- ., ,		Page1
	NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	
	COMMISSION HEARING	
	SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO	
Hearing Date	NOVEMBER 8, 1990	Time:_9:00 A.M.
NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION

Bytan Co.

GCUM

GENM

GCNM

Montgomery Andrews , P.A.

Maurice Tremenica

PAUL MOLLO

ann Bolom

Ward Camp

~ #					Page	2
	NEW MEXIC	O OIL	CONSERVATION	N COMMISSION		
		COMM	ISSION HEARI	NG		
			SANTA FE	, NEW MEXICO		
Hearing Date_			NOVEMB	ER 8, 1990	Time	: 9:00 A.M.
NAME			REPRESENTII	NG		LOCATION
					T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	
	}					
.4						

٠.

1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2	OID COMBINATION COMMISSION
3	IN THE MATTER OF: THE HEARING CALLED BY THE)
4	OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION) TO CONSIDER:)
5))) CASE NO. 10143
6) APPLICATION OF THE OIL CONSERVATION)
7	DIVISION FOR ORDER ENACTING AND) ADOPTING A RECODIFICATION OF THE)
8	RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE OIL)
9	CONSERVATION DIVISION)
10	
11	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS COMMISSION HEARING
12	BEFORE: WILLIAM J. LeMAY, Chairman
13	WILLIAM WEISS, Commissioner
14	November 8, 1990 9:05 a.m.
	Santa Fe, New Mexico
15	
16	This matter came on for hearing before the Oil
17	Conservation Commission on November 8, 1990, at 9:05 a.m.
18	at Morgan Hall, State Land Office Building, 310 Old
19	Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Maureen R.
20	Hunnicutt, RPR, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 166 and
21	Notary Public, in and for the County of Santa Fe, State of
22	New Mexico.
23	
24	
25	FOR: OIL CONSERVATION BY: MAUREEN R. HUNNICUTT, RPR DIVISION Certified Shorthand Reporter CSR No. 166

1		
2	INDEX	
3	November 8, 1990 Commissioner Hearing Case No. 10143	PAGE
5	APPEARANCES	3
7 8	OPENING STATEMENT By Mr. Stovall	5
9	DIVISION WITNESS:	
10 11	DIANE RICHARDSON Direct Examination by Mr. Stovall Direct Examination Commissioner Weiss	8 11
12 13	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	15
14	* * *	
14 15	* * * E X H I B I T S	
	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	ADMTD 12
15 16	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD	ADMTD 12
15 16 17	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	
15 16 17 18	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	
15 16 17 18	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	
15 16 17 18 19	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	
15 16 17 18 19 20	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	EXHIBITS DIVISION EXHIBIT MRKD 1 New Rule Book	

r		
1		
2		APPEARANCES
3	TOD THE DIVISION.	
4	FOR THE DIVISION:	General Counsel
5		Oil Conservation Commission State Land Office Building
6		310 Old Santa Fe Trail Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
7		
8	FOR EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY:	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS, P.A. Attorneys at Law
9		BY: W. PERRY PEARCE, ESQ. 325 Paseo de Peralta
10		Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
11	ALSO PRESENT:	FLORENCE DAVIDSON
12		Staff Specialist Oil Conservation Division
13		
14	FOR BYRAM COMPANY:	MAURICE E. TRIMMER 112 Valley Drive
15		Santa Fe, New Mexico
16		* * *
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	1	

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Good morning, Oil Conservation

Commission hearing. Two of the commissioners will be here

out of the three: Commissioner Bill Weiss to my left and

myself, Bill LeMay. Commissioner Humphries was not able

to make it.

To begin, we'll call Case No. 10143 in the matter of the application of the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division to adopt a complete recodification of the rules and regulations of the division.

Appearances in Case 10143.

MR. STOVALL: Robert G. Stovall of Santa Fe on behalf the division.

MR. PEARCE: May it please the Commission, I'm

W. Perry Pearce of the Santa Fe office of the law firm of

Montgomery & Andrews, appearing in this matter on behalf

of El Paso Natural Gas Company.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Thank you, Mr. Pearce.

MR. STOVALL: Mr. Chairman, I have one -- I am going to offer a legal opinion, if you will, a history on this. I can do it either under oath or just as a lawyer's address. I have one other witness to testify today as to the contents of the rule book.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: As long as you have a witness, why don't you make an opening statement that will be part of the record? You can cover the history, if you will.

Mr. Pearce.

MR. PEARCE: I will try not to object.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: You have the same rights, of course, under your opening statement to --

MR. PEARCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: -- take issue with what Mr. Stovall says. Do you have any witnesses, Mr. Pearce?

MR. PEARCE: I do not.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Mr. Stovall, you may proceed.

MR. STOVALL: The purpose of this case is to, in effect, repeal -- or actually repeal existing General Rules and Regulations of the Oil Conservation Division and readopt them in this revised format.

The history behind this is really quite simple. We found out that we were running out of copies of the rule books. We were going to have to reprint them. About the same time we changed word processing systems. We found out that the rule book, which was on the old word processing system, could not be easily converted to the new word processing system for reproduction.

What that meant was the entire rule book had to be typed into the new word processing system manually. In doing so, we looked at the rule book and determined that it was a series of rules adopted over a number of years in different formats, not consistent. Some of them were

better than others, what have you.

We said, "Why not reproduce it in a manner it could be more consistent, more easily modified or amended when the rules came out?" One of the other problems, I found for an example myself, I've been with the division over a year and a half, and discovered that I was working with an out-of-date rule book. There had been rule revisions which had not been incorporated. We wanted to come up with a system which would reduce that risk.

The result is that we took the rule book. Diane Richardson, my witness and assistant, typed it into her word processor. She used a formatting, which she'll explain momentarily, on the word processor which provided a consistency. We're now identifying, and I'll, as I said, offer the exhibit.

You'll be able to see each rule is going to have an effective date on the page where it is. Our intention is to develop a list of every rule, showing the effective date; and whenever a rule is amended, a new list with new effective dates will be shown. Anybody, subscribers to the rule book, if you will, will have access to that list. It will be provided to them, it will be sent out. And again you'll be able to look at any given time to determine whether or not you've got an up-to-date rule book.

And also it will be much easier to substitute pages in the rule book. If we modify a rule, simply send out replacement pages. Based on our current activity, we anticipate that will probably be no more than twice a year, and half a dozen pages at the most at any given time.

That very simply is the history of it. I will tell, and then we'll present the witness to testify, that in making this transition we have typed the rules word for word from the existing rules. There is absolutely no substantive change whatsoever in the rules, so there really isn't any need to look in depth.

I will also provide you with copies of the format, or at least part of it -- part of it is still up in the printer at the moment, but the rest of it will be available by the end of the hearing -- for your examination, if you wish.

We ask that the rules be adopted effective as of March 1, 1991. The reason we have selected that is simply to allow time to process through the New Mexico Records Center the New Mexico register, a fairly voluminous process, and each rule has to go through the records center individually with individual cover sheets in the processing, so it will take some time. I think we're pretty much ready to get it to the records center, but

it's going to take the records center -- we want to give them plenty of time to review the rules, make sure everything conforms to their requirements, get the rules printed, gives us leadtime to get the rules published and available to the users before they actually become effective.

At this time I would like to call Diane Richardson, and she does need to be sworn at this time.

DIANE RICHARDSON,

the Witness herein, having been first duly sworn by Chairman LeMay, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STOVALL:

- Q. Ms. Richardson, would you please state your name and place of employment?
- A. Diane Richardson. I work with the Energy,
 Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Oil
 Conservation Division, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- Q. What are your duties with the Oil Conservation Division?
- A. I am an administrator. I take care of the bonding, rule changes, typing legal briefs and et cetera.
- Q. Are you the person who performed the process, which I have described, of transcribing the rule book into the new word processing system format, as I've described

it?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Would you tell me exactly what you've done, please?
- A. I have -- using what's called Word Perfect, and Word Perfect has a setup where you can define paragraphing indentations, numbering, and so I typed verbatim from the rule book using this Word Perfect paragraphing, indenting, et cetera.
- Q. Now, in doing so did you actually change the content, the words of any rules?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. And all of the contents are within the same rule number? In other words, Rule 101 contains the same words as Rule 101 in the old rule book; is that right?
 - A. Yes, sir, that's right.
- Q. But within -- and I'm just using this as an example -- Rule 101, the paragraphing may be different than in the new or the old rule book?
- A. It may have a different number, a different indentation.
- Q. Now, after you finished the typing of these rules, did you do any followup steps to ensure that it was accurate and consistent with the old rule book?
 - A. Yes. Another woman in the office and myself

proofread every rule, and -- we just proofread it.

- Q. In other words, one of you looked at the old rule book and the other one looked at what has been typed?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Or read it out loud, is that how it was done --
 - A. Read it out loud.
 - Q. -- and found out they were identical?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Now, what you and the commissioners have in front of you is what is an unmarked exhibit. Would you describe what that is?
- A. On Word Perfect there is a master document, and I have pulled the rule book all together from each rule, making it one document; and this is the first time that I have done this, and so this is going to be our rule book; and I did notice that there is one section that is not numbered correctly. Section C starts out C1, 2, 3, and the page numbering is wrong.
- Q. You're talking about the page numbering, correct?
- A. Yes, just the page numbering; so I will correct that.
- Q. Now, what you have in front of you right at this moment only contains through Rule 1002. Are there additional rules which are still in the process of being

printed by word processing?

A. That's correct.

MR. STOVALL: We would request leave to supplement and put the rest of the rule book in evidence for the exhibit at the conclusion of the hearing. It is just simply a matter of printing a hundred pages, and that took more time than we anticipated.

I have no further questions of the witness.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Thank you, Mr. Stovall.

Additional questions of the witness?

DIRECT EXAMINATION

COMMISSIONER WEISS:

- Q. Has anyone else edited it, other than yourself and the other lady up in the OCD?
 - A. No, sir.

COMMISSIONER WEISS: I wonder if that's worth --

MR. STOVALL: Commissioner Weiss, I will say that I have reviewed not as closely and carefully as they have, but I have been through the books and reviewed the overall contents.

COMMISSIONER WEISS: I'm sure the overall contents are correct, but in the old rules, I recall seeing things that didn't read right or misspellings or typos; and I wonder if it's worthwhile to get this looked at again.

THE WITNESS: If I may. There were rule changes that

we have made that went over to the records center where some of these corrections were made because they were discovered. If there was a typo, the typo was corrected. I did not change the wording or the word, but I did correct typos.

- Q. (By Commissioner Weiss) So the English is correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. I don't recall precise examples, but I know the old rules that --
 - A. Yes, we did --
 - Q. -- we could have done a better job.
- A. Right. And we did pick up on that and send that over to the records center previously so that this could just be typed verbatim; and if there was a typo, that was picked up.

COMMISSIONER WEISS: Okay.

MR. STOVALL: I anticipate that we may find additional errors. We made every effort to correct them.

COMMISSIONER WEISS: Well, that's good, but I wonder if it's worthwhile to make sure there are no errors.

MR. STOVALL: We certainly would invite review for that type of correction of errors. We can't make any substantive changes because of the rulemaking process under the statutes.

CHAIRMAN Lemay: Mr. Weiss, I have a suggestion for that if you concur. I think we could leave the record open for one week, so that it didn't put the pressure on them to submit the final document without additional proofreading. By leaving the record open for the exhibit to be submitted within one week, it will be proofread again and then be marked as Exhibit 1, I assume; and then before the order is written, it can be sent to your office and you can look at it as Exhibit 1; and so we'll have a couple of proofreading sessions in there to make it as perfect as possible.

COMMISSIONER WEISS: Good.

MR. STOVALL: Yes. I think with an effective date of March 1st that allows time as long as we can start the processing through the records center. By sometime in December, actually, is what I think our timetable is to get over to records center to start the process.

COMMISSIONER WEISS: That's my only comment.

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Additional questions of the witness?

If not, she may be excused.

And what will be Exhibit 1, I take it, will be moved to be --

MR. STOVALL: It's moved for admission.

(Division Exhibit 1 to be subsequently

marked and was moved for admission.)

CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Right. And it shall go into the 1 record without objection. Also let it be noted that the 2 record will be open for one week, and Exhibit 1 can be 3 modified within that week's period so that a final Exhibit 1 with corrections will be part of the official 5 record. 6 Mr. Pearce. 7 Nothing, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. 8 MR. PEARCE: 9 CHAIRMAN LeMAY: Is there anything else in Case No. 10143? 10 11 If not, that case will be taken under 12 advisement. 13 (The foregoing proceeding was concluded at the 14 approximate hour of 9:25 a.m.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

STATE OF NEW MEXICO 1 ss. COUNTY OF SANTA FE 2 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 3 5 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing reporter's transcript 6 of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was 7 taken by me; that I was then and there a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the County 8 of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico; that the witnesses 9 10 before testifying were duly sworn to testify to the whole truth and nothing but the truth; that all statements and 11 12 questions propounded by counsel and the Commission and the 13 answers of the witnesses thereto were taken down by me, 14 and that the foregoing 14 pages of typewritten matter 15 contain a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings and testimony had and adduced upon the taking of said 16 17 proceedings, all to the best of my skill and ability. 18 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to nor 19 employed by any of the parties hereto, and have no interest in the outcome hereof. 20 21 DATED at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 29th day of November, 1990. 22 23 2.4 RPR MAUREEN R. HUNNICUTT,

My Commission Expires: April 25, 1993

25

MAUREEN R. HUNNICUTT, RPR Certified Shorthand Reporter CSR No. 166, Notary Public