STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

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

CASE NO. 11,802

APPLICATION OF XERIC OIL AND GAS CORPORATION FOR COMPULSORY POOLING, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner

June 26th, 1997

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, June 26th, 1997, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Porter Hall, 2040 South Pacheco, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

INDEX

June 26th, 1997 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 11,802

PAGE

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

9

* * *

EXHIBITS

Applicant's Identified Admitted

Exhibit 1 3 7

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE DIVISION:

RAND L. CARROLL Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division 2040 South Pacheco Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN
117 N. Guadalupe
P.O. Box 2265
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2265
By: W. THOMAS KELLAHIN

* * *

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 1 8:20 a.m.: 2 3 EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay, I'll call next case, 11,802. 4 5 MR. CARROLL: Application of Xeric Oil and Gas Corporation for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico. 6 7 EXAMINER STOGNER: Call for appearances. 8 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, I'm Tom Kellahin of the Santa Fe law firm of Kellahin and Kellahin, appearing 9 on behalf of the Applicant. 10 11 EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay. Mr. Kellahin, you may 12 proceed. MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, I'm not aware of the 13 appearance of any other party in this matter, and we are 14 15 proposing to submit this to you pursuant to the Rule 1207 Sub 2, which provides an alternative method or procedure 16 for submitting an application for compulsory pooling where 17 it is known that the application is unopposed. We believe 18 this to be such a case. 19 I have prepared and marked as Xeric Exhibit 1 the 20 affidavit and supporting attachments to that affidavit, and 21 22 I will hand you those copies now. 23 The format used for the affidavit, Mr. Examiner, tracks the language and the submittals required under 1207 24 25 Sub 2 (a). It's attested to by Lisa Snelson -- she's a

petroleum landman -- and by Randy Hall, a petroleum
geologist.

The chronology is summarized, and basically there are four identities of interest in a 40-acre proposed spacing unit, consisting of the property described on the docket as the southwest quarter, southwest quarter of Section 19, 20 South, 39 East. It's a proposal to drill their Carter Well Number 1 at a standard location to test for production from the surface through the base of the Abo formation.

The four entities and individuals described here have not been locatable by the Applicant. That effort is summarized in one of the attachments, and if you'll turn with me to Exhibit A, you can see the proposed 40-acre tract down in the southwest guarter of Section 19.

Followed behind that is Exhibit B, which identifies the percentage interest in the spacing unit of these individuals and identifies an address.

Subsequent affidavits and exhibits demonstrate that these addresses are outdated and the parties cannot be located.

Starting with Exhibit C, there's a summary of the landman's efforts to locate Alice Bannatyne. The exhibit is organized in a manner to show you. The premise is that this interest is identified as a result of documents filed

in Lea County in November of 1960.

There is no address indicated for this individual.

The second part of the affidavit summarizes the series of five different attempts, including CD-ROM computer searches of telephone directories in the United States, and other efforts to locate an address for this individual.

It then goes on and summarizes the results. And the efforts, despite a good-faith attempt, have been unsuccessful.

The next attachment to Exhibit C identifies the heirs of Harald Muller and Helen Muller. The document demonstrating an interest to these individuals was recorded in Lea County in 1983.

While that appears to be a more recent filing, the attempts, again, have been unsuccessful, as documented in the affidavit. And as a result, the landman is unable to locate either one of these individuals, despite her best effort.

The next page, page 3 of Exhibit C, identifies an interest of William J. Foster. The record-check in Lea County demonstrates a document placed of record in 1950, summarizes the attempts and concludes with the result that they are unable, despite their efforts, to find William J.

Foster.

In addition, that same document recorded in 1950 shows the interest of Mary C. Foster Geddes. They apparently were -- My recollection is, they were husband and wife, but they may have been related in some other immediate way.

The end result, however, is, the landman is not able to find Mary Geddes despite her good-faith efforts.

The affidavit request that the overhead rates be approved for pooling using \$4000 a month drilling and \$400 a month producing, it follows the Ernst and Young average, which is attached as Exhibit F to the affidavit.

Exhibit H to the affidavit is a copy of the AFE showing that a completed well for this area and this particular AFE is for \$455,000.

The geologist, then, attaches to the exhibit a series of geologic displays to support his conclusion of a 200-percent risk factor penalty. He starts with Exhibit D, which is a structure map on top of the Tubb.

It shows the presence in the immediate vicinity of a plugged and abandoned well and shows you that there are not producing Abo wells north, northwest, northeast of this location, and the production, if available, is to the south.

This appears to be on the fringe of this Abo

1 development and explains part of his conclusion with 2 regards to risk. He's attached a type log so that you can see the 3 intervals that he is describing, and then he gives you a 4 copy of the Exhibit F, which is the Ernst and Young 5 tabulation. 6 7 Exhibit G is the spotted and approved location 8 for the well, as demonstrated on a C-102. And then finally Exhibit H is the AFE for the 9 10 dryhole and completed well cost. I believe the information is complete at this 11 12 time, Mr. Examiner, and with your permission we would request the submittal and admission of Exhibit 1. 13 EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibit 1, subparts A through 14 15 H, I believe, will be admitted into evidence at this time. Again, Mr. Kellahin, what is the requested risk 16 17 penalty factor? MR. KELLAHIN: The affidavit reflects an opinion 18 19 and a request for 200 percent. EXAMINER STOGNER: 200 percent. 20 Does anybody else have anything further in Case 21 Number 11,802? 22 23 Again, thank you, Mr. Kellahin. I like this procedure in which you and Mr. Carr have established on 24 this type of compulsory pooling on these type of cases. 25 I

	, '
1	congratulate your efforts on that.
2	MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you.
3	EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay, I'll take 11,802 under
4	advisement.
5	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
6	8:30 a.m.)
7	* * *
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	11802
16	Oil Conservation Division
17	Olvision Chicker
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
ו נים	

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 Division 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 26th, 1997.

STEVEN T. BRENNER CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 1998