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. 12,832
APPLICATION OF YATES PETROLEUM CORPORATION FOR AN UNORTHODOX GAS WELL LOCATION, CHAVES COUNTY, NEW MEXICO	)	

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner

March 7th, 2002

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, March 7th, 2002, 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

March 7th, 2002
Examiner Hearing
CASE NO. 12,832

* * *

E X H I B I T S

Applicant's	Identified	Admitted
Exhibit 1	7	11
Exhibit 2	8	11
Exhibit 3	8	11
Exhibit 4	9	11
Exhibit 5	10	11
Exhibit 6	10	11
Exhibit 7	17	25
Exhibit 8	18	25
Exhibit 9	19	25
Exhibit 10	21	25
Exhibit 11	22	25
Exhibit 12	23	25
Exhibit 13	23	25
Exhibit 14	23	25

* * *

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE DIVISION:

DAVID K. BROOKS
Attorney at Law
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department
Assistant General Counsel
1220 South St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

HOLLAND & HART, L.L.P., and CAMPBELL & CARR
110 N. Guadalupe, Suite 1
P.O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208
By: WILLIAM F. CARR

* * *

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 11:46 a.m.:

EXAMINER CATANACH: At this time we'll call Case 12,832, the Application of Yates Petroleum Corporation for an unorthodox gas well location, Chaves County, New Mexico.

Call for appearances.

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with the Santa Fe office of Holland and Hart, L.L.P. We represent Yates Petroleum Corporation, and I have two witnesses.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Are there any additional appearances?

Will the two witnesses please stand to be sworn in?

(Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)

CHARLES E. MORAN,

the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q. State your name for the record, please.

A. My name is Charles Moran.

Q. Mr. Moran, where do you reside?

A. I reside in Artesia, New Mexico.

Q. By whom are you employed?

A. Yates Petroleum Corporation.

Q. What is your position with Yates Petroleum Corporation?

A. Landman.

Q. Mr. Moran, have you previously testified before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. At the time of that testimony, were your credentials as an expert in petroleum land matters accepted and made a matter of record?

A. Yes, they were.

Q. Are you familiar with the Application filed in this case?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. And are you familiar with the status of the lands in the subject area?

A. Yes, I am.

MR. CARR: Are Mr. Moran's qualifications acceptable?

EXAMINER CATANACH: They are.

Q. (By Mr. Carr) Initially, would you summarize for the Examiner what it is that Yates seeks with this Application?

A. Yates Petroleum Corporation is seeking approval of our Pay "AYY" well at an unorthodox location of 660 feet

from the north line, 330 feet from the west line, in Section 11 of Township 8 South, Range 26 East.

Q. And what acreage are you proposing to dedicate to the well?

A. We propose to dedicate a west-half spacing unit to the well for all formations to be developed on a 320-acre spacing unit, and the northwest quarter in the event of a formation requiring 160-acre spacing.

Q. Is one of the formations, 320-acre-spaced formation, the Undesignated North Foor Ranch-Prepermian Gas Pool?

A. That's what I understand it to be, and the other one would be the Pecos Slope Abo Gas Pool.

Q. What rules govern each of these pools?

A. The rule for the Undesignated North Ranch-Precambrian Gas Pool [*sic*] is governed by the standard rules of the OCD, and the Pecos Slope-Abo is governed by the rules for the Pecos Slope-Abo Gas Pool.

Q. Those rules were promulgated in 1996 by Order Number R-9676; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Rule 5 of those rules provides that any application for an unorthodox location in the Pecos Slope-Abo must go to hearing; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you review for the Examiner why this unorthodox location is necessary?

A. Our original location that we proposed to drill was at a legal location of 660 from the north, 660 from the west. However, upon a surface examination and as shown by the topo included, there is a ravine there that the BLM would not allow us to permit a well at that location. They recommended that we move the well to a location 230 feet west -- or east of the west line in Section 11.

We did not -- We attempted to move it the minimal distance we could, unorthodox, and we found that the 330 location, we think we can build a location there.

Q. You also could not move to the east for geologic reasons?

A. Yes, we could not move to the east for geologic reasons, which the geologist will testify to.

Q. Let's go to what has been marked for identification as Yates Exhibit Number 1, and I'd ask you to identify that and review it for the Examiner.

A. Exhibit 1 is a plat of the leasehold in the area around Section 11, identifying the west half of Section 11 as the proposed spacing unit for the 320-acre formations.

Q. And it shows the offset operators?

A. Yes, it shows the offset operators.

Q. And other wells in the area?

A. And other wells in the area.

Q. What is Exhibit Number 2? Is this your administrative application?

A. Exhibit Number 2 was the well location acreage dedication plat and C- -- well, I don't remember the exact C number -- filed with the APD for the well.

Q. Mr. Moran, is this what you have as Exhibit Number 2 in your set of exhibits?

A. Okay, I guess it is. Oh, there it is. I was referring to the original Exhibit 2 in my administrative application. I apologize.

Q. Okay, Exhibit 2 is the administrative application?

A. Yes.

Q. And attached to that is the survey that you were just talking about; is that right?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. And you're proposing to dedicate to this well standard spacing units; is that also correct?

A. Correct.

Q. In this exhibit there is also the topographic map; is that correct?

A. Yes, that is identified as Exhibit 3 to the administrative application.

Q. And --

A. And on that map, in Section 11, you can see a box where we propose to put the location. And if you move to the east of that box you can see that where 660 feet would be is right in the middle of the ravine.

Q. Is all working interest committed to this well?

A. Yes, all working interest is committed to the well.

Q. All right, let's go to what has been marked as Exhibit Number 4. Would you identify that, please?

A. That is the ownership schedule for the lands affected by this Application, that being the leasehold ownership in Section 10, the working interest owners and the affected wells in the area and the ownership of Section 3 in Township 8 South, 26 East, on an east-half spacing unit.

Q. Now, if we look at this exhibit and compare it to the plat which is Exhibit Number 1, does this well location actually encroach on Section 2?

A. No, it does not encroach on Section 2.

Q. And so what we're doing is, we're encroaching on the diagonal slightly, Section 3, and to the west on Section 10?

A. Correct.

Q. Section 10 is operated by who?

A. Section 10 is operated by Yates Petroleum

Corporation.

Q. Section 3 is operated by --

A. By Yates Petroleum Corporation as well.

Q. Are there some additional interest owners in Section 3?

A. There are three owners that are non-Yates entities that are working interest owners in Section 3.

Q. That's Roxy Burkfield?

A. Roxy Burkfield and Bryan Solsbery and Dean Solsbery, Jr.

Q. What is Yates Exhibit Number 5?

A. Yates Exhibit 5 is the affidavit of mailing. When we were sent to hearing, we had to notify the owners again that I notified at the administrative hearing, that we were going to be required to go to hearing.

Q. And then what is Exhibit Number 6?

A. Exhibit Number 6 is a waiver received from two of the working interest owners in Section 3, that being Dean Solsbery and Bryan Solsbery, that was written by their attorney, and the other waivers attached obtained from the other working interest owners in Section 10.

Q. At this point in time, the only interest owner who we've not reached an agreement with, really, is Roxy Burkfield; is that correct?

A. That is correct, and I've had conversations with

her attorney. I don't know that they object, they just -- They're afraid to do anything.

Q. Will Yates call a geological witness to review the technical portions of the case?

A. Yes.

Q. Were Yates Exhibits 1 through 6 either prepared by you, or have you reviewed them and can you testify as to their accuracy?

A. Yes, they were prepared and reviewed by me.

MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Catanach, we move the admission into evidence of Yates Exhibits 1 through 6.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 1 through 6 will be admitted as evidence.

MR. CARR: And that concludes my direct examination of Mr. Moran.

EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

Q. Mr. Moran, in Section 3 is there a producing well?

A. Yes, there are, the Percentage "APR" in the southeast corner of the section, and in the northeast corner there are the Coronet TI Number 1 and 2, which are both Abo wells, and in the northwest quarter there's a well operated by a third party. I don't remember the name of the well.

Q. The well in the southeast quarter of Section 3, what is that producing from? Do you know?

A. Currently, I believe, it's a commingled well. I think it's producing from both the -- I'd rather let the geologist answer that.

Q. I assume that this Exhibit Number 6, the letter from the Solsbery interest -- I'm a little curious as to -- it seems to me that they've not objected to this location.

A. The conversation I had with Mr. Solsbery's attorney, upon their advice they had received from -- A little history may help understand the Solsbery and Roxy Burkfield interest.

Last fall I had to force pool those interests in the Percentage well after the fact, because they were not -- there was a family feud going on. The family has settled the ownership of those minerals, and that is why they were both represented by attorneys; they were fighting over who owned the minerals, and the attorneys are not familiar with oil and gas, per say.

MR. BROOKS: I thought I remembered those names from somewhere. Now I remember where.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q. (By Examiner Catanach) I'm just a little curious as to their letter. What does it mean when -- "that Yates will produce ratably from the APR/Percentage well"?

A. The subject of the discussion was whether we would shut in the Percentage well at their detriment and produce the Pay well at that unorthodox location, and I explained that we have an obligation to protect all the leases in the area because of the ownership, and that we would produce each one as best we could as a prudent operator. And that is what I understood him to mean, "ratably".

Q. I see. So the only additional interest owners that you notified were all in Section 3; is that correct?

A. I only notified the east half of Section 3 because of the established spacing unit, and I notified the operator of Section 2 as a courtesy.

Q. Okay, within Section 10 the interest -- there are no additional interests in Section 10?

A. They are owned by various Yates entities that have signed a waiver to the unorthodox location.

Q. All right. Now, I guess the well will be drilled in the northeast quarter -- I'm sorry, the northwest quarter --

A. Northwest.

Q. -- I assume for geologic reasons --

A. Yes.

Q. -- which will be presented?

A. Yes.

Q. Are there any existing Abo wells within Section 11 at this point, do you know?

A. I'm not aware of one. I mean, there might -- I think there was one, possibly, in the east half, but I just don't remember what that one was.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay. I have nothing further, Mr. Carr.

Do you have anything?

MR. BROOKS: Just one.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

Q. Section 10 is, from these numbers, I assume -- are those federal leases also?

A. Those are federal leases.

Q. And Yates owns all the working interest?

A. Yes.

Q. Or Yates collectively?

A. Various Yates entities own the working interest.

Q. But Section 3 is fee?

A. Section 3 is fee.

Q. Okay, so you have different royalty owners in Section 3, and of course the federal government in Section 1 --

A. Correct.

Q. -- Section 11.

Okay, thank you.

FURTHER EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

Q. Have you ever had a Yates entity object to a Yates application?

A. Yes.

Q. Really?

A. It gets solved internally.

EXAMINER CATANACH: I see. This witness may be excused.

MR. CARR: At this time we call Tim Miller.

TIM MILLER,

the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q. Would you state your name for the record, please?

A. My name is Tim Miller.

Q. Mr. Miller, where do you reside?

A. I reside in Carlsbad, New Mexico.

Q. And by whom are you employed?

A. Yates Petroleum.

Q. What is your position with Yates?

A. I'm a geologist with Yates.

Q. Have you previously testified before this

Division and had your credentials as an expert in petroleum geology accepted and made a matter of record?

A. Yes, they were.

Q. Are you familiar with the Application filed in this case on behalf of Yates Petroleum Corporation?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Have you made a technical study of the area surrounding the proposed well?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. And are you prepared to share the results of that work with Mr. Catanach?

A. Yes, I am.

MR. CARR: Are the witness's qualifications acceptable?

EXAMINER CATANACH: Mr. Miller is so qualified.

Q. (By Mr. Carr) Mr. Miller, first would you identify the primary objective in this proposed well?

A. The primary objective in the Pay well is the deepest producing formation in the area out there, called the Siluro-Devonian dolomite.

Q. The Abo formation is also --

A. Yeah, the Abo is the secondary objective. But our primary purpose for drilling the well is to the Siluro-Devonian.

Q. Let's go to what has been marked Yates Exhibit

Number 7, the structure map. I'd ask you to review the information on this exhibit for the Examiner.

A. Okay, this is a structure map of the four sections in the area, and basically what it is is a structure map on top of the Siluro-Devonian. And basically, as you see, there is a fault running from the southwest to the northeast part of the map, and this is basically known by some seismic data. There's a seismic line to the south of this, basically, that runs west to east from the south half of 10 over to 11, so we're projecting in where this fault may be.

As you can see, where the pay well is projected we would be down the flank of a structural nose. As you can see, there is not that much control for the Siluro-Devonian. There is one well in the southwest quarter, the Railroad State Number 2, of Section. Pecos River Operating drilled that well recently. The only deep well in Section 3 is our percentage well, and there are three wells down in Section 10, the Horn 1, the Horn 2 and -- it's hard to see there, but the Jasper 3 up in the northeast quarter of 10. There basically are no wells to date drilled in Section 11, so far.

So basically, this is a map showing a fault running southwest to northeast. We figure our Pay well will be on the upthrown side. The downthrown side, as you

can see on the Horns 1, 2 and 3, they basically all -- the Horns 1 and 2 are producing out of Strawn sand or basically what's known as Pennsylvanian sand formation, and the Jasper 3 right now has been plugged back to the Abo formation. These were basically uneconomic wells in the Siluro-Devonian, and they're on the downthrown side of the fault.

The Percentage well, which to date is one of the best wells out there, as opposed to the Railroad State, is higher structurally to the Railroad State, and it is commingled out of two separate formations, the Penn sands and the Siluro-Devonian.

Q. Let's now go to the isopach map, Yates Petroleum Corporation Exhibit Number 8.

A. And basically, to me, this signifies why we are wanting to drill the Pay well at an unorthodox location. This is a gross isopach of the dolomite, the thickness of the Siluro-Devonian out there.

The Percentage well -- now it's very hard to see because of that circle -- the Percentage well, which is in the southeast quarter of Section 3, has a total interval, total thickness of 74 feet.

The Railroad State Number 2 well, which is in the southwest quarter of Section 2, 660 from the south and west, has 30 feet maximum thickness.

If you move down to the Jasper 3 well, the Jasper 3 and the Horn Number 2 wells were not drilled all the way through the dolomite, and it's estimated that the Jasper 3 has 130-feet-plus of dolomite, the Horn 2 100-plus, and the Horn Number 1 does have 220 feet in it.

As you go from west to east -- as you can see, these are the thicknesses of the dolomite -- you are thinning to the east. And we feel that if we would -- what the BLM has suggested, forced us to put our pay location basically to the east of the Railroad State, down in Section 11, we would be 20 feet or less, or maybe even nothing, of the dolomite.

So the further east you move past that Railroad State Number 2 well, you have the danger of being totally out of the dolomite.

And if you could stay more towards the west of it, closer to where the Percentage Number 1 and the Jasper 3 is located, you will still stay, as my map says, maybe somewhere between 60 and 80 feet of dolomite that still can be productive.

Q. There's also a trace on this exhibit for a cross-section, is there not?

A. Right. Yes, there is.

Q. Let's move on to the cross-section, which is marked Yates Exhibit Number 9.

A. Okay, this cross-section -- Again, there's two cross-sections for exhibits. This one is structural cross-section hung on a subsea depth of minus 1550. Basically it runs, as you can see on Exhibit 8, it runs from south, starting on the left of the cross-section, through the Jasper 3, across the fault, through our Percentage Number 1, which is in the southeast quarter of Section 3, through the proposed Pay well, and then up and ends up into the Railroad State Number 2.

As you can see over in the Jasper 3, of course, again, we did not drill all the way through the dolomite. This interval is colored in blue on all three wells. The estimated thickness there, like I have on the isopach map, is 130-feet-plus.

You cross the fault and you go up to the Percentage, the dolomite thins to 74 feet. And as you can see on the cross-section, we have perfs. The dolomite there is perf'd at 5630 to -36 feet, and is commingled with the -- what we call Strawn sands up above it in three separate sand intervals. It has produced as of through December, 905 million, almost 1 BCF. It's a very good well.

The Jasper well to the left has produced 66 million, and that is basically now -- which I do not show on the map -- uphole in the Abo. We have a plug set over

the perfs in the Strawn, so at this point we're not producing out of it.

The Railroad State Number 2, which has only 30 feet of dolomite and it is directly east of our Percentage, is perf'd from 5670 to -77 and from 5690 to -96. That is all they have left in that well, is 30 feet of dolomite, and as through December it has made, as you can see just looking at the cum so far, in less than a year it's already made 750 million, and it still is producing around 2 1/2 to 3 million a day out of the dolomite.

This gives you an idea of what the structure is being designated here, and that -- it seems like the dolomite that is on the upthrown side of the fault has better production than what is shown down in the Jasper, which basically did not test economic for the dolomite.

Q. All right. Now, you've reviewed the structural cross-section, Exhibit 9. Let's go on to the stratigraphic cross-section, Yates Petroleum Corporation Exhibit Number 10.

A. Okay, once again the stratigraphic cross-section is basically through the same three wells plus the proposed well, and this just gives you a different view of it, and this is hung stratigraphically on top of the Cisco formation to give you a more flatter version of that.

You can see, just looking from left to right,

starting over at the Jasper well, again you have 130-feet-plus dolomite, and as we go up through the Percentage we have 74 feet of dolomite, and it thins going over to the Railroad State, which again, these cross-sections are showing that if you would have the location down in Section 11 moved further east than what it is right now, you have the danger of totally losing the dolomite, thinning out.

Q. What is Exhibit 11?

A. Exhibit 11 -- and basically, since all three of them are shown on the map, we can talk about them all together. Exhibits 11, 12 and 13, these are maps of the Abo sand intervals in the area.

And Yates Petroleum normally groups the Abo sands into an A interval, a B interval and a C interval, which -- meaning the A interval is really a cutoff from the top of the Abo, 100 feet down into the Abo, that's -- there's several sands in there, and we lump them together and call it an A zone.

Same thing with the B, we consider it from below the A zone, about 150 feet thick, of different sand intervals. And the C zone is down below that.

As you can see on the map, Exhibit 11 would be of the A zone. Where the Pay well would be situated right now, we might encounter maybe a maximum of two feet of it.

Now, this is a map of the net porosity of the

neutron density crossover on the logs with a 9-percent cutoff. This gives us what we've used in the past, a better advantage of trying to detect where we would want to -- when we drill Abo wells, how we spot our locations.

The Exhibit Number 12 is an isopach of the net porosity of the B interval. And once again, you see we're right on the edge. We -- Basically, my mapping says we would have no sand for the B interval.

The last exhibit, Exhibit 13, is obviously the best of the three intervals. We're predicting we can encounter somewhere around 15 feet of the sand in this interval to be productive.

Q. Is the final exhibit a summary of your geological presentation?

A. Yes, it is.

MR. CARR: And, Mr. Examiner, that should be marked Exhibit 14, not Exhibit 12.

THE WITNESS: Basically the summary of it is, the Pay well, the Pay "AA" [*sic*] Federal Com Number 1 needs to be at an unorthodox location at least for two reasons.

Of course, the first reason is that the topography out there influences the location. Like Mr. Moran said, our first location, which would have been orthodox, at 660 from the north and west puts it right down in the middle of a ravine.

Any location proposed to move it further east of this location, again, would cause, as shown by the two cross-sections and the gross isopach thickness map of the Siluro-Devonian dolomite, to be in danger of basically thinning out and not encountering any productive dolomite, as opposed to the thicknesses.

Again, the wells -- the Horn 1, which has 220 feet of dolomite; the Horn 2, 100-plus feet; the Jasper 3, 130-feet-plus; the Percentage well, which is to the northwest of where the proposed pay location is, has a gross thickness of 74 feet; and the Railroad State Number 2, which basically is north northeast of the Pay location, is already thinned down to 30 feet.

So where we're proposing, at least we think we have a shot of at least staying -- maybe having the dolomite still be there between 60 and 80 feet thick.

Q. (By Mr. Carr) Mr. Miller, in your opinion will approval of this Application and the drilling of this well at the proposed unorthodox location be in the best interest of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

A. Yes, it will.

Q. Were Exhibits 7 through 14 prepared by you?

A. Yes, they were.

MR. CARR: At this time I move admission into

evidence of Yates Petroleum Corporation Exhibits 7 through 14.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 7 through 14 will be admitted as evidence.

MR. CARR: And that concludes my examination of Mr. Miller.

EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

Q. Mr. Miller, have you done any mapping in the Strawn at this location?

A. Not really, no.

Q. That is a secondary target?

A. That is a secondary target. From what we've seen so far -- I don't have any, *per se*, thickness maps, any gross isopachs or structure -- structure sort of mirrors the structure of the Siluro-Devonian.

We have found out by -- we have taken a full-diameter core in the Horn 2, down through the -- what used to be called Penn sands, and we think now we've dated it with a paleo that it is Strawn, and they more act like more kind of a debris-type sand, because they're a jumble of limestones, dolomites, igneous rock fragments, granite washed in there. It's not -- We call it a sand; it's not a *per se* clean sand, say, like a Morrow sand. It's more of a mix of different rocks in it.

Q. In the Percentage well you do have the Strawn --

A. Right, right, that is commingled with the dolomite.

Q. Does that contribute a lot to the well's production, do you know?

A. There's a debate in-house. If you look at the cross-section it will show you -- it doesn't matter, cross-section Exhibit Number 10, on the Percentage well there is -- you can see the blue coloration in there. That's the dolomite where we are only perf'd out of six feet.

Right up above it is a Strawn sand that sits right on top of the dolomite. And as you can see -- It's hard to see the crossover, the neutron density, but to the right of where those perfs are you can see kind of a blackish area. That's averaging around 15-, 16-percent porosity, which is outstanding for a well like this.

We frac'd this well after we initially acidized and perf'd it. The data is -- Before we frac'd that well, the dolomite was doing 1.3 million. And then when we frac'd the well and we got the commingling order, the thing was doing anywhere from 5 to 6 million.

So it's debatable. Did we frac down into the dolomite and open up more pay? That we really don't know. I think they're both contributing, but how much, one towards the other, we don't know for a fact.

Q. Is it important for this well to be on the upthrown side of that fault?

A. Yes, I think it is, because the Horns 1, 2 and Jasper 3, they're on the downthrown side, and we've tested gas out of the dolomite, but it tested -- was anywhere from 50,000 to about 100,000 a day, just look at that one, and with some water.

That's just not an economic -- producing solely as Siluro-Devonian dolomite wells.

Q. Is there communication across that fault?

A. That we don't know.

Q. Actually, moving the well to the east would probably situate you better in the Abo formation. Is that your --

A. Yes, looking at the -- looking at the --- it probably would, but again our prime target is the Devonian. We figure we can make more gas out of the Devonian dolomite than we could the Abo.

Basically the Abo right now, in case we strike out in the dolomite, would be the backup.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, I have no further questions.

MR. CARR: That concludes our presentation in this case.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, there being nothing

further in this case, Case 12,832 will be taken under advisement.

And we'll adjourn until 1:30.

MR. BROOKS: Sounds good.

(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at 12:18 p.m.)

* * *

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 12832, heard by me on March 7, 2002.

David K. Catanach, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

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 March 15th, 2002.

STEVEN T. BRENNER
CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 2002