

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. 12,447

APPLICATION OF OXY USA, INC., TO RESCIND)
DIVISION ORDER R-4949 WHICH ADOPTED THE)
SPECIAL POOL RULES FOR THE NORTH BURTON)
FLATS-WOLFCAMP GAS POOL, EDDY COUNTY,)
NEW MEXICO)

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: MARK ASHLEY, Hearing Examiner

July 13th, 2000

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, MARK ASHLEY, Hearing Examiner on Thursday, July 13th, 2000, 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.

* * *

OIL CONSERVATION DIV.
CO JUL 27 AM 5:01

I N D E X

July 13th, 2000
Examiner Hearing
CASE NO. 12,447

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	3
APPEARANCES	3
APPLICANT'S WITNESS:	
<u>RICHARD E. FOPPIANO</u> (Engineer)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	4
Examination by Examiner Ashley	19
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	24

* * *

E X H I B I T S

Applicant's	Identified	Admitted
Exhibit 1	5	19
Exhibit 2	5	19
Exhibit 3	11	19
Exhibit 4	13	19
Exhibit 5	13	19
Exhibit 6	16	19
Exhibit 7	18	19
Exhibit 8	19	19

* * *

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE DIVISION:

LYN S. HEBERT
 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

* * *

1 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at
2 9:45 a.m.:

3 EXAMINER ASHLEY: At this time Division calls
4 Case 12,447, Application of OXY USA, Inc., to rescind
5 Division Order R-4949 which adopted the special pool rules
6 for the North Burton Flats-Wolfcamp Gas Pool, Eddy County,
7 New Mexico.

8 Call for appearances.

9 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, I'm Tom Kellahin of
10 the Santa Fe law firm of Kellahin and Kellahin, appearing
11 on behalf of the Applicant, and I have one witness to be
12 sworn.

13 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Additional appearances?
14 Will the witness please rise to be sworn in?
15 (Thereupon, the witness was sworn.)

16 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Mr. Kellahin?

17 RICHARD E. FOPPIANO,
18 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon
19 his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

22 Q. Mr. Foppiano, for the record, sir, would you
23 please state your name and occupation?

24 A. My name is Richard E. Foppiano, and I'm a
25 regulatory affairs engineer for OXY USA in Houston, Texas.

1 Q. On prior occasions, have you testified before the
2 Division, Mr. Foppiano, and been recognized as an expert in
3 petroleum engineering?

4 A. Yes, I have.

5 Q. As part of your responsibilities for your
6 company, have you made an investigation of the engineering
7 aspects of this case?

8 A. Yes, I have.

9 Q. And based upon that study, do you now have
10 opinions and conclusions concerning the pool rules that are
11 subject to this production?

12 A. Yes, I do.

13 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr. Foppiano as an
14 expert witness.

15 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Mr. Foppiano is so qualified.

16 Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) Let's take a moment, Mr.
17 Foppiano, and unfold Exhibit 1. What is represented by the
18 yellow outline on this display, Mr. Foppiano?

19 A. Well, this display is a plat showing the Wolfcamp
20 wells in Township 20 South, Range 28 East, and the
21 surrounding area. And shown in yellow, or dark yellow, are
22 the boundaries of the North Burton Flat-Wolfcamp Gas Pool.

23 Q. Let's set that display aside for a moment and
24 identify for the Examiner Exhibit Number 2. What is this?

25 A. Exhibit Number 2 is the order setting out the

1 field rules applicable to the North Burton Flat-Wolfcamp
2 Gas Pool.

3 Q. It was originally issued on January 22nd of 1975,
4 and it's Order Number R-4949?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. Can you summarize for us the major portions of
7 the rule that make them special from the general rules?

8 A. Yes, I can. The order, pertinent sections of the
9 rule, relate to spacing and allowable. In particular, Rule
10 Number 2 requires standard units of 320 acres and one well
11 per 320 acres.

12 It also has, in Rule Number 4, the setback
13 requirements of 660 from the side boundary and 1980 from
14 the end boundary, which are reflective of what the
15 statewide rules were in effect at that time, I believe.

16 Rule Number 5 sets out an allowable for each well
17 producing from that pool of 1.5 million a day.

18 Q. All right. Those are the major components of the
19 rule, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Let's address the first one. Rule 2 says 320
22 acres. Are you proposing to change that?

23 A. No.

24 Q. All right. The footage requirements in Rule 4,
25 which are currently 660 from the side and 1980 from the

1 end, do you propose to change those rules?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. In what way would you change them?

4 A. We feel it's appropriate at this time to
5 eliminate these setbacks in favor of the new statewide Rule
6 104 setbacks, which would allow 660 from the outer boundary
7 of the 160-acre tract on which the well is located.

8 Q. Okay. The implication and interpretation of this
9 order is such that the practice is to limit spacing units
10 in this pool to one well per 320, correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. What do you propose to do about well density?

13 A. Well, under new Rule 104, we would be allowed two
14 wells per 320, and that's what we would propose as the
15 final result of this hearing.

16 Q. And then finally, this well has a gas allowable
17 limit of 1.5 million today, correct?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. What would you propose to do with that rule?

20 A. Eliminate it.

21 Q. What is the net effect, then, if the Examiner
22 grants your Application?

23 A. The existing wells and their production and any
24 new wells that could be completed in the pool would be
25 governed under Rule 104.

1 Q. All right, sir. Let's go back and look at
2 Exhibit 1, and when I relate Exhibit 1 to the order, 4949,
3 I find that Cities Service was keying off a well in Unit C
4 in Section 14, 20 South, 28 East. It was the Government T
5 1 well. Is that your knowledge and understanding?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. That was the key well, then, upon which the rules
8 were originally established, correct?

9 A. That's my understanding, yes.

10 Q. All right. Let me have you discuss with Mr.
11 Ashley the component of the current rule that established
12 the basis for the 1.5-million-a-day gas limit. What is
13 your belief as to why that occurred?

14 A. Well, in reviewing the testimony for the hearing
15 and looking at the field performance, it's obvious that
16 what was anticipated at that time were two things. One,
17 this is a gas-condensate reservoir. It became obvious
18 early on that it was a retrograde gas-condensate reservoir,
19 and there was some interest at the time in looking at the
20 reinjection of a processed gas to maximize the liquid
21 recovery from this reservoir.

22 Also, there was probably some concern, although
23 you have to read between the lines in the transcript, but I
24 believe there was some concern about pulling the wells too
25 hard and causing some higher than normal, or higher than

1 would be necessary, liquid saturations near the wellbore,
2 to the detriment of the ultimate recovery.

3 So I think there were really two reasons for the
4 1.5 million a day: trying to keep the wells from being
5 pulled too hard, and also to maintain the reservoir as long
6 as possible above the dewpoint to facilitate or allow time
7 for investigation of secondary and tertiary recovery
8 methods, i.e., the injection of gas to maximize liquid
9 recovery.

10 Q. Let me ask you two questions. First, were there
11 any wells in this pool that were ever restricted by the gas
12 allowable limit?

13 A. It does not appear from my investigation of all
14 the wells and their production profiles over the entire
15 life of the pool that any well ever produced at any length
16 of time at 1.5 million a day or above.

17 Q. Is it necessary now to continue to maintain the
18 gas-allowable limit of 1.5 million, and if not, why not?

19 A. Well, it's not necessary, because the reservoir
20 is now far below the dewpoint. As it is right now, the
21 reservoir pressure has declined, and we're to the point
22 where all the wells are producing at maximum capacity.
23 They're all riding the line pressure, so to speak. The
24 average producing rates of the wells is around 200 MCF a
25 day, far below the 1.5 million.

1 And so there's not really any expectation that a
2 1.5-million-a-day allowable -- a continuation of that
3 allowable restriction is necessary for any conservation
4 reason.

5 Q. Let's talk about altering the well-location
6 requirements in conjunction with increasing well density
7 under Rule 104, which would give you an optional second
8 well opportunity in this pool that you don't currently
9 enjoy. What would be the benefit of doing that?

10 A. Well, the primary benefit, this -- as I described
11 before, this reservoir is on its -- it's a mature
12 reservoir, and we don't anticipate drilling wells with the
13 primary objective being the Wolfcamp zone in this area,
14 because of the low reserves, recoverable reserves that
15 would be associated with it.

16 But we do drill deeper wells in this area to the
17 Morrow, so we penetrate the Wolfcamp, and we already have
18 existing Morrow wells that have recompletion opportunities
19 in the Wolfcamp on the other 160.

20 So what we see here are just basically some
21 recompletion possibilities and some secondary objectives
22 when we drill deeper for a Morrow in this area. So it's
23 really bailout zones, is what we're looking at.

24 Q. Give us your explanation and opinion concerning
25 the reservoir management of the pool in terms of increasing

1 the well density. Will that increased-density well afford
2 the opportunity to recover incremental reserves that would
3 not otherwise be produced, or would it simply represent a
4 rate acceleration?

5 A. We have evidence that we believe strongly shows
6 that increased recovery will result if the rules were
7 rescinded and we were allowed to operate under statewide
8 rules here, both in liquid and in gas recoveries.

9 Q. All right, sir. Let's turn to some of the
10 specifics of the data that you've reviewed and assimilated.
11 Let's take a moment and look at Exhibit 3. Identify that
12 for us so that we understand how you have organized the
13 display, and then describe the points of importance to you.

14 A. Exhibit Number 3 is a production profile of all
15 the wells that produced from the North Burton Flat-Wolfcamp
16 Gas Pool. It's on a daily rate basis on the left side, and
17 on the right side is the legend or the axis for the well
18 count and the GOR.

19 Shown in black, the heavy black line at the top,
20 uppermost curve, is the daily gas rate for the field,
21 that's the entire field. And the curve right below that,
22 shown in black and -- green, I guess, is the oil rate or
23 condensate rate from the field. Below that and shown in
24 red is the well count for the field. And then the
25 bottommost curve, shown in yellow, is the GOR of the field.

1 And you can see production commences 1974, 1975,
2 that time frame. And you can see what happens over time:
3 The number of wells, initial development, went up and then
4 kind of steadied out at around 15. There were some
5 fluctuations later on. And the current well count today is
6 14 active wells in the North Burton Flat-Wolfcamp Gas Pool.
7 You can see, as is typical for a retrograde gas condensate
8 reservoir, the GOR shot up, dropped down a little bit, and
9 now it's just continued to gradually increase over time as
10 we approach depletion.

11 You can see the green line, oil rates, have
12 dropped, consistent with a normal retrograde gas condensate
13 reservoir over time. And the gas rates have dropped, and
14 you can see in the recent years, particularly in 1997, on
15 forward, there's actually been an increase in the gas rate
16 from the pool. And we feel like there's two reasons for
17 that.

18 One, there were some changes in the operating
19 pressure of the gathering system out there where some
20 central compression was installed that dropped the
21 gathering pressure significantly, and that allowed gas
22 production to increase since the well was riding the line.

23 And also, the drilling of an additional well in
24 1997, the OXY Government NBFD Number 1 there in the
25 southwest quarter of Section 11, which we'll talk a little

1 bit more in detail here in a minute.

2 Q. When I turn to Exhibit 4, Mr. Foppiano, what am I
3 looking at in this package of displays?

4 A. Exhibit 4 is just a pool that we did to create
5 production decline curves of the gas rates from each well
6 in the North Burton Flat-Wolfcamp Gas Pool. And the
7 primary reason for doing this was to investigate if any
8 wells had produced for very long at the 1.5 million a day.
9 And so basically I did that to do that kind of research,
10 and this is a pool for all those wells. It just shows the
11 gas rate, and it is on a daily rate basis.

12 Q. All right, sir. Let's go back to Exhibit 1, and
13 I want to focus your attention for a moment on the
14 southwest quarter of Section 11, and I want to look at the
15 well in the southwest quarter of 11 that you have captioned
16 the Government NBFD Number 1. Do you see that well?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Turn now with me to Exhibit 5 and tell me what
19 this is in relationship to that well.

20 A. Okay, before I describe Exhibit 5, let me just
21 draw the Examiner's attention to the Exhibit 1 and explain
22 a little bit of why we looked at that particular area.

23 Exhibit 1 shows the location of the NBFD well in
24 the southwest quarter of Section 11. And then surrounding
25 that, there were existing Wolfcamp wells on every 160

1 surrounding that, and in fact there was a Wolfcamp well on
2 the existing spacing unit for the NBFD. The NBFD actually
3 was authorized under a separate order to be completed in
4 the Wolfcamp, and because it was originally drilled as a
5 Devonian test, which turned out to be a dry hole in the
6 Devonian.

7 So what we've got here with this situation is
8 essentially less than 160-acre effective density in this
9 one particular area, or in and around the NBFD location.
10 So we thought it instructive to investigate the performance
11 of the NBFD well in relation to the performance of the
12 offsetting wells to see if there had been any interference
13 or anything that would lead us to believe that we were just
14 accelerating reserves or whatever.

15 So that was -- Exhibit Number 5, then, is a
16 production decline curve. You can see it shows the
17 inclining production for this well. But it's on a gas --
18 The only curve shown is the gas rate on a daily basis, MCF
19 per day. But you can tell the well was completed right
20 there around early 1997, and it's continuing to produce to
21 this day. It was originally completed at around -- a
22 little less than 200 MCF a day, and it's approaching a
23 little less than 300 MCF a day in gas rate. And as you can
24 see, it's showing, over time, basically increasing
25 production.

1 Another thing I'd like to point out about its
2 performance: Initially when it was tested, the GOR of the
3 well was 2278; yet over the three-year history of this
4 well, the cumulative GOR is over 15,000. And what that's
5 indicating to us is that the liquids recovered by this well
6 are essentially liquids that dropped out when the reservoir
7 pressure fell and liquid saturation increased in the
8 reservoir, and when this well was drilled in this depleted
9 area, it allowed the recovery of liquids that I don't
10 believe would have been recovered by any of these offset
11 wells.

12 And yet it's -- And now as it's depleting that
13 area, its GOR, of course, is going back up. But it has
14 recovered some liquids. And if you'll notice from the
15 chart, at the bottom, the oil cumulative recovery so far
16 has been 16,000 barrels of condensate.

17 So we think that this shows us that even on this
18 density pattern there are 16,000 barrels of incremental
19 liquid recovery that wouldn't have occurred from the offset
20 wells.

21 And then cumulative recovery from the well so far
22 in the first three years is 252 million. As we say, this
23 is not a barn-burner well, and this is probably what we
24 would expect of any wells that were recompleted in the area
25 as a result, if this -- if our Application was approved.

1 Q. All right. So when we look at the Government
2 NBFD 1 and see its production history for gas on Exhibit 5,
3 that production started in about 1997?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And that prior to that there were existing
6 Wolfcamp wells adjacent to this well in a density that
7 would be comparable to what you would receive if the rules
8 are rescinded and you go to the current Rule 104?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. As part of your analysis, then, knowing what the
11 NBFD well is capable of doing, did you have available to
12 you sufficient data to see if its production was adversely
13 affecting this offsetting well pattern?

14 A. Yes, I went ahead and investigated the gas rates
15 on all four wells, and I summed them up, and the sum of
16 those gas rates on the offset wells is shown on Exhibit 6.

17 Q. All right, let's look at 6 and have you describe
18 that display, and then let's have you help us convert the
19 scales -- These are on different scales, aren't they?

20 A. Yes, they're on different vertical scales. The
21 time scales are the same.

22 Q. Let's make the conversion and show where we
23 should have seen an adverse effect on this well grouping if
24 they had been in effective communication with the newest
25 well.

1 A. Okay, if we overlaid the graphs we would see that
2 obviously the NBFD well curve would be below the curve
3 shown on Exhibit 6. It would be from 200 to 300 MCF a day.
4 The curve shown on Exhibit 6 is -- particularly from 1997
5 on, shows combined production rate of about a million a
6 day, or a little higher than a million a day, actually.

7 And I think what's illustrative about these
8 exhibits is that the production from the NBFD has had no
9 effect, no adverse effect, on the production from the four
10 offsetting wells. And this, of course, is indicating to us
11 that these are incremental reserves being produced and not
12 accelerated reserves that would have been produced by the
13 offset wells.

14 Q. Is this data, in your opinion, sufficient to
15 satisfy you as a petroleum engineer that it's now
16 appropriate to rescind the current rules?

17 A. Yes, it is.

18 Q. Have you shared that position with the other
19 operators in the pool?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Let's identify for Mr. Ashley who those other
22 operators are.

23 A. Referring back to Exhibit 1, we have three other
24 operators in the field -- actually, I'd have to say we have
25 four, and I can explain the difference there -- of active

1 wells in the field. We have Chi Operating, or Chi Energy,
2 Vision and Yates. And ONGARD shows Exxon to have a well in
3 the field; it's a saltwater disposal well. And it escapes
4 me why it's assigned to this field; I don't believe it's
5 disposing of water under the Wolfcamp. But nonetheless,
6 it's showing up on ONGARD, and we treated them as any other
7 operator in the pool.

8 So what we did before we ever filed the
9 Application is, I drafted a letter with all the information
10 I had available to me, to the four operators in the field,
11 and said, here's what we would propose, here's why we would
12 propose it, here's a waiver for you to execute if you have
13 no objection. If you do have any objections please let me
14 know, I'd be interested to hear them. And I got no
15 response other than the signed waivers from all the other
16 operators.

17 Q. Let's turn to Exhibit 7. It's marked 7-A, 7-B,
18 and the latest one I've received yesterday is now marked 7-
19 C. Is this the letter you sent?

20 A. Yes, this is the letter I sent, and these are
21 executed by the other operators of actively producing
22 Wolfcamp wells in the pool. And it evidences their waiver
23 of any objection to our proposal to rescind the pool rules
24 for this field.

25 Q. Okay. And so you have a signed waiver from

1 Vision, from Yates Petroleum Corporation and Chi Operating?

2 A. Yes.

3 MR. KELLAHIN: In addition, Mr. Examiner, our
4 notice of hearing is marked as Exhibit 8. It shows the
5 notice letter, and we sent all these parties the actual
6 Application, and it shows to whom those notices were sent.
7 I have not received any objections.

8 That concludes our presentation, Mr. Examiner.

9 And with your permission we would move the
10 admission of Exhibits 1 through 8.

11 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Exhibits 1 through 8 will be
12 admitted as evidence.

13 EXAMINATION

14 BY EXAMINER ASHLEY:

15 Q. Mr. Foppiano, do you know what the drainage
16 radius is of these wells?

17 A. No, I have not calculated the drainage radius of
18 the wells. We did investigate trying to calculate some
19 drainage radiuses of these wells when we came to the
20 Division for the hearing on the NBFD, and as I recall, the
21 testimony was based on the log information and the type of
22 environment we had. It was rather difficult to get good
23 porosity and water saturation information from this
24 carbonate reservoir.

25 Plus, there's kind of one main body of pay in

1 this area around the NBFD, but there are several stringers,
2 and so trying to estimate the extent of the stringers is
3 rather difficult. So the long-winded answer to your
4 question, no, we didn't really feel the results would be
5 very good.

6 Q. Now, is the NBFD an infill well? Is that drilled
7 on a -- It's the second well on a proration unit?

8 A. When we came to the Division to request approval
9 of that well as an infill well, the Division approved it.
10 But they approved the simultaneous dedication of it, with
11 the understanding that it would be perforated in Sections
12 that were not perforated in the existing well on the same
13 160, which was the Government AB Number 1, and we were
14 directed to the District Office to get approval of our
15 perforations in the Wolfcamp, which we did do that. So we
16 perforated it as required, and those perforations were
17 approved by the District Office.

18 So I'm not sure I can answer your question. It
19 was a simultaneous dedication with a restriction.

20 Q. Do you have an order number for that?

21 MR. KELLAHIN: We have a copy of the order, Mr.
22 Examiner.

23 Q. (By Examiner Ashley) Okay. Thank you.

24 So the surrounding wells, the wells surrounding
25 the NBFD, are producing from a different zone within the

1 Wolfcamp?

2 A. They are all perforated in the same main pay as
3 the Wolfcamp. There's a main porosity interval there
4 that's somewhat -- that's pretty continuous through that
5 area. But there are stringers that were perforated in the
6 NBFD well, that were also perforated in the offset to the
7 south and east, which is the T Com Number 1. And we think
8 that's another reason for some increased reserves on
9 smaller than 320-acre spacing, is because of the presence
10 of these porosity stringers in the entire buildup section
11 of the Wolfcamp.

12 Q. And so the NBFD is not perforated in the main pay
13 of the Wolfcamp, is that --

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q. Okay. And so the response that you saw in the
16 condensate in the NBFD was from the stringers that are
17 perforated in other wells, but these other wells are not
18 able to reach that or would not be producing that?

19 A. I think the NBFD encountered depleted reservoir
20 where it was perforated. The initial pressures, shut-in
21 pressures, indicated to us it was depleted. Even though it
22 was not perforated in the main body of the Wolfcamp
23 porosity, it was perforated in sections that were producing
24 in offset wells.

25 The result was, every indication to us was that

1 it was perforated, and the drainage area of the NBFD has
2 been depleted by offset production. Is that because we
3 perforated in correlative stringers from another well, or
4 because there is vertical conductivity in the reservoir?
5 It's really hard to say. But it does appear, obviously,
6 that it's been depleted.

7 Q. Okay. Can you summarize again for me why you
8 felt like these pool rules were put in place?

9 A. From my read of the testimony and the exhibits,
10 the pool rules originally were set up to provide the
11 opportunity for a gas injection project, to maximize the
12 liquid recovery and to restrict development to one well per
13 320, and also to provide -- I think the primary reason was
14 to provide the rate restriction of 1.5 million a day.

15 I think there was -- What they were trying to do
16 there, I believe, was to restrict the rate to prevent
17 excessive liquid dropout right around the wellbore area,
18 which would reduce the relative permeability of the gas and
19 reduce the flow rate right around those wellbores. And
20 they were trying to keep the reservoir as long as possible
21 to provide time for that analysis and that project to go
22 forward if it turned out to be economically feasible.

23 Obviously, it didn't turn out to be economically
24 feasible, it was never undertaken, and so the reservoir was
25 just depleted under these current rules.

1 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Okay. Mr. Kellahin?

2 MR. KELLAHIN: Sir?

3 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Can you provide a draft order?

4 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir, I'd be happy to.

5 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Can you give me a date that you
6 can provide that draft order?

7 MR. KELLAHIN: I need to do it before I go on
8 vacation, so you'll get it probably on Tuesday.

9 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Tuesday, which is --

10 MR. KELLAHIN: Next week.

11 EXAMINER ASHLEY: -- the 18th?

12 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir.

13 EXAMINER ASHLEY: Okay. I have nothing further,
14 thank you.

15 There being nothing further in this case, Case
16 12,447 will be taken under advisement.

17 (Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
18 10:15 a.m.)

19 * * *

20
21 I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
22 a complete record of the proceedings in
the Examiner hearing of Case No. 12447.
23 heard by me on 7-1-02 39
24 Mark Ashby, Examiner
Off Conservation Division
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 July 17th, 2000.



STEVEN T. BRENNER
CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 2002