STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

CASE NO. 13,163

APPLICATION OF THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR AN ORDER REQUIRING SABA ENERGY OF TEXAS, INC., TO BRING SIX WELLS INTO COMPLIANCE WITH 19.15.4.201 NMAC

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSION HEARING

2006 JUN 22 HIT I

BEFORE: MARK E. FESMIRE, CHAIRMAN

JAMI BAILEY, COMMISSIONER

WILLIAM C. OLSON, COMMISSIONER

June 15th, 2006

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the Oil Conservation Commission, MARK E. FESMIRE, Chairman, on Thursday, June 15th, 2006, 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.

* * *

I N D E X

June 15th, 2006 Commission Hearing CASE NO. 13,163

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	3
APPEARANCES	4
OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. MacQUESTEN	9
APPLICANT'S WITNESS:	
<u>DANIEL SANCHEZ</u> (Compliance and Enforcement Manager, NMOCD)	
Direct Examination by Ms. MacQuesten	12
STATEMENT BY MR. SEXTON	18
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	25

* * *

EXHIBITS

Applicant's	Identified	Admitted
Exhibit A	7	17
Exhibit 1 to Affidavit of Service	7	17
Exhibit 2 to Affidavit of Service	7	17
Exhibit B Exhibit C Exhibit D	13 15 7	17 17 17

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE COMMISSION:

CHERYL BADA
Assistant General Counsel
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department
1220 South St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

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 CAPITOL INSURANCE COMPANY:

STURGES, HOUSTON & SEXTON, P.C. P.O. Box 36210 (87176-6210) 6301 Indian School Rd. NE, Suite 400 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110 By: KEVIN M. SEXTON

* * :

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 1 9:29 a.m.: 2 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: The next cause before the 3 Commission is Case Number 13,163, the Application of the 4 New Mexico Oil Conservation Division for an order requiring 5 Saba Energy of Texas, Inc., to bring six wells into 6 compliance with 19.15.4.201 NMAC. 7 Ms. MacQuesten, do you have an entry of 8 appearance in this case? 9 MS. MacQUESTEN: I do, and I also have Mr. Daniel 10 Sanchez as a witness. 11 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay, is there any other --12 13 MR. SEXTON: Yes, good morning. May it please 14 the Commission, my name is Kevin Sexton. I'm an attorney 15 who has been retained by Capitol, C-a-p-i-t-o-l, Insurance 16 Company, which is the successor-in-interest to Redlands 17 Insurance Company, which was the surety named on the bond in question. 18 19 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Mr. Sexton, do you have 20 any witnesses today? 21 MR. SEXTON: I do not, Mr. Chairman. 22 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Ms. MacQuesten, do you 23 have an opening statement? 24 MS. MacQUESTEN: I do again, just a brief 25 statement of what we seek in the case, and I'd like to

review some of the documents in the also exhibit file. 1 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Mr. Sexton, would you 2 like to sit up here? 3 MR. SEXTON: Just so I don't have to yell over 4 this poor woman sitting here, I will do that. 5 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mostly so the court reporter 6 can get you on the record, on the recorder. 7 MR. SEXTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 MS. MacQUESTEN: We're here on a motion to reopen 9 Case 13,163, a compliance action against Saba Energy of 10 Texas, Inc. We are here seeking an order finding Saba to 11 be in violation of the Commission order issued in Case 12 13,163, requiring corrective action. If such an order is 13 issued, Saba will be in violation of Rule 40 until it 14 15 returns to the Commission and convinces you to release that 16 order. I would like to draw your attention to the 17 exhibit packet you have and add an exhibit to that. 18 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Has Mr. Sexton been provided 19 with that? 20 MS. MacQUESTEN: He's been provided with the 21 original packet of exhibits, but he hasn't seen this new 22 This is simply a continuation of our efforts to serve 23 Saba. If I may approach the Commission --24 25 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: You may.

MS. MacQUESTEN: -- with copies of this second affidavit of service to supplement the first affidavit. We did have some service issues in this case, and I wanted to address those up front.

The first exhibit in your exhibit packet is the original affidavit of service, and you'll see that we served the parties to the original case by certified mail dated April 24th, 2006. Those parties were Saba, Redlands Insurance Company, and also Mr. Michael Short who was an attorney who appeared on behalf of the owners of mineral interests in some of the wells in the original action.

We did not serve Saba's attorney, because he had formally withdrawn from the case.

We did serve an entity called Forcon

International, which I understand is a servicing company
for the surety. We served them as a courtesy, because
although they weren't a party to the original action they
had corresponded with the OCD during the course of that
case on behalf of the surety.

Attached to the original affidavit of service are the return receipts showing service to Redlands Insurance Company and Mr. Short. But we received return envelopes from Forcon and from Saba.

Also attached to Exhibit A is the letter that was sent notifying the parties of this hearing and a copy of

the order issued in Case 13,163 that we'll be addressing today.

Now as I discussed in the prehearing statement, although Forcon did not receive the mailing of April 24th notifying them of the hearing, they did hear about the case through Redlands Insurance Company and contacted me. They provided a new address.

I also researched the Internet in an attempt to find Saba, because our first efforts didn't reach them, and I did find an address for Saba that I hadn't seen before.

So I did a second mailing dated May 30th, 2006.

Now notice that that's not more than 20 days before the hearing as required by Rule 1210.B, but I wasn't able to obtain the addresses until that time.

You'll see from this second affidavit of service that the notice did reach Forcon. Of course, they all had actual notice of the hearing prior to that time. But again, we were unsuccessful in reaching Saba.

I asked that we proceed to hearing anyway. We were not required to give notice to Forcon, and they did have actual notice anyway because they contacted us and gave us their address. And the addresses for Saba that we have used have all turned out to be bad addresses.

We did publish notice of the hearing, and the affidavit of publication is included in that second

affidavit of service. So I would ask that we be allowed to proceed to hearing at this time.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Sexton, your has had actual notice of this hearing, have they not, for greater than 20 days?

MR. SEXTON: Mr. Chairman, my client, just to be clear, is the surety itself --

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Right.

MR. SEXTON: -- which is Capitol Insurance
Company, successor-in-interest to Redlands. And yes, we
did receive actual notice. I cannot speak to whether or
not the principal, Saba Energy of Texas, has received
actual notice of this hearing.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Ms. MacQuesten, I see no reason not to proceed to hearing at this time.

MS. MacQUESTEN: All right, thank you. Then I would ask you to look at the order we are attempting to enforce here. It's attached to that first affidavit of service. It's just before the copies of the return receipts. If I could turn your attention to the first page of that order, you'll note that it was issued on August 12th, 2004. And if you'll turn to page 4 and 5 of the order, that is the portion of the order directing Saba to take corrective action as to six wells.

The order identifies specific corrective action

as to each well or group of wells. For two of the wells, it required Saba to plug and abandon them. For four other wells, it simply told Saba to bring the wells into compliance, so Saba could plug the wells, place them on temporary abandonment status, or return them to productive use.

The order has different deadlines for each group

The order has different deadlines for each group of wells. For some of the wells the action was to be taken within 30 days of the issuance of the order, and for two of the wells the action was to be taken by December 31st, 2004.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Ms. MacQuesten, if I remember correctly, that was to provide the mineral owner an opportunity to do something with those well -- One of them was apparently a good producer and one they wanted to use.

MS. MacQUESTEN: That's right, there were two wells that the mineral interest owners were interested in, one because it was a productive well and the other because they wanted to use it as an injection well. So the Commission wrote the order to give them time to take whatever action they needed to take on those two wells.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Do you know what the status of that is, or --

MS. MacQUESTEN: I received a call from Michael Short, who is the attorney representing the mineral

interest owners in that Commission action. He is still interested in dealing with those wells. He indicated to me they've had trouble doing anything because -- his understanding is that the parent company for Saba is in bankruptcy, and for some reason that has caused them problems in getting -- to do what they want to do.

I informed him that -- as you'll learn through our witness, that the wells are currently on line to be plugged by the State, because significant time has passed since this issuance of the order, and we hadn't heard from Mr. Short or anyone else. And I advised him to contact David Brooks, who is handling the plugging of the cases, and find out from him whether there was anything that could be done about those two wells or whether Mr. Brooks intended to proceed with them.

I also told him that we were seeking to re-open the case in this motion strictly to deal with the Rule 40 issue, that if he wanted to ask the Commission to issue a new order on those two wells, that he should do that as a separate action. So that was the end of that.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay, I'm sorry to interrupt you there. Continue.

MS. MacQUESTEN: With that I would like to call Daniel Sanchez.

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Sanchez, you've been

previously sworn today. Why don't, just to make sure, we 1 swear him in in this case too? 2 (Thereupon, the witness was sworn.) 3 DANIEL SANCHEZ, 4 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon 5 his oath, was examined and testified as follows: 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. MacQUESTEN: 8 Mr. Sanchez, would you state your name for the Q. 9 record? 10 Daniel Sanchez. 11 Α. And did you just testify in the preceding case? 12 Q. Yes, I did. 13 Α. And are you still employed at OCD as the 14 Q. compliance and enforcement manager? 15 Yes, ma'am. A. 16 And do you still supervise the District Offices 17 Q. and track compliance with orders issued by the Division and 18 the Commission? 19 Yes, I do. 20 A. Are you familiar with the order issued against 21 Q. 22 Saba Energy of Texas in Case 13,163? 23 A. Yes, I am. Have you reviewed the well files for the wells 24 Q. 25 identified in that order and consulted with the District

Office regarding Saba's compliance with that order? 1 Yes, I have. 2 Α. Let's go through the current status of the wells 3 Q. covered by that order. I'd like you to turn to what has 4 been marked as Exhibit B. Can you identify this document? 5 Yes, it's the well list for Saba Energy of Texas, 6 Α. Incorporated, showing all six of their wells that are in 7 question in this case. 8 Where does this well list come from? 9 0. From the OCD website. 10 Α. So all of the six wells covered by the Commission 11 0. order are shown as Saba wells? 12 Yes. 13 Α. Let's go through those wells in the order they 14 appear on this well list, and let's start with the first 15 two wells, the Fern Guye Number 1 and the Harton State 16 17 Number 1. What did the Commission order require Saba to do with these wells? 18 19 To return these two wells into compliance with 20 Rule 201, which would mean, of course, bringing them back 21 into production, plugging them, or putting them on TA status. 22 23 And what was the deadline for compliance? Q. 24 Α. December 31st, 2004. 25 Q. Do the well files show any activity on these two

1	wells since the issuance of the Commission order?
2	A. No.
3	Q. Let's move to the second two wells, the Morris
4	Number 1 and the Saba State Number 1. What did the
5	Commission order require?
6	A. The order also required them to come into
7	compliance with Rule 201.
8	Q. And what was the deadline for compliance?
9	A. That would be 30 days from the order date, which
10	was August 12th, 2004.
11	Q. Does the well file show any activity on these two
12	wells since the issuance of the order?
13	A. No.
14	Q. And turning to the last two wells, the San Simon
15	5 State 1 and San Simon 5 State 2, what did the order
16	require as to these two wells?
17	A. These wells were to be plugged and abandoned 30
18	days after the signing of the order.
19	Q. Does the well file show any activity on these
20	wells after the issuance of the Commission order?
21	A. No, it does not.
22	Q. Have you spoken to the District Office about
23	these six wells?
24	A. Yes, yesterday I talked to them about them.
25	Q. Did they indicate that any activity had taken

place on any of these wells? 1 There has been no activity. Α. 2 Is the OCD taking any action with regard to these 3 0. six wells? 4 Yes, the OCD has them on contract at this time 5 Α. with Mayo-Marrs to have them plugged. That contract begins 6 next week, and we have those six wells under contract, and 7 the estimated cost is \$287,462. 8 I'd like you to turn to what's been marked as Q. 9 Exhibit C and tell us what that is. 10 This is a copy of the wells and the estimate of Α. 11 the cost to plug those wells that are under contract with 12 Mayo-Marrs. 13 And just to -- looking at the Saba wells Q. 14 specifically, they run between \$44,000 and \$56,000 per well 15 to plug? 16 A. Yes. 17 What financial assurance do we have from Saba? 18 Q. A. We have \$50,000. 19 What are we seeking in this action? 20 Q. We're looking for an order from the Commission A. 21 showing that Saba is in violation of a previous Commission 22 23 order, in order for us to implement Rule 40. 24 Q. Is Saba in compliance with Rule 40 today? 25 Α. No, they are not.

And what is the lack of compliance based on? 1 0. All six wells being out of compliance with the 2 Α. previous Commission order, of course, and all being 3 inactive for longer than necessary. 4 If the State went ahead and plugged all these six 5 0. wells and we didn't have an order from the Commission 6 finding Saba to be in violation of the Commission order, 7 would Saba be in compliance with Rule 40? 8 Yes, they would. Α. If the Commission issues an order finding Saba to 10 0. be in violation of this order requiring corrective action 11 and the State goes ahead and plugs these wells, what would 12 Saba have to do to regain compliance with Rule 40? 13 Saba would also have to petition the Commission 14 Α. 15 to get back into good standing. And what would you ask Saba to do before the 16 0. 17 Commission issued an order reinstating their good standing? Α. To pay the difference on the cost to plug those 18 19 wells that the State took, less the \$50,000 bond. And based on the estimates -- and of course these 20 0. 21 are just estimates right now, because we haven't actually 22 plugged the wells -- what amount would Saba be looking at? 23 Right about \$237,000. Α. 24 MS. MacQUESTEN: I would move to admit Exhibits A 25 through D in this case.

1	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Sexton, any objection?
2	MR. SEXTON: No objection, Mr. Chairman, thank
3	you.
4	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioners?
5	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Is there a penalty assigned
6	on these in this case also?
7	THE WITNESS: The original order from the
8	Commission fined Saba \$270,000 for not acting on a previous
9	order. We figured we probably wouldn't be asking for that
10	again in this case.
11	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay, so the \$237,000 is
12	straight, without penalties or cost of cleanup?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
14	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay, that's all I have.
15	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioner Olson, any
16	objection to the admission of the exhibits?
17	COMMISSIONER OLSON: No.
18	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Exhibits A through D
19	will be admitted.
20	MS. MacQUESTEN: And that concludes the OCD's
21	case.
22	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Mr. Sexton, do you have
23	a cross-examination?
24	MR. SEXTON: I do not, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioner Bailey?

No. COMMISSIONER BAILEY: 1 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioner Olson? 2 COMMISSIONER OLSON: No, Commissioner Bailey 3 already addressed my concern. 4 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: I have no further questions 5 either. With that, I guess -- Oh --6 MR. SEXTON: May I just make a -- I didn't do an 7 8 opening statement, but I would like to make a statement to the Commission, if I may. 9 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: You may, sir. 10 Thank you. Mr. Chairman, 11 MR. SEXTON: Commissioner Bailey, Commissioner Olson, I've never 12 appeared before your Commission before. This is the first 13 time for me. So if I violate any protocol, I apologize in 14 15 advance. Just so everyone is aware, I am very new to this 16 17 matter, and I would like to state on the record that Ms. 18 MacQuesten has been very kind and courteous through -- I 19 called her yesterday, and she was very generous with her 20 time to explain the status of this matter for me, and I 21 greatly appreciated that. She was nice enough to provide me with a copy of the prehearing statement this morning. 22 23 My appearance here today is very simply to meet two goals. One is to impress upon the Commission that my 24 25 client, Capitol Insurance Company, which is the successorin-interest of Redlands Insurance Company, did receive notice of this hearing, is interested in this process, and in no wanted the message to be sent that they are ignoring the Commission's authority regarding this matter, so they wanted me to appear today and make sure that that was understood.

Secondly, there is a concern on the part of Capitol Insurance in that they have also had a difficult time contacting their principal, Saba, and they quite frankly have the information, as Ms. MacQuesten alluded to in her presentation of evidence, that Saba may be in bankruptcy.

Now I will tell you that I do have a copy of a notice of Chapter VII bankruptcy which lists Saba Enterprises, Inc., and then a number of d/b/a's, doing business as. As Ms. MacQuesten indicated -- and she referred to Saba Enterprises, Inc., I guess, as the parent company. I don't even have that information, quite frankly.

My concern is whether or not Saba Energy of Texas, Inc., is covered by or is included in this bankruptcy filing. I acknowledge they are not listed as one of the d/b/a's, but that is a concern I have of whether or not we'd be violating some sort of an automatic stay of the administrative proceedings if we proceeded, so that was

another issue I wanted to raise to the commission.

Having said that, the only, I guess, request that I would make is -- and I guess this was somehow implied in the testimony of the witness -- that as part of this order there would be some sort of an automatic forfeiture of the bond amount, because we were only talking about including in the order that Saba would be responsible for the overage, over and above the financial assurance.

And I would make the request and ask the Commission's leave, if they could refrain from ordering forfeiture of the bond until we can determine, and just for a short period of time, a reasonable period of time, to determine this bankruptcy question, and for us to try to contact Saba and determine what their status is.

That's my statement and my only request of the Commission. I appreciate your time.

MS. MacQUESTEN: If I could clarify, the normal procedure that the OCD follows in this sort of case is, we contract for plugging of the wells, we plug the wells using the Reclamation Fund, and at that point we seek to forfeit whatever financial assurance is available to us. And it's our policy only to seek what we need to reimburse us for our costs and not the full amount of the bond.

Now as this case illustrates, and you'll see in many other cases, it's seldom the situation that the bond

is sufficient to cover the costs. But we do -- just to 1 reassure the surety, we only seek reimbursement, we don't 2 seek the full amount if the full amount is not necessary. 3 The way the orders are generally written is to 4 simply allow us to take whatever action is necessary to 5 forfeit the financial assurance when that time occurs. The 6 order itself doesn't forfeit the bond. 7 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Right, the bond forfeiture 8 could occur at a separate proceeding, at which time your 9 10 client would have the opportunity to present their evidence. And I realize that there's going to be an 11 argument as to who is the beneficiary of this bond -- I 12 mean -- yeah, of the bond. So -- But at this time that 13 14 would not be part of the order. 15 MR. SEXTON: Well then based on that, it sounds like my request was premature, but I stand by my statement. 16 17 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. It's good to have it on the record, anyhow. 18 19 MR. SEXTON: Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Ms. MacQuesten, do you have a closing? 21 22 MS. MacQUESTEN: No, I do not. 23 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Mr. Sexton, anything else you want to --24 25 MR. SEXTON: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Commissioners, anything else
2	we want on the record?
3	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: To ask Ms. MacQuesten to
4	prepare the order in this case also.
5	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Is that a motion?
6	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I so move.
7	COMMISSIONER OLSON: I'll second that.
8	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Ms. MacQuesten, the Commission
9	has moved and seconded a motion that you prepare an order
10	pursuant to your motion in this case, and all those in
11	favor?
12	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Aye.
13	COMMISSIONER OLSON: Aye.
14	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Let the record reflect that
15	that motion passed unanimously and that this case will be
16	continued until later today, at which time we will address,
17	hopefully, the orders that you've prepared.
18	MS. MacQUESTEN: All right, thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Thank you, Ms. MacQuesten.
20	MR. SEXTON: Thanks.
21	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Why don't we take a 10-minute
22	break? When we come back we will consider the three cases,
23	Cause Number 13,367, 13,368 and 13,372.
24	(Off the record at 9:50 a.m.)
25	(The following proceedings had at 12:15 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: We're going back on the 1 This is a continuation of Case Number 13,163. 2 Counsel Bada, working with the Division's 3 counsel, has presented us with a draft of the order in 4 Cause Number 13,163, Application of the New Mexico Oil 5 Conservation Division through the supervisor of District 1 6 for an order requiring Saba Energy of Texas, Inc., to bring 7 six wells into compliance with 19.15.4.201 NMAC, assessing 8 appropriate civil penalties and authorizing the Division to 9 10 plug said wells and forfeit the applicable security in default of compliance by the operator, in Lea County, New 11 Mexico. 12 Counsel Bada, have you had a chance to review 13 this order? 14 Yes, I have. 15 MS. BADA: CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: And does that in opinion 16 17 effectively reflect the order of the Commission discussed earlier today? 18 19 MS. BADA: Yes, it does. 20 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Counsel Bailey -- Commissioner Bailey, have you had a chance to look at the order? 21 22 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Yes, I have, and I believe I will sign it. 23 24 CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. Commissioner Olson, 25 have you had a chance to review this order?

1	COMMISSIONER OLSON: Yes, I've also reviewed it
2	and it appears to reflect our deliberations accurately.
3	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Okay. At this time the Chair
4	would entertain a motion to sign this order as accurately
5	reflecting the wishes of the Commission.
6	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I so move.
7	COMMISSIONER OLSON: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: All those in favor?
9	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Aye.
10	COMMISSIONER OLSON: Aye.
11	CHAIRMAN FESMIRE: Let the record reflect that
12	the motion to sign the order was passed unanimously. At
13	this time I will sign the order and transmit it to
14	Commissioner Bailey and Commissioner Olson.
15	With that, we will transmit it to secretary
16	Davidson, and we will adjourn Cause Number 13,163.
17	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
18	12:17 p.m.)
19	* * *
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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 Commission 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 June 17th, 2006.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 16th, 2006