#### STATE OF NEW MEXICO

OIL	CONSERVATION	DIV
-----	--------------	-----

# ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES ADEPARTMENT 6:32

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE	)
PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:	) CASE NO. 12,145
APPLICATION OF SANTA FE ENERGY RESOURCES, INC., FOR COMPULSORY	)
POOLING, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO	3 ORIGINAL

## REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: MARK ASHLEY, Hearing Examiner

April 1st, 1999

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, MARK ASHLEY, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, April 1st, 1999, 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.

# I N D E X

April 1st, 1999 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 12,145

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	3
APPEARANCES	4
APPLICANT'S WITNESSES:	
STEVEN J. SMITH (Landman)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	5
Cross-Examination by Mr. Carr	14
Examination by Examiner Ashley	20
THOMAS J. TINNEY, III (Geologist)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	22
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	29
MI ONIDIC D'ODINITI	2,7

# EXHIBITS

Applicant's		Identified	Admitted
Exhibit Exhibit		6 7	14 14
Exhibit	3	8	14
Exhibit	4	11	14
Exhibit	5	12	14
Exhibit	6	12	14
Exhibit	7	13	14
Exhibit	8	23	27
Exhibit	9	24	27
Exhibit	10	25	27
Exhibit	11	26	27

#### 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:

JAMES G. BRUCE, Attorney at Law 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, Suite B Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 P.O. Box 1056 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

## FOR ROBERT E. LANDRETH:

CAMPBELL, CARR, BERGE and SHERIDAN, P.A. Suite 1 - 110 N. Guadalupe P.O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208
By: WILLIAM F. CARR

1	WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at
2	12:17 p.m.:
3	EXAMINER ASHLEY: The Division calls Case 12,145.
4	MR. CARROLL: Application of Santa Fe Energy
5	Resources, Inc., for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New
6	Mexico.
7	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Call for appearances.
8	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce from Santa
9	Fe, representing the Applicant Santa Fe. I have two
10	witnesses to be sworn.
11	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Additional appearances?
12	MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is
13	Bill Carr from Santa Fe, representing Robert E. Landreth
14	from Midland. I have no witness.
15	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Will the witnesses please stand
16	to be sworn?
17	(Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
18	STEVEN J. SMITH,
19	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon
20	his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. BRUCE:
23	Q. Would you please state your name and city of
24	residence for the record?
25	A. Steve Smith, Midland Texas

- 6 1 Q. Who do you work for and in what capacity? Santa Fe Energy Resources, Inc., and I'm a senior 2 Α. staff landman. 3 Have you previously testified before the Q. 4 Division? 5 Yes, I have. Α. 6 7 Q. And were your credentials as an expert petroleum 8 landman accepted as a matter of record? 9 Α. Yes, they were. 10 Q. And you familiar with the land matters involved 11 in this Application? 12 Α. Yes. 13 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Smith as 14 an expert petroleum landman. 15 EXAMINER ASHLEY: So qualified. 16 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Smith, briefly, what does Santa Fe seek in this case? 17 18 We're seeking a pooling order covering all the Α. 19 south half of Section 4, Township 23 South, Range 34 East, Lea County, New Mexico, as to all formations from the 20 surface to the base of the Morrow, and all pools on 40, 160 21
- Q. What is Exhibit 1?

or 320 acres.

22

A. Exhibit 1 is a land plat. It shows the location of our proposed Rio Blanco 4 well, located 660 from the

south and west lines. It shows the anticipated proration unit in the south half, and it has Santa Fe's interest in that acreage highlighted in yellow, either solid or cross-hatched.

- Q. Okay. And the unorthodox location was approved by administrative order NSL-4241?
  - A. That is correct.

- Q. Would you move on to your Exhibit 2 and identify the leasehold owners in the two tracts you have marked on Exhibit 1?
- A. Exhibit 2 is really an attachment to the plat.

  It shows the ownership within the tracts reflected, Tract

  1, being the southwest quarter of Section 4, Federal Lease

  19,142, is owned 50-50 by Robert E. Landreth and Hunt Oil

  Company. As noted, Hunt Oil Company has farmed out to

  Santa Fe Energy and Southwestern Energy, and pursuant to

  that agreement we must spud on or before May 22nd, 1999, or

  the agreement will terminate.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. Tract 2 is the southwest quarter of Section 4, Federal Lease 19,143. That lease is held contractually, 50-50, by Southwestern Energy and Santa Fe Energy, and under that agreement we must spud a well on or before July 2nd, or 50 percent interest will revert to Altura Energy.
  - Q. Mr. Landreth is the only person that Santa Fe

seeks to pool; is that correct?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Let's discuss Santa Fe's efforts to obtain the joinder of Mr. Landreth in the well. Would you identify the packet of correspondence marked Exhibit 3 for the Examiner?
- A. Exhibit 3 contains all the written correspondence between Santa Fe and Robert E. Landreth. The first correspondence, of course, is our well proposal letter, dated January 12th, in which we proposed a 13,450-foot Morrow test at the location and offered him the opportunity to either participate or farm out. We carried on various written correspondence back and forth between ourselves up and through March 29th. All of the correspondence is included.
- Q. And with your original proposal letter you did attach an AFE and ask his joinder in the well?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Did you have telephone conversations with Mr. Landreth in addition to the written correspondence?
- A. Yes, I did. I had ten separate phone conversations with Mr. Landreth.
  - Q. When was your last conversation with him?
- A. Monday, May 29th [sic]. That conversation was really directed at the contents of our last two letters

between one another. Actually three. The March 26th letter of 1999 from Mr. Landreth to Santa Fe, my reply of March 29th, and his reply of March 29th as well.

- Q. Okay. Now, in that letter Mr. Landreth said he would agree to do certain things, but there has been no definitive agreement between the parties at this point?
- A. We have not been able to reach a mutually acceptable written agreement at this point.
  - Q. Either farmout or signature on a JOA?
  - A. That's correct.

- Q. Why are you going forward with pooling at this time if there appears to be some chance of working things out?
- A. Well, we have a March 22nd [sic] drop-dead date, which, by our calculations, this was the last hearing date where we could comfortably seek an order to protect our interest and get an order in time to spud a well and drill.
- Q. Get an order in time to send out the Election notice, et cetera?
- A. Exactly, right, to comply with all of the hurdles that are implicit in obtaining an order to get a well drilled.
- Q. And the drop-dead date under the farmout is May 24 22nd?
- A. Excuse me, May 22nd, that's correct.

- Q. Now, after this hearing, will you continue to negotiate with Mr. Landreth?
- A. As I indicated in my letter to him of March 29th, we will continue to work around the general concepts in his March 26th letter, in an attempt to come to an agreement. The letter, I think, my letter, kind of details our concerns, that we've got to get Mr. Landreth to give us a reasonable amount of time to know what his intentions are so that we can offer his interest, if we should farm it out, or take it under an order to our partners, give them sufficient time to elect, and get our well drilled.

So we will work to that end, and I will -- If we can reach an agreement with Mr. Landreth, we will notify you and dismiss him from this process.

- Q. Now, Mr. Landreth did not join in the well or farmed out, his interest is what? He has a 25-percent interest?
- A. In the anticipated unit. Now, if we were to encounter 40- or 160-acre spacing, he would have a 50-percent interest.
  - Q. Okay, and a 25-percent interest in --
- A. In a 320-acre proration --
- Q. In a 320-acre unit?
- 24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. And we'll get to the AFE in a while, but that

is -- If Santa Fe or its partners have to absorb or pay for
that share of costs, that's quite a bit of money to have to
come up with?

A. Well, it can have a potential swing of 25 percent
to Santa Fe, if our partner did not choose to carry their
share.

- Q. And that's why you need to make your plans as reasonably soon as possible?
- A. Correct, we must have some time to accommodate the contracts of the parties involved.
- Q. Okay. In your opinion, has Santa Fe made a good-12 faith effort to obtain the voluntary joinder of Mr.
- 13 | Landreth in the well?

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 14 A. Absolutely.
  - Q. What is Exhibit 4, Mr. Smith?
    - A. Exhibit 4 is the letter that was mailed to Altura Energy pursuant to our exploration agreement with them.

      They actually own 100 percent -- or they have 50-percent interest in the southwest quarter, and under that agreement we were to --
      - Q. In the southeast quarter?
    - A. Excuse me, southeast quarter. And we were to propose the well to them if they chose not to participate, and we took their interest as if they nonconsented.
      - Q. And what is Exhibit 5?

A. Exhibit 5 is the operating agreement that is currently in place between Santa Fe and Southwest Energy. I'd like to point out that this operating agreement has been signed by Robert Landreth, but only as to the north half of Section 4. So I don't want anyone to be confused by seeing his signature on the operating agreement. His joinder is limited to the north half. In my proposal letter for the well, I recommended that if he participate, that we simply amend the Exhibit A to reflect that his interest was then adjoined as to that south half.

- Q. And a well has been drilled under this JOA?
- 12 A. That's correct.

- O. In the north half?
- 14 A. That is correct.
  - Q. Okay. Would you please identify Exhibit 6 and discuss the cost of the proposed well?
  - A. The -- Exhibit 6 is the AFE cost estimate that was sent out to all potential participants. It provides for a \$1,204,490 dryhole cost and a \$1,452,150 completed well cost.
  - Q. So unless my math isn't good, which it may not be, but Mr. Landreth's share of those well costs is approximately \$350,000?
    - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Now, is the cost reflected on this AFE in line

with the costs of other wells drilled to this depth in this 1 2 area of New Mexico? 3 Α. Yes. 4 0. Does Santa Fe Energy request that it be 5 designated operator of the well? 6 Α. Yes, yes, we do. And do you have a recommendation for the amounts 7 0. 8 which Santa Fe should be paid for supervision and 9 administrative expenses? The recommended -- the same overhead rates in the 10 Α. operating agreement, being \$6000 a month for a drilling 11 well and \$600 for a completed producing. 12 13 Q. And are these amounts equivalent to those 14 normally charged in this area for wells of this depth? 15 Α. Absolutely. 16 Was Mr. Landreth notified of this hearing? Q. 17 Yes, he was. Α. And is Exhibit 7 my affidavit of notice? 18 Q. 19 Α. Yes. Were Exhibits 1 through 7 prepared by you or 20 Q. under your supervision, or compiled from company business 21 22 records? 23 Yes, they were. Α. 24 Q. And in your opinion, is the granting of Santa 25 Fe's Application in the interests of conservation and the

1	prevention of waste?
2	A. Yes.
3	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I'd move the admission
4	of Santa Fe's Exhibits 1 through 7.
5	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Exhibits 1 through 7 will be
6	admitted at this time.
7	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Mr. Carr?
8	EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. CARR:
10	Q. Mr. Smith, you indicated that Mr. Landreth had
11	signed a JOA for the north half of Section 4?
12	A. That is correct.
13	Q. Is Santa drilling a well currently in the north
14	half of Section 4?
15	A. No, we that well has been drilled and has been
16	completed.
17	Q. Okay, when was that completed? Do you know?
18	A. In the last two or three months.
19	Q. And you're still acquiring information on that
20	well?
21	A. We are running a four-point test on it as we
22	speak, probably.
23	Q. There is also a well being drilled in the north
24	half of Section 9, is there not?
25	A. That's correct.

Who is drilling that well? 1 Q. 2 Α. It will be -- Concho is the operator. 3 And do you have an ownership interest in that Q. 4 well? No, we do not. 5 Α. 6 Will you have access to data or information on Q. 7 that well? We have no contractual way of obtaining any. 8 Α. And that well is currently drilling? 9 Q. It, I believe, spud the 24th of last month. 10 Α. 11 Q. Information that you're going to get from further testing of your well in the north half of Section 4 is 12 13 going to be valuable, is it not, in terms of evaluating this location? 14 15 Absolutely will. Α. The results of the well south of you will also be 16 0. valuable? 17 18 Α. If we can obtain the information in a timely 19 fashion, yes. 20 And if you obtain that information, are you Q. 21 willing to share that with Mr. Landreth? 22 Α. I believe we would as a partner. 23 Mr. Landreth has agreed, has he not, to join or Q. farm out? 24 25 A. He has agreed to enter into an agreement where he will either advise us as to that election at some point in time. He has not given us a date, other than he's agreed to my proposed May 17th date with conditions, and --

- Q. Isn't the condition that if you move the well back in time, that he still be able to make that election close to the spud date?
- A. Well, I'm not sure that I can provide him that moving target. I think that May 17th date is an acceptable date.

We kind of roughly calculated it based upon about the same date that if we obtained an order and provided him notice of that order, and gave him 30 days within which to choose to participate or go under the order, that's about -- that's a guesstimation.

We also believe that if the well in Section 9 was spud on the 24th, which that is, in fact, what has happened, we drilled and completed our well in 46 days -- if Concho does the same, that well will be drilled and logged by May 9th, which would give ten days for him to know what the outcome of that well was.

So we feel like that date is sufficient and would be able to give him a reasonable amount of time to make up his mind.

Q. If you move the spud date back for some reason, would it be possible that between May the 17th and whenever

you eventually spud the well, there might be events which would cause you to decide to not go forward with the well?

- A. We have not received our APD back for this well that's on federal acreage, and there is the possibility that a prairie-chicken stipulation will be attached to the APD.
- Q. And if that should occur, what would happen to your May 22nd date? Would you have a force majeure provision that would --
- A. You could attempt to enact it, yes. I mean, it's one of those deals where we could ask and they could tell you yes or no.
- Q. You don't have a right, if there's a force majeure --
- A. There's a force majeure clause, but I am saying that it's subject to interpretation as to whether the prairie-chicken stipulation would fall under force majeure. We would ask for it under those terms.

What I'm saying is, I'm not -- I have no certainty at this point as to what Hunt's response would be to that.

- Q. You understand, do you not, that Mr. Landreth is just trying to be in a position to have as much information as possible before he has to make his election?
  - A. I understand, and I feel like we have at this

point bent over backwards to accommodate Mr. Landreth along those lines.

- Q. And if you move the well-drilling date back farther, there would be information, additional information, potentially, would there not?
  - A. Not necessarily.

- Q. But there might be?
- A. I can't think of any.
- Q. So you're telling me that after May the 17th, there will be no new data if you move the well back 90 days?
- A. Production data from the wells --
- Q. Would that information be of value to you in determining whether or not to spud?
  - A. Well, it may, and I can assure you that Santa Fe is not in a position of wasting its or any of its partners' money, and that we will look, certainly, long and hard at drilling any well that we had the authority either under a JOA or an order.

We wouldn't drill a well that, in our opinion, was uneconomic or wasteful.

- Q. Don't you understand the problem to be that all we're trying to do is have as much information --
  - A. Sure.
- Q. -- as possible when we need to make the election?

- 19 Α. Right. And of course our position is, we need 1 sufficient within which to allocate and budget our moneys, 2 offer Mr. Landreth's interests to our partners under our 3 AMI and JOA, give them sufficient time to elect, and timely 4 5 drill the well under the constraints. Did you propose the May 17th date? 6 Q. 7 Yes, I did. Α. 8 Q. And so that is five days before spud date? 9 Α. That's, in essence -- Yeah, it was to give him some time. 10 11 It was a balancing act between the current drop-12 dead date, and then I perceived Mr. Landreth would, if we 13 were to take him under an order, be forced to either decide 14 to participate or go under the order. Since you picked the May 17th date, is it fair to 15 Q. 16 assume that five days is enough time to go to your partner?
  - A. It's possible, yes.
- Q. You wouldn't have picked that if you thought you couldn't do it, five days; is that --
  - A. It -- Well, okay.
  - Q. That's fair?
  - A. It's possible.
- 23 \ Q. And you are willing to share data with him?
- 24 A. Yes.

17

20

21

22

MR. CARR: That's all I have, thank you.

1	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Mr. Bruce.
2	MR. BRUCE: I have nothing further with respect
3	to Mr. Smith.
4	EXAMINATION
5	BY EXAMINER ASHLEY:
6	Q. Mr. Smith
7	A. Yes.
8	Q who You said there's a well drilling in the
9	north half of Section 4?
10	A. That's correct.
11	Q. And where is that well located, and who's the
12	operator?
13	A. I believe it is 1650 off of the north line and
14	660 off the west.
15	I don't have that, but I believe that's my guess.
16	It's at a legal location.
17	Q. And who operates who's operating that?
18	A. I believe it will be Concho
19	Q. Okay.
20	A out of Midland.
21	Q. And they also have the one in the north half of
22	Section 9?
23	A. Wait a second. I may be confused.
24	MR. BRUCE: I think he was confused. I think the
25	Examiner asked you about the Section 4 well.

THE WITNESS: That is operated -- yes, the first 1 2 well --EXAMINER ASHLEY: Okay. 3 THE WITNESS: -- the Rio Blanco 4, is a Santa Fe-4 5 operated well, which currently Southwestern Energy, Bob Landreth and Santa Fe are partners in that well. 6 7 0. (By Examiner Ashley) Now, according to your 8 Exhibit 1, you hold 100 percent of Tract 2? That's correct. 9 Α. 10 And what's the percentage in Tract 1? 0. We have a farmout covering Hunt's one-half 11 Α. interest. 12 Q. 13 Okay. So if the well was completed in the Morrow, and 14 15 assuming all parties participate, Santa Fe would have 37 1/2, Southwestern would have 37 1/2, and Robert Landreth 16 17 would have 25. 18 Now, is Southwestern part of Robert E. Landreth, 19 or is that a separate company? 20 Α. That's a separate company. 21 Q. Okay. 22 Southwestern Energy Production Company. Α. 23 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Okay. I have nothing further, Mr. Smith. Thank you. 24 25 MR. BRUCE: Call Mr. Tinney to the stand.

1	THOMAS J. TINNEY, III,
2	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon
3	his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. BRUCE:
6	Q. Would you please state your name and city of
7	residence?
8	A. Thomas Jordan Tinney, III, Midland, Texas.
9	Q. Who do you work for and in what capacity?
10	A. Santa Fe Energy Resources. I'm the geological
11	and geophysical manager.
12	Q. Have you previously testified before the Division
13	as a geologist?
14	A. Yes, I have.
15	Q. And were your credentials as an expert petroleum
16	geologist accepted as a matter of record?
17	A. Yes, they were.
18	Q. And are you familiar with geologic matters
19	pertaining to this Application?
20	A. Yes, I am.
21	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Tinney as
22	an expert petroleum geologist.
23	EXAMINER ASHLEY: Mr. Tinney is so qualified.
24	Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Tinney, could you identify
25	Exhibit 8 for the Examiner and briefly discuss its

contents?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A. Yes, Exhibit 8 is a structure map on the middle Morrow marker. It shows a northeast-southwest structure and the relative dip to that.
- Q. With respect to the existing wells that Mr. Smith has been asked about, could you go through the three wells we're talking about and give their footage locations, please?
- A. Yes, starting with the well in the north half of
  Section 4, the Santa Fe Energy Resources Rio Blanco Fed

  Number 1, that well is located 1980 from the north and 1980
  from the west. In Section 9 you will see a circle
  designating the Concho Resources well. That well is
  located 1650 from the north and 660 from the west.
  - Q. Okay. And this might be jumping ahead, Mr. Tinney, but in many instances structure is unimportant in the Morrow. Does structure have importance with respect to this well?
  - A. Yes, it introduces an amount of risk into this particular location. We can address that when we get to the -- I believe it's Exhibit 10.
    - Q. The isopachs?
- 23 A. The isopach.
- Q. Let's move on to your first isopach, then,
  Exhibit 9. Is this the -- Could you identify that for the

Examiner and discuss what the primary target for your well is.

A. Yes, Exhibit 9 is a clean sand isopach map of the Upper Morrow Grama Ridge "A". That's the primary objective of this well. It's the reason that we sought and received approval for an unorthodox location, which is 660 from the south and 660 from the west.

This sand is a prolific Morrow sand that is productive just off of this map to the north in our Gaucho Unit. We're trying to extend this productive sand trend to the south through drilling of this exploration well.

You can see the Rio Blanco Fed Number 1, the well in the north half of Section 4, encountered five feet total of sand, in a gross sense. And in a net sense, using an 8-percent density porosity cutoff, encountered two feet. So we feel like we're on the edge of the sand. And by moving to the west we hopefully will encounter a thicker sand.

- Q. Does the fact that you only encountered two feet of net sand add to the risk involved in drilling this well?
- A. Yeah, prior to drilling the Rio Blanco Fed Number 1 our interpretation was that it was going to be thicker than it was, and obviously when we drilled it, it wasn't. We uncovered the thin sand.

Fortunately, we encountered a sand lower than the

Grama Ridge "A", which is the middle Morrow A, which is Exhibit 10 --

- Q. Why don't you move on to that exhibit, then?
- A. -- and in Exhibit 10 we encountered 20 feet of that particular sand with 20 feet of porosity, and that's the interval that that well is currently producing out of.

The middle Morrow A, to the east, you'll notice, there's in Section 34 of 22 South, 34 East -- and I might note there is a typographic error on your -- on that base map. On the right-hand side it says 24 South. That should be 22 South, as it is on the left-hand side. And 34 East.

In Section 34 there, you'll see two wells in the south half of 34 that are -- one is 16 feet thick and the other is 12 feet thick. And also in the north half of Section 3 in 23 South, 34 East, you'll notice there's a well that's 15 feet thick. All those wells calculated out as wet in this middle Morrow A. The Rio Blanco Fed Number 1 encountered these sands somewhere, depending on which well you pick, 200 feet high to those wells, and it was productive. So there is a gas-water contact at some point between the wells to the east and to our well.

Obviously, the location that we have staked for the Rio Blanco Fed Number 2, we are moving structurally downdip. That introduces an amount of risk to where that gas-water contact is. Q. So structure does have some importance in this matter?

A. Absolutely.

- Q. Okay. Now, these areas highlighted in yellow on the map, is there a geologic term that you use to --
- A. Well, on the Rio Blanco Fed Number 1 we ran a FMI, which is formation micro-imaging tool, Schlumberger runs, and that tool indicated to us -- and one reason we picked the unorthodox location was that the Thalweg direction, which is the thickest portion of the center portion of the channel, was to the west. So that was really the -- One of the impetus behind picking that location was that Thalweg direction to the west.
- Q. Let's move on to your final exhibit, Exhibit 11. Would you identify that and discuss for the Examiner any possible secondary zones for your proposed well?
- A. Yes, this is a cumulative production map, with the Dwight's production data through 10 of 1998. It's the most recent that we have. And it indicates there is some Morrow production in the area, a couple wells -- one in particular, in Section 8. You can see it only made 20 million out of the Morrow sand.

There's also Atoka production to the east. There is some scattered shallower production, Wolfcamp, there is some Delaware in Section 10, there's also a Bone Springs in

Section 10 and Section 9. The production is not something
that Santa Fe would drill on its own, but if encountered
obviously it would add as a plugback, potential plugback,
so...

Q. In your opinion, based on your structure, the
isopachs, the result in your Number 1 well, and the lack of
immediate offsetting Morrow commercial production, should

- isopachs, the result in your Number 1 well, and the lack of immediate offsetting Morrow commercial production, should the maximum cost plus 200 percent be assessed against any interest owner who goes nonconsent in this well?
  - A. Yes, I agree with that.
- Q. Were Exhibits 8 through 11 prepared by you or under your direction?
  - A. Yes, they were.
  - Q. And in your opinion, is the granting of Santa

    Fe's Application in the interests of conservation and the

    prevention of waste?
- 17 A. Yes, it is.

8

9

10

13

14

15

- MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I'd move the admission of Santa Fe's Exhibits 8 through 11.
- 20 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Exhibits 8 through 11 will be 21 admitted as evidence at this time.
- 22 Mr. Carr?
- MR. CARR: No questions.
- EXAMINER ASHLEY: I have nothing further, Mr.
- 25 Tinney. Thank you.

```
1
                 THE WITNESS:
                                 Thank you.
 2
                 MR. BRUCE: I have nothing further to present in
 3
      this case, Mr. Examiner.
 4
                 EXAMINER ASHLEY:
                                      There being nothing further in
 5
      this case, Case 12,145 will be taken under advisement.
 6
                 Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
 7
      12:45 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
                           I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
15
                           « complete record of the proceedings to
                           the Examiner hearing of Case No. 12195
16
                           heard by me on
17
                                                   _, Lxeminer
                             Of Conservation Division
18
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 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 April 6th, 1999.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 2002

Series   Asher Oil	Print Press 66272	Tork & Harper		V.R. BTA Amer. Wood- 9-11-93 Cuchas Chicago Chicago S5964 8000 - U17- T013575	8TA - 18   8TA Oil   812 50	
U.S., MI rchant Live Stock Co.	U.S., MI Merchant Live Stock Co.	U.S., MI State, S TO See U.S.	State 22	34 Yates Pet., etal	HBC 5/2 State	s
Mitchell Egg. 92776 120 00	L.A. Sowyer 7 96 12 197 66272 69596 1 197 66272 197 66272 197 66272 1989 1989 1989 1989 1989 1989 1989 198	F.L. Engle 7-1-95 7-1-91(3) 070544	<b>BTA</b> 6 · I · 9I 43564	Hunt Oil HBP Brunson 1086-2-72	HBC N/2 V-2545	Mitche 4 · 1 V8 ·
	Santa Fe Ener 92781 2004	Centrinental 7.1-61(3) 1, 5arrta Fg Free 7.1-61(3) 27781 070544 1 20 92	21	Yartes Apache Part, et al. 7019435 22 90913 1	Brunson LG-7267	; ;***
U.S.	วามณ ฦ (20 <u>°°</u> U.S.	U, S.	v.s	v.s.	0 io Chiso 8 15 A TDIA 139 BTA to 13.470 P76 12640 Chiso 871.17 P State, M.I.  Merchants Livestock, et al	CHIN.
Engle V. J. Duncan 6 · 1 · 96 1360 66271	L. A. Sawyer 12 · 1 · · 97 69596	L.A.Sawyer 12. 1. 91 69596 4. 1. 95 60509	RE.Landreth,etal 4·1·94 57536	8TA Hunt 01 6-1-91 Hep 16-1-91 Hep 43564 43564 43565	6TA 0ryk 43564	Phillips HBP E-1932
Asher Oil 1 - 1 - 81 12846	30 - V.J. Duncan   6 · 1 · 96   66271	29- — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	28	Arrivore	26 "8817 JV-P Ojo Chiso Fed."  **  **  **  **  **  **  **  **  **	Amerada H.B.P. B-1040 Phillips Merchant T0 13,600 D/A II: 29-71
S., MI ore, S U.S.	U,S.	U.S., MI State, S U.S.	U.S.	U.S. TO 4202	96 bbls U.S.	D/A 11-29-71
P HBP B-10752 (Unit) er-Francis   18P   -3513	7   61(3) 070544 Dr.Mar. PCONOCO(OPER) BELL LAKE UNIT	Continental H. B. U. E-6434	Camterra Res.   Amoco 6   19063   HBP 89063   19143	Amoco HBP 19143 Maxus Expl: to 13.652 (Amoco) Moxus to 13.652 (Moxus to 13.652)	874 16 13,750' Amoco (5,175) (5,175) 10 1 62 27768 16 16890 26996 2.8961 25 16890 26996 2.8961 25 16890 26996	Yates Pet., etal 1 · 1 · 97 VA · 499 12 50
36	3184- 11 - 31 EXXON 7-1-5(73)070544	32	33   Belco Pet.   False-Fed.   TO 384 74   U.S. D/A2 4 74   Camterra Res.   Amoco	2.2 Mil. U.S. Mil. Hanich Bros (5) U.S. Fed.:	12 · 1 · 85 (10 13,750)	Maxus 7000 12 7013, 70- 17 18 5-1
State ASSEL ASSEL	U.S., MI Harrich Bros.(S)	State 11774 (unit)	89063 U.S.M.I. HBP 19143 Hanich Bros.,(S)	CHAPTER OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE	(PI DI JE	414 844
onf-Lewis Centinental HBP 7.1.6 (2) 56438 068387	Coneco   Burmah 0 & G   H P   5-1-44   5587	Conoco HBP 01244 BurmahOE.G 5-1:00 0587	9E Gonzales 3:1-2004 Hunt 01,12 3:0-25 5-31-65 Blanco Co. 19142 12:1-2003 19 BTA,17,17 92:199-4100 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Amoco (Amoco) Belco, 1/2 HBP BTA Hunty 19143 +0 13.652 Hunty U.S. Min 19142	(Phillips) (Haugeh)	Francis 19196 86561 3192 Diamond Shomrock 9193 56403
Hudsoná Lewis etal HBP 066438 H.B.U.	7) 74. 71 6 Gonoco Burmah 0 €, G I 01244 5-1-14 10244 10587   Davi 0 164 1 10 16 500	BurmahOE,G Conoco 5.1.4 Conoco 0587 01244	Belco, 1/2 Hunt Oil, 1/2 5 31.05 HBP 19142 19143	Belco, Y2 Hunt Oil, V2 9 - 31 - 92 Y0 1914-2 Ampco	(PIS) 2 STA   Americale   H.B.P.   B-1040   LG.485   S/2 BTA	Yates Pet.etal 6-1-97 v-4041 9-19 Horgrave R.Barto State Jr. 10-449 JE Latha
re Bros.(S) State(S)	Be" Lake Un 1"	U.S. (5) Hanich Bros.,(5)	U.S., MI Hanich Bros.,(S)	Harrich Bros,(S) U.S. Fed. 次 1.5 Mil.	64MiL 1 1013480' St8006 JV-P" State  (E.R.Hudson, Jr.)	√ √212 8 √212 8
HBP	Conoco   Conoco   3.1.58   3.1.58   064881	Conoco Res. Kaiser- 3-1-58 HBP 064881 0279 HBP 060734	Phillips HBP E-1932 Curry Res Phillip-St. 1 A 1980	J C Williamson   Florida	BTA JAMES BTA 10.15.50 (5) STA	ME Barry 22.05 M.E. Barry 22.05 M.E. Barry 22.05 M.E. Barry 22.05 M.E. Margary 22.05 M.E. M.E. M.E. M.E. M.E. M.E. M.E. M.E
hidler 12 spoor 12 te M.1. th Bras.(S)	U.S. Conoco HBP E-1999	Hanich Bros.(5)  Cont1. 4.7 Mil. Bell Lake 65 Prop. Lunt No. 4 Prop. Lunt No. 59458	Hunt Oil (Adobe) 17.1.95 18.413 an Spring Presh Her Curry Res) Prongrary-St.	Estorial Pala Fed Concentration of the Concentratio	¥2 HBC 9 bble. 21250 /	ASS J.E. Robel O. Its king Jellette
L 5999 State	State	State	State	Hanich Services (U.S. Berco Fed	I-ME I Amoco MigAmer JATOS TANDO MOGOOX	Rebelo: Christine Harrich
Senta Fe Ener, I · I · 95 VB-367 42.00	8TA 8TA 8TA 8TA 8TA 8TA 8TA 8TA	Yates Pet., etal 11 : 1 : 94 82945 4022	Hunt Oil 6 · 1 · 95 V8 · 396 V8 · 396 V8 · 396 V8 · 397 V8 · 397 V8 · 397 V8 · 3475 V8	Guinoco, etal (Adobe) HBP 13641 (September 13838 **Dual 'Adobe-Fed.'	Chevron 3 · 1 · 85 24491  HBC W/2  / Hunt 0il./2*	/mid YatesPe /Amer etal /0-48// 1-196 //-58// V-3559 //-562
Store 13- Yutes Pet, etal 2: 1: 93 70347 66 98 KGS	Chos. I Bares, etal, M.I. 1777& 1   Centimental   Continental   Continental   S-1.41(1)		16 191 white 191 25 113 88	Adobe (Stori) (Adobe	AA Mins Corp. Parkil Duel M. 15035 Supren-Fed U.S.	Ø An St. DWA
State(s)	Hanich Bros.(S)	U.S. R. Westall Ray Westall	Santa Fe Ener: 9:1:95 V:3408 Santa Fe Ener: 9:1:95 Williamson	Hearth Bres. (5) Belco-Fed.	Hanich Bras.,(5) State	Yate
103570 668 <u>8</u> K <b>G</b> S	065194 Expl.e(s) (wo) P38		10092	"Curry-St." Canto Didge Unit	Hunt Oil Honnifin /Z LG 1208 R.C. Lawsen, J. 11-23-81/ Houal	
24	January January IS Brodley Morrow I Disc. Sability IS	(Monsanto) Back Basin Unit Aroka Orse 1.1 Mill	Tenison Oil, et al. (2 Century Century Century Century Century Frod. 1 Frod. 1 Frod. 1 Frod. 2 1 63 1 63 1 63 1 63 1 63 1 63 1 63 1	(Estorii) 13 Mil.  J.C. Williamson 0552659 (nichod: 2, Captrick Pet.) Currus Fed. 13 Mil.  (Special Control of the Control of	Centry Fed. HBC 3/2 Sortio Fe HBC 4.1 Mil. Bros.(5)	Yeles Pe
J.C Williamson	36 304 a Ray Westall, etal	U.S.   1067159	State, M.I W.S., MI Hanich Bros.,(S)	Citation   Citation 0 E, G 27	*i-E0 *i-S0 Mil.	Ya
25465	Ray Westell Fed. 1 Bell Lake St. Disc.	10-1-95 v.3476 v.3476 (Exx 6) (Exx 6) (Arribellum Unit TDIA3B 29(T/A41276)	067715 (218) (218) (32) (32) (33)	071949 (P/B) (1.6 Mil.)	Атасо к 5283	
W. Williamson	38 414 3 Corm 30 Fed. S. Bell Lake Del Disc. TO 13866 PS 176 90 PS March 11	8100000 12-1-2009	ANTELOPE RIDGE UT	T. Ru.) Strata Prod	(Robert   HBC	Yo Superior