1	NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
2	STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
3	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
4	CASE NO. 10427
5	
6	IN THE MATTER OF:
7	
8	The Application of Mewbourne Oil Company for compulsory pooling,
9	an unorthodox gas well location, and non-standard gas proration units,
10	Eddy County, New Mexico.
11	
12	
13	
14	
1 5	BEFORE:
16	
17	MICHAEL E. STOGNER
18	Hearing Examiner
19	State Land Office Building
20	December 19, 1991
2 1	
2 2	
2 3	REPORTED BY:
2 4	DEBBIE VESTAL Certified Shorthand Reporter
2 5	for the State of New Mexico
	ORIGINAL

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	FOR THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION:
4	
5	ROBERT G. STOVALL, ESQ. General Counsel
6	State Land Office Building Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
7	
8	FOR THE APPLICANT:
9	HINKLE, CLOX, EATON, COFFIELD & HENSLEY
10	500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 740 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102-2121
11	BY: JAMES BRUCE, ESQ.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
2 1	
2 2	
2 3	
2 4	
2 5	

1		I N D E X	
2			
3		Page	Number
4			
5	Appearance	es	2
6			
7	WITNESSES	FOR THE APPLICANT:	
8			
9	1.	PAUL HADEN	
10		Examination by Mr. Bruce	6
11		Examination by Mr. Stovall	15
12			
13	2.	J. DAVID OVERTON	
14		Examination by Mr. Bruce	19
15		Examination by Examiner Stogner	2 4
16			
17	Certificat	te of Reporter	2 7
18			
19			
20			
2 1			
2 2			
23			
2 4			
25			

		E	x :	н і	В	I	T	s	
									Page Marked
Exhibit	No.	1							7
Exhibit	No.	2							8
Exhibit	No.	3							9
Exhibit	No.	4							10
Exhibit	No.	5 – A							1 2
Exhibit	No.	5 – B							1 2
Exhibit	No.	6							1 2
Exhibit	No.	7							14
Exhibit	No.	8							19
Exhibit	No.	9							20
Exhibit	No.	10-A							2 1
Exhibit	No.	10-B							2 3
	Exhibit	Exhibit No.	Exhibit No. 1 Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 10-A Exhibit No. 10-B	Exhibit No. 1 Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 9	Exhibit No. 1 Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 10-A	Exhibit No. 1 Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 9	Exhibit No. 1 Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 9	Exhibit No. 1 Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 9	Exhibit No. 2 Exhibit No. 3 Exhibit No. 4 Exhibit No. 5-A Exhibit No. 5-B Exhibit No. 6 Exhibit No. 7 Exhibit No. 8 Exhibit No. 9 Exhibit No. 10-A

EXAMINER STOGNER: The hearing will 1 come to order. Call the next case, No. 10427. 2 3 MR. STOVALL: Application of Mewbourne Oil Company for compulsory pooling, an unorthodox 4 gas well location, and nonstandard gas proration 5 units, Eddy County, New Mexico. 6 EXAMINER STOGNER: Call for 7 8 appearances. 9 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, my name is Jim Bruce, from the Hinkle law firm in 10 11 Albuquerque, representing the applicant. I have two witnesses to be sworn. 12 13 EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other 14 appearances? 15 Will the witnesses, please, stand to be 16 sworn. 17 (The witnesses were duly sworn.) MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, one 18 19 preliminary matter, my application erroneously 20 asked to pool all formations from the surface to the base of the Morrow, and instead it should be 21 22 from the base of the Abo to the base of the 23 Morrow. 24 EXAMINER STOGNER: Everything else 25 being the same?

1	MR. BRUCE: Yes.
2	EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you.
3	PAUL HADEN
4	Having been duly sworn upon his oath, was
5	examined and testified as follows:
6	EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. BRUCE:
8	Q. Would you, please, state your name and
9	city of residence.
10	A. My name is Paul Haden. I live in
11	Midland, Texas.
12	Q. And what is your occupation?
13	A. Petroleum landman.
14	Q. Who do you work for?
15	A. Mewbourne Oil Company.
16	Q. Have you previously testified before
17	the Division as a petroleum landman?
18	A. Yes, I have.
19	Q. Are you familiar with the land matters
20	involved in this application?
2 1	A. Yes, I am.
22	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I tender the
23	witness as an expert.
2 4	EXAMINER STOGNER: He is.
25	Q. (BY MR. BRUCE) Mr. Haden, state

briefly what Mewbourne seeks in this case.

Я

A. Mewbourne seeks an order pooling all mineral interests from the base of the Abo formation to the base of the Morrow formation underlying the west half of Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 28 East for all pools or formations spaced on 160 or 320 acres.

The units will be nonstandard in size, however, being 334.98 acres for the west half, and 167.36 acres for the southwest quarter of Section 6.

Mewbourne also requests approval of an unorthodox gas well location for the west half and southwest quarter spacing units.

- Q. What is the location of Mewbourne's proposed well? And I refer you to Exhibit 1.
- A. Exhibit 1 is a land plat showing our proposed west half spacing unit for Section 6.

 Our unit is shaded in yellow with the red dot indicating our proposed well location. This location is 730 feet from the west line and 990 feet from the south line of Section 6.

The well will be drilled to depths sufficient to test the Morrow formation, being approximately 10,350 feet.

Q. Referring to Exhibit 2 now, who are the parties that Mewbourne seeks to force pool?

- A. Exhibit No. 2 is a listing of the ownership of the operating rights in the west half of Section 6. The interest owners shaded in yellow are the owners in which Mewbourne Oil Company wishes to force pool.
 - Q. They are the uncommitted interests?
 - A. They are the uncommitted interests.
- Q. And what does the green shading indicate?
- A. The green shading indicates those who were named in the application for forced pooling but who have subsequently joined or farmed out to Mewbourne the drilling of this test well.
- Q. Besides the parties listed on Exhibit 2, is there anyone else you seek to force pool?
- A. Yes. We also seek to force pool the Sunwest Bank of Albuquerque as a personal representative of the estate of Ruth Hatch, deceased.
- Q. Why do you seek to force pool Sunwest Bank?
- A. The reason for this is Ruth Hatch owned certain operating rights in Tract A. This Tract

1 A is listed or described on this Exhibit No. 2.

2 She died. And the Sunwest Bank as personal

3 representative supposedly conveyed operating

4 rights to the devisees under a will.

Leet, Jr., and Frank Hatch.

Those people are the regents of the
University of New Mexico, Cheedle and Elizabeth
Caviness, Harriet Hatch Trapani, Carla
Leet-Assaf, Frederika A. Leet, Ryan P. Hatch,
Carl F. Hatch, Jeannie H. Collins, Victoria Hatch
Pereira, Glen F. -- wait. Excuse me. Glenn F.

These conveyances, unfortunately, were made by mineral royalty deed, which our title attorney considers them defective conveyances as these are operating rights, not mineral and/or royalty interests. Therefore, we need to force pool the personal representative.

- Q. And this is due to the title question?
- A. This is due to the title question.
- Q. Okay. Please describe your efforts to obtain the voluntary joinder of the uncommitted parties. And I refer you to Exhibit 3.
- A. Exhibit 3 is a copy of all of our correspondence in regard to the uncommitted owners shaded in yellow on our previous Exhibit

1 No. 2.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

We started since January 1991 trying to commit these interests.

- Q. Besides the correspondence at least with the companies like Enron and Phillips, et cetera, were there follow-up phone calls?
 - A. Yes. Numerous calls since January 91.
- Q. Okay. In your opinion have you made a good faith attempt to obtain the voluntary joinder of these uncommitted parties?
 - A. I believe I have.
- Q. Does Mewbourne request that it be named operator of the well?
- 14 A. Yes, that's correct.
 - Q. What is its current ownership interest in the west half of the unit?
- A. Mewbourne controls approximately 23.65

 percent of the unit in the west half.
 - Q. Okay. And moving on to Exhibit 4, would you discuss the costs of the proposed well?
 - A. Our estimated well cost for our Chalk Bluff "6" State No. 1 well is estimated at \$745,306.
- Q. And that's for a completed well?
- A. That's for a completed well.

- Q. And is this well cost comparable to the cost of other wells Mewbourne has drilled in this area?
 - A. That's correct.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And what is your recommendation as to the amounts Mewbourne should be paid for supervision and administrative charges?
- A. We are recommending \$6,000 per month for drilling well costs monthly and \$600 for producing well costs.
- Q. Okay. Now, moving on to the -- or excuse me. Are these amounts comparable to rates normally charged by Mewbourne and other operators for wells of this depth in this area of the state?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And what penalty do you recommend against any non-consenting pool parties?
 - A. Well costs, plus 200 percent.
 - Q. And will the geologist for Mewbourne further testify as to this stiff penalty?
 - A. Yes, he will.
 - Q. Is the 200 percent risk penalty used in operating agreements in this area of New Mexico?
- A. Right, well costs plus 200 percent.

- Q. Now, moving on to the unorthodox
 location part of the hearing, would you identify
 Exhibits 5-A and 5-B and discuss them for the
 Examiner.
 - A. Exhibit 5-A is a listing of the offset ownership. This ownership is restricted for rights from the base of the Abo formation to the base of the Morrow formation. Exhibit No. 5-B is a tract, a map of the tract ownership of the ownership described in Exhibit 5-A.
 - Q. Okay. And the people listed in Exhibit 5-B, were they all notified of the unorthodox location request?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. Are the notification letters marked Exhibit 6?
- A. That also is correct.
- Q. Referring to the back of that packet,
 there are a couple of letters dated December 13.
 What is the reason for that late notice?
 - A. The reason for this notice given is apparently the change in ownership since the last time I had checked it. To make sure things were done correctly, I notified these people.
 - Q. And that's Enron and Chevron and Kersey

1 & Company?

- A. Chevron USA, Inc., Hondo Oil & Gas
 Company, and Kersey & Company.
 - Q. Where do they own interests?
- 5 A. They own interests in north, northwest 6 of our proposed location. Their interests are 7 located in Section 36 in the south half.
 - Q. And the unorthodox location is moving away from them; is that correct?
- 10 A. That is correct.
- Q. And did any of the offset parties sign waivers as to the unorthodox location?
- 13 A. Yes. We have numerous waivers signed
 14 by the offset operators as to our proposed
 15 location.
- Q. And those are part of Exhibit 6?
- 17 A. That is right.
- Q. Who is the immediate offset operator of Section 7 and Section 12?
- A. Section 7, Arco Oil & Gas Company, they
 own the deep rights and operate the two gas wells
 depicted on this exhibit.
- Q. Did they waive objection to the location?
- A. Yes, they did by waiver signed December

10, 1991. 1 And who owns Section 12 as to the deep Ο. 3 rights? Mewbourne Oil Company owns these Α. 5 rights. Okay. Finally, Mr. Haden, what is 6 Q. Exhibit 7? 7 8 Α. Exhibit 7 is an affidavit regarding 9 notice, which was executed by myself. 10 0. And does that concern notice of the 11 forced pooling portion of this application? 12 That is right. Α. 13 Q. Were Exhibits 1 through 7 prepared by 14 you under your direction or compiled from company 1.5 records? 16 Α. That's correct. In your opinion is the granting of this 17 Q. application in the interests of conservation and 18 19 the prevention of waste? 20 Α. Yes. MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I move the 21 22 admission of Exhibits 1 through 7 at this time. EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 1 through 7 23

EXAMINATION

will be admitted into evidence.

24

BY MR. STOVALL:

- Q. Mr. Haden, the people on your list on Exhibit 2, are there no royalty interests that you're having to force pool?
 - A. No. These are operating rights.
 - Q. Okay. Under leases?
- 7 A. Yes, under previous held by production 8 leases.
 - Q. Okay. So all the royalty interests that are in the proposed spacing units are -- the people that control those royalty interests have agreed to -- I mean, they're not going to be pooled as far as costs, but as far as their royalty?
 - A. This has nothing to do with royalties. These are state leases. The state of New Mexico owns the royalty.
 - Q. Okay. That was the question. If they were fee royalties, it would be a different situation?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Sticking with the forced pooling thing, is there anybody you haven't been able to find or you haven't gotten any letters back from or that you've got any concerns about not having actually

- 1 | had direct contact with them?
- A. There's one person, yes, Arthur L.
- 3 Owen. We have researched the records in Eddy
- 4 | County thoroughly and have not been able to come
- 5 | up with any sort of address for this individual.
- 6 | They own a very small, small interest.
- 7 Q. Arthur Owen you said?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. Which tract is he in? Oh, there he
- 10 is. I see it.
- 11 A. We would, of course, like to find him.
- 12 Q. I notice you even have somebody in
- 13 | Brazil?
- 14 A. Yes. She has not responded at all.
- 15 Q. Now, moving on to the unorthodox part,
- 16 | the companies -- we've got the December 13
- 17 | letter?
- 18 A. Right.
- Q. Do you know when they acquired their
- 20 | interest of record?
- 21 A. I don't know right offhand when they
- 22 | did. One of the questions having to do with
- 23 | Hondo Oil & Gas Company, I thought all along that
- 24 | was Atlantic Richfield Company. There's always a
- 25 question as to that ownership. I had notified

1 Atlantic Richfield. Of course, they said okay.

- Q. So you don't know who owned record title as of the date you gave notice or record at the recorded interest?
 - A. I wasn't real clear. The ownership in the county records is very split up. It's unclear even in taking in conjunction with the records filed with the Bureau of Land Management.

EXAMINER STOGNER: But both parties,

Arco and Hondo, have been notified?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

Arco also being an offset owner in Section 17, I
believe, who operates two gas wells.

- Q. (BY MR. STOVALL) You say all three interests are in Section 36; is that what you said?
- A. I believe the Hondo Oil & Gas Company interest is in Section 6. Right. Hondo owns in the east half of the northeast quarter, the southwest-northeast quarter, northeast-southeast quarter of Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 28 East in conjunction with some other parties.

This is listed as Tract No. 10 on Exhibit 5-A.

Q. How did you become aware of the

1 interests of these parties who got late notice? Atlantic Richfield, for one, advised me 2 Α. 3 they didn't believe they owned in that Tract No. 10 anymore. They conveyed their interests to 5 Hondo. The rest was through subsequent checking 6 of the records. 7 I guess the question I've got -- when Ο. 8 we switch witnesses, I want to go get a rule book 9 and make sure what the requirements are -- but if in fact they had a record, you know, notice 10 interest as of the date that notice was required, 11 12 then they would have been entitled to notice. 13 MR. BRUCE: If the hearing needs to be 14 kept open, that's fine. 15 MR. STOVALL: When you go to your next 16 witness -- I can't remember what the rules are. 17 They're different, I know, in administrative and 18 hearing. THE WITNESS: I understand that. 19 20 EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other questions 21 of this witness? 22 If not, Mr. Haden may be dismissed. 23 J. DAVID OVERTON 24 Having been duly sworn upon his oath, was 25 examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. BRUCE: 2 3 Q. Would you, please, state your name for the record. 4 Α. My name is David Overton. 5 6 Q. Where do you reside? 7 Α. I live in Midland, Texas. 8 Q. What is your occupation, and who are 9 you employed by? 10 Α. I work for Mewbourne Oil Company as a petroleum geologist. 11 12 Have you previously testified before 13 the Division as an expert petroleum geologist? 14 Yes, sir, I have. Α. Are you familiar with the geology 15 16 involved in this application? 17 Α. Yes, sir, I am. 18 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. 19 Overton as an expert geologist. 20 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Overton is so 21 qualified. 22 Q. (BY MR. BRUCE) Mr. Overton, would you, 23 please, move on to Mewbourne's Exhibit 8 and

discuss what you're hoping to find in this

24

25

proposed well.

A. Exhibit 8 is a production study of the area for those wells that penetrated 7,000 feet or deeper. This area is covered with a bunch of shallow wells in the Abo, Queen, and Grayburg.

So in dealing with it, we were only looking for gas wells below there because there's no chance of getting any rocks from the base of the Abo up.

You'll note that orange-shaded circle surrounding some of the well symbols, especially in Section 7, 12, and 1, is Lower Morrow, which is what we're looking for in our proposed location in Section 6.

We have drilled and operate the three wells in Section 12 and the -- one well in Section 12 and the two wells in Section 1.

- Q. And the Lower Morrow is the primary pay zone you're hoping to hit?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Would you move on to Exhibit 9 and discuss its contents for the Examiner.
- A. Exhibit 9 is an Atoka Morrow stratigraphic cross-section, G-to-G prime, G being to the northwest in Section 35 and G prime being in Section 7.

Across the area of our proposed location, there basically we are looking for the brown and orange sand. And they're shown on this cross-section. However, there are a few others that have played a minor significance in the area, being a basal Morrow grade that we encountered in Section 1 has proved to be non-economic or borderline economic.

Green sands in the area, which are the Middle Morrow, have not been tested at all. And the immediate area, you'll have to go several miles away to find where that's been tested.

Noting over here in our proposed location, we are expecting to encounter a Lower Morrow orange sand and a Lower Morrow brown sand, which act as completely separate reservoirs in this immediate area.

- Q. Okay. Do you have anything further on that exhibit?
 - A. No.

- Q. Would you move on to Exhibits 10-A and and 10-B and discuss further the prospect you're hoping to drill.
- A. Exhibit 10-A is a Lower Morrow structure map in the hatched or dashed lines,

showing regional dip to the southeast. Also included in that map is a net Lower Morrow orange sand isopach map in which I have the numbers on the individual wells are the net sand greater than or equal to 8 percent over a gross sand interval.

And this map is on the net sand, so it's porosity greater than or equal to 8 percent, which acts as a cutoff, baseline cutoff for us in the Morrow, Lower Morrow.

We have sand channels trending from the northwest to the southeast. We have one in the orange sand crossing our proposed location at about ten-foot thick at the proposed location.

- Q. Is that approximately what you believe is necessary to hit a commercial well in the Morrow?
- A. It's not necessarily required to be commercial, but it is required to justify drilling for a horizon.
- Q. On Exhibit 10-A what is the little "X" north of the proposed location?
- A. The "X" is the legal location defined by the rules of the NMOCD versus our proposed location, which is unorthodox at 730 from the

west and 990 from the south.

Moving on to Exhibit 10-B is the lower reservoir we're after, the brown sand. Once again, it's pretty much channels trending from the northwest to the southeast in our proposed location. And that sand is a little shy of ten foot, about nine foot on my map, eight or nine.

Again, the "X" marks a legal location and the circles are proposed locations.

- Q. Okay. Looking at Exhibits 10-A and 10-B, is an unorthodox location more necessary for the orange sand than the brown sand?
- A. Yes, sir, that's true. To give us a backup secondary two targets to look for, we pretty well have to have an unorthodox location for that orange sand, although we're not really improving ourself at all in the brown sand by our move from orthodox.
- Q. Regarding the unorthodox, or I should say the compulsory pooling part of this case, what penalty do you recommend against non-consenting interest owners?
 - A. I recommend cost plus 200 percent.
 - Q. Is that based on geologic risk?
- 25 A. Yes, sir, a lot on geologic risk.

We've drilled three wells in the area and to some extent have not had the same zone in each well to date, so there is a lot of risk in it geologically.

There is also some mechanical risk in the area on the wells. Two of those three wells have had severe circulation problems in the upper Penn.

- Q. What is the approximate depth of these wells?
 - A. Approximately 10,300 feet.
- Q. Were Exhibits 8 through 10 prepared by you or under your direction?
 - A. Yes, sir, they were.
 - Q. In your opinion is the granting of this application in the interests of conservation and the prevention of waste?
- 18 A. Yes, sir, it is.
 - MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of Exhibits 8 through 10.
- EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 8 through
 22 10 will be admitted into evidence.

EXAMINATION

24 BY EXAMINER STOGNER:

5

6

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

19

20

23

25

Q. Is there any Wolfcamp production in

1 | this area?

A. Yes, sir. To the northwest of us in Sections 27 and 26 of 17. 27 is noted on the production study.

Wolfcamp wells would have penetrated the 7,000-foot limit that we set in building the map so that we could get it where you could see what was there that we were really dealing with.

- Q. Is that gas production from the Wolfcamp?
 - A. Yes, sir, it is.
- Q. Because that was essentially what your objective is is the base of the Abo to the Morrow and anything from the Wolfcamp down to the Morrow; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the possibility of some Atoka hopefully?
 - A. Atoka is very slim. There's one Atoka well in the area, which is in Section 3 of 18-27, and it's totally uneconomic. So that's really an untested pay zone in our Federal "T" well, which I assume you're looking at there on the cross-section.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any

1	questions of this witness? None.
2	You may be excused.
3	Anything further?
4	MR. STOVALL: Yes, Mr. Examiner. I
5	checked the rules, and I think we're okay as far
6	as that notice because, if I understand Mr.
7	Haden's testimony correctly, they are to the
8	north. And the people who received notice on the
9	13th are to the north and east. And for the
10	hearing, it requires the notice to be given to
11	people in the direction in which the
12	encroachment, which is to the south and west.
13	EXAMINER STOGNER: So you're telling me
14	I can take this case under advisement?
15	MR. STOVALL: So you can take it under
16	advisement.
17	EXAMINER STOGNER: Anything further?
18	MR. BRUCE: No, sir.
19	EXAMINER STOGNER: Case No. 10427 will
20	be taken under advisement then.
21	(The proceedings were concluded.)
2 2	
23	I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
2 4	the Examiner hearing of Control o
25	heard by me on 19 facunter 19 9/.
	Major 1
	Oil Conservation Division

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO 3 ss. COUNTY OF SANTA FE 5 I, Debbie Vestal, Certified Shorthand 6 Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that 7 the foregoing transcript of proceedings before 8 the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; 10 that I caused my notes to be transcribed under my 11 personal supervision; and that the foregoing is a 12 true and accurate record of the proceedings. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a 13 relative or employee of any of the parties or 14 15 attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of 16 this matter. 17 WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL DECEMBER 27, 18 19 1991. 20 21 22 23 DEBBIE VESTAL, RPR 24 NEW MEXICO CSR NO. 3