and are you aware that they 20 are accurate and correct? 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 MR. STOVALL: I offer Exhibits 23 One and Two into the record. 24 MR. LEMAY: Without objection

Exhibits One and Two will be admitted into evidence.

1 MR. STOVALL: And I have 2 nothing further in this case. 3 MR. LEMAY: Any questions of Mr. Anderson? 5 6 QUESTIONS BY MR. WEISS: 7 What does it cost to cover a pit? 8 Α It depends on the size of the pit now. 9 What we did was about a year and a half ago when we put the 10 \$25,000 bond on it, we took the average pit and went 11 through the mining and minerals reclamation process and 12 figured \$25,000 would be the amount that covered it, to 13 clean up an average site that we have in New Mexico. 14 It seems like a lot. Q 15 Α Some of the sites are pretty big that we 16 have in New Mexico. 17 18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. STOVALL: 20 Let me ask you perhaps for clarification Q 21 for Mr. Weiss, if in fact a pit -- would you go through the 22 process of reclamation? What is required if the operator, 23 first, is required to do the cleanup himself? 24 Initially the operator, if he is still a

viable operator, is required to clean up his pit after he

1 operations and that is reclaiming, removing all ceases 2 fluids or sludges, reclaiming the site and removing all 3 tanks. And the bond then serves the purpose of Q 5 an insurance policy, in effect --6 Yes, sir. Α 7 0 -- to insure that the Division has the 8 money to clean up if the operator fails to do so? Yes, it does. Α 10 Q And is it correct they'd only use the 11 bond to the extent necessary to clean up a pit? In other 12 words, if a cleanup only cost \$10,000, that's all the money 13 that would be used. 14 That's correct. Α 15 MR. STOVALL: I have nothing 16 further. 17 Additional gues-MR. LEMAY: 18 tions of the witness? 19 He may be excused. 20 there anything additional 21 in the case? 22 MR. STOVALL: Nothing further 23 in this case. 24 MR. LEMAY: Thank you, Mr. 25 Stovall. Does anyone have any comments in Case Number

```
11
 1
     9769?
 2
                                    If not, the Commission will
 3
     take that case under advisement.
 4
 5
                         (Hearing concluded.)
 6
 7
 8
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

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.

Sary W. Boyd CSR