

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION  
STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING  
STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
CASE NOS. 10807, 10808, 10809  
Consolidated Cases

IN THE MATTERS OF:

10807      The Application of Kinlaw Oil  
Corporation for a High Angle/  
Horizontal Directional Drilling Pilot  
Project, Special Operating Rules  
Therefor, a Non-Standard Oil Proration  
Unit, an Unorthodox Well Location,  
and a Special Project Oil Allowable,  
Lea County, New Mexico.

10808      The Application of Kinlaw Oil  
Corporation for a High Angle/  
Horizontal Directional Drilling Pilot  
Project and Special Operating Rules  
Therefor, Lea County, New Mexico.

10809      The Application of Kinlaw Oil  
Corporation for a High Angle/  
Horizontal Directional Drilling Pilot  
Project, Special Operating Rules  
Therefor, a Non-Standard Oil Proration  
Unit, an Unorthodox Well Location,  
and a Special Project Oil Allowable,  
Lea County, New Mexico.

BEFORE:

MICHAEL E. STOGNER

Hearing Examiner

State Land Office Building

Thursday, September 23, 1993

REPORTED BY:  
CARLA DIANE RODRIGUEZ  
Certified Court Reporter  
for the State of New Mexico

COPY

## A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION:

**ROBERT G. STOVALL, ESQ.**

General Counsel  
State Land Office Building  
Post Office Box 2088  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2088

FOR THE APPLICANT:

CAMPBELL, CARR, BERGE & SHERIDAN, P.A.

Post Office Box 2208  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208

BY: **WILLIAM F. CARR, ESQ.**

## I N D E X

## Page Number

Appearances

2

## WITNESSES FOR THE APPLICANT:

1. MICHAEL ROBERT HILL

Examination by Mr. Carr

5

Examination by Mr. Stogner

20

Certificate of Reporter

26

## E X H I B I T S

## Page Marked

Exhibit No. 1

9

Exhibit No. 2

13

Exhibit No. 3

14

Exhibit No. 4

14

Exhibit No. 5

16

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: At this time, I'll  
2 call Case No. 10807.

3 MR. SJOVALL: Application of Kinlaw Oil  
4 Corporation for a high-angle/horizontal  
5 directional drilling pilot project, special  
6 operating rules therefor, a non-standard oil  
7 proration unit, an unorthodox well location, and  
8 a special project oil allowable, Lea County, New  
9 Mexico.

10 EXAMINER STOGNER: Call for  
11 appearances.

12 MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner,  
13 my name is William F. Carr with the Santa Fe law  
14 firm Campbell, Carr, Berge & Sheridan. We  
15 represent Kinlaw Oil Corporation in this case,  
16 and I have one witness.

17 I would also request at this time that  
18 this case be consolidated, for purposes of  
19 hearing, with Case 10808 and 10809. These are  
20 also applications of Kinlaw for horizontal  
21 drilling. They immediately offset each other,  
22 and the testimony in these cases will be  
23 virtually identical.

24 EXAMINER STOGNER: If there are no  
25 objections, I'll call Cases 10808 and 10809 at

1 this time.

2 MR. STOVALL: Case No. 10808 is the  
3 application of Kinlaw Oil Corporation for a  
4 high-angle/horizontal directional drilling pilot  
5 project and special operating rules therefor, Lea  
6 County, New Mexico. Case No. 10809 is the  
7 application of Kinlaw Oil Corporation for a  
8 high-angle/horizontal directional drilling pilot  
9 project, special operating rules therefor, a  
10 non-standard oil proration unit, an unorthodox  
11 well location, and a special project oil  
12 allowable, Lea County, New Mexico.

13 EXAMINER STOGNER: I'll call for any  
14 additional appearances other than the Applicant  
15 Kinlaw in these matters at this time.

16 These cases will be consolidated for  
17 purposes of testimony. Mr. Carr.

18 **MICHAEL ROBERT HILL**

19 Having been first duly sworn upon his oath, was  
20 examined and testified as follows:

21 EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. CARR:

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

25 A. Michael Robert Hill.

1 Q. Mr. Hill, where do you reside?

2 A. In Austin, Texas.

3 Q. By whom are you employed and in what  
4 capacity?

5 A. Kinlaw Oil Corporation as petroleum  
6 geologist.

7 Q. Have you previously testified before  
8 this Division?

9 A. Yes, I have.

10 Q. At the time of that testimony, were  
11 your credentials as a petroleum geologist  
12 accepted and made a matter of record?

13 A. Yes, they were.

14 Q. Are you familiar with the applications  
15 filed on behalf of Kinlaw in each of these cases?

16 A. Yes, I am.

17 Q. Are you familiar with the proposed  
18 horizontal drilling for each of the wells in the  
19 subject area?

20 A. Yes, I am.

21 MR. CARR: Mr. Stogner, are the  
22 witness's qualifications acceptable?

23 MR. STOGNER: They are.

24 Q. Mr. Hill, would you briefly state what  
25 Kinlaw seeks in each of these cases?

1           A.       Kinlaw seeks approval to horizontally  
2 directionally drill the following wells: V.F.  
3 Petroleum Huber, State No. 1, the Shell Oil  
4 Company SDA No. 1, the Shell SDA No. 2, by  
5 reentering an existing borehole and kicking off  
6 the top of Devonian and drilling approximately  
7 500 to 700 feet lateral to the top of Devonian.

8           Q.       Is Kinlaw seeking exemptions from  
9 existing Division well location requirements?

10          A.       At this time we are not. We hope to  
11 not be needing exemptions, but it's going to  
12 depend on where our bottomhole locations fall  
13 after running gyro surveys on these reentry  
14 wells.

15          Q.       So you'll reenter, drill out the plugs,  
16 things of that nature, and then survey?

17          A.       That's correct.

18          Q.       That will affect where the actual  
19 terminus of the horizontal portion of the well is  
20 actually located?

21          A.       That's correct.

22          Q.       Are you seeking an exemption from the  
23 acreage dedication requirements?

24          A.       Once again, at this time, we hope not  
25 to need that, but it's going to depend on where

1 the bottomhole location falls.

2 Q. On two of the wells, the Huber and the  
3 Shell SDA No. 1, you're proposing 80-acre units,  
4 is that correct?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. If you're able to keep the wellbores on  
7 the 40 acres on which the hole was actually  
8 located, you won't need those additional 40-acre  
9 tracts, is that right?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. You're not seeking a special oil  
12 allowable for these wells?

13 A. Not at this time.

14 Q. Mr. Hill, you, in fact, testified four  
15 weeks ago in Case 10806, did you not?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. That was the case in which Kinlaw was  
18 seeking authority to horizontally drill its New  
19 Mexico "N" No. 1 well?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. Could you advise the Examiner what's  
22 happened since that time to the New Mexico "N"  
23 No. 1?

24 A. Since that time, we received permission  
25 to reenter that well. We reentered to a



1 depth of approximately 9700 feet and, after  
2 attempting a squeeze job on some perms at that  
3 depth, we were coming back into the hole and  
4 found that the casing had parted in both the  
5 9-5/8 and the 13-5/8" casing. So, at that time,  
6 a decision was made to replug this well.

7 Q. And that has been done?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. The Commission has approved the  
10 plugging program?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. Let's go to what has been marked Kinlaw  
13 Exhibit No. 1. I would ask you to identify and  
14 review this for Mr. Stogner.

15 A. This is an outline, in yellow, of the  
16 acreage that Kinlaw currently has under lease  
17 with the location of the wells that we plan to  
18 reenter.

19 Q. Could you briefly identify the three  
20 wells which are involved in this hearing, and  
21 then point out the acreage which will be  
22 dedicated to those wells?

23 A. The well that we are attempting to  
24 reenter first and foremost will be the V.F.  
25 Petroleum Huber State No. 1, which is located in

1 the northeast quarter of Section 5. It's  
2 designated by a dry hole symbol.

3 The other well would be the No. 1 SDA,  
4 which is in the southwest quarter of the  
5 southwest section of 36. The 80 acres that we  
6 might need on that well would be the southwest of  
7 the southwest of 36, and the southeast of the  
8 southeast of 35.

9 Going back to the V.F. Petroleum well,  
10 the 80 acres that we might need to designate on  
11 that well would be that stand-up 80 on the east  
12 half of the northeast quarter of Section 5.

13 The third well would be the Shell Oil  
14 SDA No. 2, which is in the southeast quarter of  
15 the southwest quarter of Section 36, and that  
16 would be just a 40-acre designation.

17 Q. Now, Mr. Hill, the Huber well in  
18 Section 5, is an unorthodox location, is that  
19 correct?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. That location has been previously  
22 approved by the Division?

23 A. That's correct.

24 MR. CARR: Mr. Examiner, that location  
25 was approved in Case 7173, and it was Order No.

1 R-6608, February 25, 1981.

2 Q. Mr. Hill, is there other Devonian  
3 development within a mile of these wells?

4 A. No, there is not.

5 Q. Are there unleased minerals in the area  
6 that we're talking about?

7 A. Yes, there are.

8 Q. Are those State of New Mexico  
9 properties?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. Have you reviewed this proposal with  
12 the New Mexico State Land Office?

13 A. Yes, we have. We talked to a Mr.  
14 Albers at the State Land Office. He had no  
15 objection, and stated that we would need a  
16 commercial lease on state-owned surface  
17 underneath this acreage.

18 Q. In fact, he wrote Mr. Stogner with that  
19 recommendation, did he not?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. Does Kinlaw have any objection to the  
22 orders that result from this hearing requiring  
23 that, where needed, Kinlaw will obtain business  
24 leases from the New Mexico State Land Office?

25 A. No, we don't.

1 Q. Is the acreage you propose to dedicate  
2 to the wells, actually state land?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q. What is the status of the royalty  
5 ownership in this area?

6 A. The royalty ownership is all the same,  
7 identical under each tract.

8 Q. Is the working interest all in Kinlaw  
9 at this time?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. What is the current status of the  
12 development on each of these tracts?

13 A. At the present time, there is no  
14 current development except for the V.F. Petroleum  
15 well, which we did receive permission to reenter  
16 and we are, at the present time, attempting to  
17 drill out the plugs.

18 Q. Why don't we describe just briefly the  
19 general characteristics of the formation. You  
20 did this four weeks ago and so I don't think you  
21 don't need to go into particular detail, but I  
22 think it would be useful, at this point, just to  
23 summarize the characteristics of the Devonian in  
24 this area.

25 A. The Devonian is a shallow water

1 carbonate, consisting of a dense, crystalline  
2 dolomite, very little primary porosity. It does  
3 exhibit good secondary porosity in the way of  
4 fractures and vugs.

5 Q. Let's go to Exhibit No. 2. Would you  
6 identify that, please.

7 A. Exhibit No. 2 is a structure map on the  
8 top of Devonian. It basically shows anticlinal  
9 feature bounded by three faults, with the apex of  
10 the structure in and around the Kelly State No. 1  
11 at a subsea of minus 9079.

12 The three wells in question here are  
13 the V.F. Petroleum well, which has a subsea of  
14 minus 9101, and the Shell SDA No. 1 which is a  
15 minus 9179, and the SDA No. 2, which is the  
16 lowest of the three, at a minus 9328.

17 Q. Actually these are at the top of  
18 structure, are they not?

19 A. Two out of the three are. There is a  
20 SDA No. 2 is not the lowest well in the  
21 structure, but it is about the third.

22 Q. If you horizontally drill all these  
23 wells, what order would you anticipate taking  
24 them in?

25 A. Well, we would drill this V.F.

1     Petroleum well first, the SDA No. 1, and then the  
2     SDA No. 2.

3             Q.     Let's move now to Exhibit No. 3, the  
4     isopach.     Would you review that for Mr. Stogner?

5             A.     Exhibit 3 is a net pay isopach of the  
6     Devonian.     It's showing a range of 109 feet of  
7     net pay, on the low end; up to 411 feet of net  
8     pay on the high end.

9             The V.F. Petroleum Huber State well has  
10     approximately 389 feet of net pay, the Shell SDA  
11     No. 1 has 311 feet, and the SDA No. 2 has 162  
12     feet of net pay.

13            Q.     From a geological perspective, is this  
14     a good candidate for a horizontal drain hole?

15            A.     Yes, it is.

16            Q.     You wouldn't see any problem in being  
17     able to keep the wellbore within the Devonian  
18     formation?

19            A.     No, we do not.

20            Q.     Let's go to Exhibit No. 4, and I would  
21     ask you to review that for the Examiner.

22            A.     Exhibit No. 4 is a cumulative  
23     production map of the wells in the South Devonian  
24     field, with a well-by-well cumulative underneath  
25     each well.

1           Q.       What is really your hope with this  
2 horizontal program?

3           A.       With this horizontal program, we hope  
4 to go in and recover reserves that have been left  
5 behind by virtually drilling this formation.

6           Q.       If you are successful with the Huber  
7 well, do you have an idea as to how soon you might  
8 be reentering other wells?

9           A.       Within, I would say, three to six  
10 months of the Huber State.

11          Q.       Huber State has a dry hole symbol. Why  
12 is that?

13          A.       The Huber State was drilled as an  
14 infill well in approximately 1981. The well  
15 tested free oil with no water on a drill stem  
16 test. At the time the well was drilled, there  
17 was only one other well which was producing in  
18 the field, which was the highest well in the  
19 field, and that well was producing in the range  
20 of 3,000 barrels of water a day and a hundred  
21 barrels of oil.

22                 Once a decision was made to run pipe on  
23 the Huber State, after having a water-free drill  
24 stem test, the well was acidized and only  
25 recovered a small amount of oil. We feel like it

1 has to do with the way the Kelly State, or the  
2 highest most well in the field was being pulled  
3 at the time, and also had to do with the type of  
4 acid job they did on it.

5 Q. What conclusions can you reach from  
6 your geologic study of this area?

7 A. We feel like we have a small Devonian  
8 field which is well-suited for horizontal  
9 drilling. We believe we can adequately drain  
10 left-behind reserves from this reservoir.

11 Q. Let's go to Kinlaw Exhibit No. 5. Can  
12 you identify that, please?

13 A. Exhibit 5 is the wellbore diagram of  
14 the V.F. Petroleum Huber State No. 1. It  
15 basically shows what we're going to attempt to do  
16 on this well. This well has 12-3/4" surface  
17 casing set at 282 feet. The 8-5/8 casing was  
18 shot off at approximately 251 feet.

19 Initially, we'll attempt to tie back  
20 into this 8-5/8 casing, drill out the plugs No. 3  
21 and 4 on the diagram. At that point, we will  
22 move in a drilling rig and drill out test casing  
23 and drill out plugs 5, 6 and 7, and attempt to  
24 tie into 5-1/2 at 11,008 feet.

25 If that proves unsuccessful, at that



1 time we will sidetrack the 5-1/2" casing that's  
2 currently in this well, and drill new hole back  
3 down to the top of Devonian and kickoff there at  
4 a short radius.

5 Q. At what depth do you anticipate kicking  
6 off in the Devonian formation in this well?

7 A. We anticipate kicking off approximately  
8 12,915 feet.

9 Q. It might be slightly shallower than  
10 that if you have trouble tying into that lower  
11 string?

12 A. That's correct. It could be anywhere  
13 between 12,878 and 12,915.

14 Q. That would be in the Devonian?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. What would be the kickoff depths in the  
17 State SDA 1 and 2?

18 A. The SDA No. 1 kickoff point would be at  
19 12,958. The SDA No. 2 would be at 13,110.

20 Q. Now, as to the horizontal drilling  
21 portion of the hole, will Kinlaw be using the  
22 identical procedure that was reviewed on August  
23 the 26th by Mr. Dave Phillips in Case 10806?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. You will be using a small-angle

1 horizontal radius, and staying within the  
2 Devonian?

3 A. That's correct.

4 MR. CARR: Mr. Stogner, at this time we  
5 would request that the testimony of David  
6 Phillips in Case 10806, presented on August 26th,  
7 be incorporated into the record of this  
8 proceeding.

9 EXAMINER STOGNER: The record in Case  
10 10806 will be incorporated at this time in this  
11 consolidated matter.

12 Q. Mr. Hill, do you anticipate that the  
13 acreage dedicated to each of these wells will, in  
14 fact, be drained by the wells, if they are  
15 successful?

16 A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. Do you anticipate any excessive  
18 drainage from offsetting tracts?

19 A. No, I do not.

20 Q. In fact, if there was, it would still  
21 be tracts that have identical ownership with the  
22 dedicated acreage, is that right?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. If the wells are successful, do you  
25 have a guess or a hope as to how long they might

1 be able to produce?

2 A. We're anticipating seven to 10 years.

3 Q. At the conclusion of the drilling, as  
4 well as after you drill out the plugs, will you  
5 be running a directional survey on each of the  
6 wells?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. Will copies of these surveys be  
9 provided to the Oil Conservation Division?

10 A. Yes, they will.

11 Q. How soon does Kinlaw hope to commence  
12 this effort?

13 A. As soon as we're authorized to do so.

14 MR. CARR: Mr. Stogner, I have prepared  
15 proposed orders in these cases, and I have them  
16 on floppy disk, but Mr. Hill this morning pointed  
17 out some errors in footages. I'll have them  
18 revised, and we'll submit them to you later  
19 today, if that's all right with you.

20 EXAMINER STOGNER: That would be good.  
21 I appreciate that.

22 Q. Now, Mr. Hill, in your opinion, will  
23 approval of each of these applications be in the  
24 best interest of conservation, the prevention of  
25 waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

1           A.       Yes, they will.

2           Q.       If these applications are granted and  
3 the wells are successful, will oil be recovered  
4 that otherwise will be left in the ground?

5           A.       Yes, it will.

6           Q.       Were Exhibits 1 through 5 prepared by  
7 you?

8           A.       Yes, they were.

9                   MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Stogner,  
10 we move the admission of Kinlaw Exhibits 1  
11 through 5.

12                   EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 1 through 5  
13 will be admitted into the record at this time.

14                   MR. CARR: That concludes my direct  
15 examination of Mr. Hill

16                               EXAMINATION

17 BY EXAMINER STOGNER:

18           Q.       Mr. Hill, in your conversations with  
19 the State Land Office, was the matter discussed  
20 of the first well, I'm referring to the one in  
21 Case 10807, in which you're proposing to dedicate  
22 perhaps 80 acres, a portion of Section 36 and a  
23 portion of Section 35, their concern that that's  
24 two different leases?

25           A.       Yes, they did mention that there was

1 some concern there. They said if we could get  
2 approval through this hearing, that that would be  
3 okay with them that we did what we're talking  
4 about.

5 Q. If it was approved at this level, what  
6 would the State Land Office require of Kinlaw to  
7 communitize or whatever had to be done to connect  
8 those two 40s?

9 A. They really didn't tell us.

10 MR. CARR: Mr. Stogner, we would have  
11 to communitize the state leases. I have been  
12 involved in those discussions with them. If the  
13 surface is a state surface, a business lease  
14 would be required, they said.

15 Q. Mr. Hill, since I don't have the record  
16 in front of me in Case 10806, even though we  
17 incorporated those, can you enlighten me again  
18 what the maximum horizontal distance you're  
19 hoping that can be accomplished with this type of  
20 short radius horizontal drilling?

21 A. Approximately 700 feet.

22 Q. That will be max?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Now, should the well in Case 10807 not  
25 reach that maximum 700 foot horizontal extension

1 but, in fact, stop short of Section 35, then  
2 you're proposing only a 40-acre proration unit be  
3 dedicated?

4 A. That's correct. As I stated earlier,  
5 it would depend on where the bottomhole location  
6 falls. And if it's actually a little bit closer  
7 to Section 35 than where the surface hole  
8 location was staked, we would need to go over  
9 there into the other 40 acres.

10 Q. Have you taken a reading or do you know  
11 about what the natural drift of those old  
12 original vertical wells were, and what direction?

13 A. If I can recall correctly, I believe  
14 the one that we looked at initially had around  
15 five to six degrees of deviation; but, in what  
16 direction, I'm not sure. I believe there was  
17 around 300-and-some-odd feet total.

18 Of course, it was done by a single  
19 shot, and it didn't give the exact bottomhole  
20 location. It would depend on whether all that  
21 deviation was in one direction or whether it was  
22 going a number of different directions.

23 Q. Now, let's refer to the well in Case  
24 10809. That's your Huber State Well No. 1 or the  
25 Huber State Well No. 1.

1           There again, the same mechanics of your  
2 proposed horizontal drilling would be set a  
3 hundred foot max, is that true?

4           A.     That's correct.

5           Q.     And you're proposing to go in a  
6 southern direction and connect the two, I call  
7 them Lots 1 and 8, being that shaded area on your  
8 Exhibit No. 1 in Section 5, is that correct?

9           A.     That's correct.

10          Q.     According to my calculations, that 700  
11 foot wouldn't even connect that 40-acre portion  
12 to the south?

13          A.     That's correct. At that time, it would  
14 depend on what type of allowable we needed and so  
15 forth. That's the main reason for going for 80s  
16 on that particular well. If we needed to come  
17 back and request a larger allowable, we might  
18 need to incorporate those two 40-acre units.

19          Q.     Our policy is, if you connect the two  
20 with the horizontal portion, then you're entitled  
21 to that, but if you're just drilling toward it,  
22 that doesn't entitle you to that other 40. Are  
23 you proposing that you're requesting this just to  
24 get a higher allowable, but not actually  
25 connecting the two 40s?

1           A.       No. My understanding was that we would  
2       have to have two 40-acre proration units in order  
3       to get a higher allowable, and at this point  
4       we're not asking for one but I said, in the  
5       future, if we needed to, we might need to add  
6       those two.

7           Q.       Why would you need a higher allowable?

8           A.       At this time we don't know. We would  
9       have to drill the well, potential it, and see  
10      what draw-down pressures we were getting from  
11      producing this well, and checking bottomhole  
12      pressures, so on and so forth. We felt like we  
13      weren't hurting the reservoir, producing it at a  
14      higher than the depth bracket allowable, and at  
15      some point we might request a higher allowable.

16          Q.       What is that depth bracket allowable at  
17      the present time?

18          A.       It's around 430 barrels a day.

19          Q.       I know you're hoping for that, but are  
20      you anticipating it being over 430?

21          A.       Not at this time. That's why we're not  
22      currently requesting it.

23          Q.       There again, with our policy, the same  
24      restriction on Case 10809 would be put or set or  
25      written in as in 10807. It's possible that you



1 could connect the two, and that's what you're  
2 requesting today, and, if an order is issued,  
3 we'll stipulate that.

4 However, if the two actual 40s are not  
5 connected, then you would not be entitled to hold  
6 the two 40-acre tracts, and only that one 40-acre  
7 tract could be written in or incorporated. And  
8 then, once the well is drilled or once the survey  
9 is established, then the proration unit could  
10 then be, how would you say, set, or drawn, or set  
11 out, whatever the case may be.

12 EXAMINER STOGNER: I have no other  
13 questions of Mr. Hill at this time. Are there  
14 any other questions, Mr. Carr?


15 MR. CARR: We have nothing further in  
16 this case, Mr. Stogner.

17 EXAMINER STOGNER: Does anybody else  
18 have anything further in Cases 10807, 10808 or  
19 10809?

20 Then these cases will be taken under  
21 advisement.

22 (And the proceedings concluded.)

23  
24 I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
25 a complete record of the proceedings at  
the Examiner hearing of Cases Nos. 10807, 10808, 10809  
heard by me on 23 Sept. 1993

  
Oil Conservation Division

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER.

2  
3 STATE OF NEW MEXICO )  
4 COUNTY OF SANTA FE ) ss.  
5

6 I, Carla Diane Rodriguez, Certified  
7 Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY  
8 that the foregoing transcript of proceedings  
9 before the Oil Conservation Division was reported  
10 by me; that I caused my notes to be transcribed  
11 under my personal supervision; and that the  
12 foregoing is a true and accurate record of the  
13 proceedings.

14 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a  
15 relative or employee of any of the parties or  
16 attorneys involved in this matter and that I have  
17 no personal interest in the final disposition of  
18 this matter.

19 WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL September 30,  
20 1993.  
21

22  
23   
24 CARLA DIANE RODRIGUEZ, RPR  
25 CCR No. 4