

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT  
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION  
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

17 October 1984

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of TXO Production Com-	CASE
pany for compulsory pooling, Lea	8383
County, New Mexico.	

BEFORE: Gilbert P. Quintana, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Oil Conservation	Jeff Taylor
Division:	Attorney at Law
	Legal Counsel to the Division
	State Land Office Bldg.
	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For the Applicant:

1  
2  
3 MR. QUINTANA: We will call  
4 next Case 8383.

5 MR. TAYLOR: The application of  
6 TXO Production Corporation for compulsory pooling, Lea  
7 County, New Mexico.

8 The applicant has requested  
9 that this case also be continued.

10 MR. QUINTANA: Case 8383 will  
11 be continued until October 31st, 1984.

12 (Hearing concluded.)  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY  
that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Con-  
servation Division was reported by me; that the said tran-  
script is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing,  
prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a complete record of the proceedings in  
the Examiner's hearing of Case No. 8383,  
heard by me on OCT. 17 1984.  
Gilbert P. Quintana Examiner  
Oil Conservation Division

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT  
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION  
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

31 October 1984

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of TXO Production Cor-	CASE
poration for compulsory pooling,	8383
Lea County, New Mexico.	

BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Oil Conservation	Jeff Taylor
Division:	Attorney at Law
	Legal Counsel to the Division
	State Land Office Bldg.
	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For the Applicant:	W. Thomas Kellahin
	Attorney at Law
	KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN
	P. O. Box 2265
	Santa Fe, New Mexico. 87501

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

DAVID M. HUNDLEY

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	3
Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner	12

JOHN TITTL

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	14
------------------------------------	----

E X H I B I T S

TXO Exhibit One, Plat	5
TXO Exhibit Two, Correspondence	8
TXO Exhibit Three, Memo	10
TXO Exhibit Four, AFE	11
TXO Exhibit Five, Production Map	15
TXO Exhibit Six, Contour Map	17
TXO Exhibit Seven, Contour Map	19
TXO Exhibit Eight, Contour Map	20
TXO Exhibit Nine, Cross Section	20

1  
2  
3 MR. STOGNER: We will now call  
4 Case Number 8383.

5 MR. TAYLOR: The application of  
6 TXO Production Corporation for a compulsory pooling, Lea  
7 County, New Mexico.

8 MR. KELLAHIN: If the Examiner  
9 please, I'm Tom Kellahin of Santa Fe, New Mexico, appearing  
10 on behalf of the applicant and I have two witnesses to be  
11 sworn.

12 MR. STOGNER: Are there any  
13 other appearances in this matter?

14 If not, will the witnesses  
15 please stand to be sworn?

16 (Witnesses sworn.)

17 DAVID M. HUNDLEY,  
18 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his  
19 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

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

24 A My name is David Hundley. I'm a landman  
25 for TXO Production Corp., Midland, Texas.

1  
2 Q Mr. Hundley, have you previously testi-  
3 fied before the Oil Conservation Division as a landman and  
4 had your qualifications accepted and made a matter of re-  
5 cord?

6 A Yes, I have.

7 Q Pursuant to your employment as a landman  
8 with TXO Production Corporation, have you made a study of  
9 the land matters that are relevant to this compulsory pool-  
10 ing application?

11 A Yes, I have.

12 Q Would you describe generally for the Exa-  
13 miner what TXO proposes to accomplish with this compulsory  
14 pooling application?

15 A TXO seeks an order pooling all the miner-  
16 al interests in the Drinkard and Strawn formations under-  
17 lying the east half southeast quarter, and all mineral in-  
18 terests in all other formations from the surface to 11,500  
19 feet underlying the northeast quarter southeast quarter of  
20 Section 33, Township 16 South, Range 37 East, Lea County,  
21 New Mexico.

22 Q In order to form the necessary spacing  
23 and proration units for the various pools involved in the  
24 application, Mr. Hundley, have there been interest owners  
25 that have as of today failed to agree to participate in the  
drilling of the well or otherwise made some agreement with  
TXO as the operator?

A Yes.

1  
2 Q And have you been in contact with, or at-  
3 tempted to notify those companies and individuals of TXO's  
4 application?

5 A Yes, we have.

6 MR. KELLAHIN: At this time,  
7 Mr. Stogner, we tender Mr. Hundley as an expert petroleum  
8 landman.

9 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Hundley is so  
10 qualified.

11 I'd to like to interject at  
12 this time, if I may, the docket and the advertisement both  
13 said the northeast half of the southeast quarter. This was  
14 a typographic error; fortunately, however, most people that  
15 read our ads understand our descriptions and we see no prob-  
16 lem with this having to readvertise and delaying the process  
17 any longer.

18 So we will continue .

19 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you.

20 Q Let me refer to Exhibit Number One, Mr.  
21 Hundley, which is the land plat, and have you simply ident-  
22 ify for us the east half of the southeast quarter of the  
23 section, and tell us generally where this property is lo-  
24 cated.

25 A Okay. The proposed location is the  
circle in red on the yellow colored tract, which is, of  
course, the east half of the southeast quarter of Section  
33, 16 South, 37 East.



1  
2 This is about a mile from the stateline  
3 to the east and we are several miles east of the City of  
4 Lovington.

5 Q In the event the operator is able to ob-  
6 tain production out of the Lovington Paddock Pool, what ac-  
7 reage would be dedicated to the well?

8 A The spacing for the Paddock formation is  
9 40 acres and for this well would be the northeast quarter of  
10 the southeast quarter, Section 33.

11 Q In the event the operator obtains produc-  
12 tion out of either the West Knowles Drinkard or the Casey  
13 Strawn Pools, what will be the acreage dedication to the  
14 well?

15 A The proration unit for both the Drinkard  
16 and Strawn formations is 80 acres and will be the east half  
17 of the southeast quarter of Section 33, or all of the ac-  
18 reage colored yellow on the exhibit.

19 Q All right. Mr. Hundley, do you have a  
20 copy of the amended application that was filed for the ap-  
21 plicant in this case?

22 A Yes, I do.

23 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin, the  
24 amended application that you're referring to --

25 MR. KELLAHIN: Was filed Sep-  
tember 28th, --

MR. STOGNER: Thank you, sir.

MR. KELLAHIN: -- 1984.

1  
2 Q Mr. Hundley, if you'll refer to page two  
3 of the amended application, all of the companies and indivi-  
4 duals named on page two and then going on to page three,  
5 will those companies' and individuals' interest change be-  
6 tween a 40-acre proration unit and an 80-acre proration  
unit?

7 A No, they will not.

8 Q When we go down the list of individuals  
9 and companies, Mr. Hundley, let's have you indicate for us  
10 what is the status with regards to those companies or indi-  
11 viduals participating in this well, starting off with Sun  
Oil Company?

12 A Okay. Sun Oil Company has agreed to  
13 lease to TXO.

14 Q All right, sir, Moncor?

15 A They've also decided to lease.

16 Q Shipp?

17 A Mr. Shipp's interest, we believe, is not  
18 applicable to this tract of land --

19 Q All right, sir.

20 A -- for further study.

21 Q Cleroy?

22 A Both Cleroy and Lanroy have agreed to  
lease.

23 Q McGinley?

24 A Mr. McGinley has not agreed to anything  
25 and requested that he be force pooled.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Q All right, and Sohio?

A Sohio, to be frank, could not make a decision in time and said go ahead and force pool us and we will try to participate before you drill the well.

Q All right. Petco?

A Petco did not want to lease or participate and asked to be force pooled.

Q All right. James Woods?

A Mr. Woods did not wish to participate, either.

Q Getty Oil?

A Getty Oil Company wishes to lease.

Q Felmont Oil?

A Felmont is like Mr. Shipp. We believe that they are not involved in this.

Q All right, Mr. Hundley, let's turn to Exhibit Number Two, which is a package of correspondence to the various parties to be subject to the pooling order, and if you'll simply identify for us the party, the date of the correspondence, and the purpose of your letter.

A Okay. The first one is a letter dated September 13th, 1984, to Cleroy, Inc., Lanroy, Inc., and J. R. McGinley, notifying them of the hearing, giving them the opportunity to lease or participate and also attached are the copies of the certified receipts.

With this letter we sent an Authority for Expenditure form should the addressee want to participate.

1  
2 Q And what, if any, response did you re-  
3 ceive from Mr. Cleroy or Lanroy, Inc.?

4 A Cleroy and Lanroy, Inc. have both signed  
5 oil and gas leases.

6 Mr. McGinley has elected not to lease.

7 Q Okay.

8 A Or participate.

9 Q All right, sir, let's go to the next let-  
10 ter, which is Sohio Petroleum.

11 A Okay, it's the same form letter dated  
12 September 13th, 1984, giving Sohio the opportunity to lease  
13 or participate and enclosing an AFE.

14 Q And you have attached to that the return  
15 receipt card indicating that Sohio has received the letter.

16 A Yes.

17 Q All right, and what, if any, response did  
18 you receive from Sohio?

19 A Sohio indicates a willingness to do some-  
20 thing but they asked that we go ahead and force pool their  
21 interest.

22 Q All right, sir, and the Petco, Limited,  
23 letter.

24 Q Petco, Limited's letter, the same date,  
25 on the same form with the certified receipts attached. Petco  
has repoded that they wish to be force pooled.

Q All right, sir, and finally, Mr. Woods.

A Another letter on the same form dated

1 September 13th, 1984, certified receipts. Mr. Woods has not  
2 responded to any of our correspondence and so he does not  
3 choose to lease or participate.

4 Q All right, Mr. Hundley, let's turn to  
5 what is marked as Applicant Exhibit Number Three and have  
6 you identify this document.

7 A This is an interoffice memorandum from  
8 TXO Production Corp. Accounting Department. It reflects the  
9 overhead rates that our Accounting Department has instructed  
10 us to use in preparation of operating agreements.

11 As you can see, on the left side of the  
12 page, various areas of operation that TXO's involved in.

13 In the middle of the page is the well  
14 depth and on the right side of the page is the -- are the  
15 rates we'd like to use beginning April 1, 1984, through  
16 March 31, 1985.

17 Q Is the Lea County, New Mexico property  
18 that's the subject of this case in the West Texas District?

19 A Yes, it is.

20 Q And would this be a well at a depth be-  
21 tween 4000 and 12,000 feet?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And what is the overhead charge you would  
24 propose to include, then, in the forced pooling order on a  
25 monthly basis while drilling and then during operations?

A The drilling well rate would be \$5,233.  
The operating or producing well rate would be \$524 per

1 month.

2  
3 Q Based upon your experience, Mr. Hundley,  
4 in your opinion is that a fair and reasonable rate to in-  
5 clude in the pooling order?

6 A Yes, it is.

7 Q All right, sir, let's turn then to Exhi-  
8 bit Number Four and have you identify that exhibit for us.

9 A Exhibit Number Four is an Authority for  
10 Expenditure, or AFE, for the drilling of the Carter F No. 1  
11 Well, to be located 1980 from the south and 660 from the  
12 east of Section 33, Township 16 South, Range 37 East, Lea  
13 County, New Mexico. The proposed total depth is 11,500  
14 feet.

15 Q Is this the proposed Authority for Expen-  
16 diture that has been circulated among the various parties  
17 involved in this well?

18 A Yes, it is.

19 Q And is it one that's been found accept-  
20 able by those parties?

21 A Several of the parties we've sent it to  
22 have signed it and returned it.

23 Q All right, sir, in your opinion is the  
24 Authority for Expenditures as estimated on this Exhibit Four  
25 fair and reasonable?

A Yes.

Q All right, sir. Mr. Hundley, when does  
TXO propose to commence the drilling of this well?

1  
2           A           Well, as soon as we would receive an or-  
3 der.

4           Q           All right. Do you have any time con-  
5 straints on you with regards to the commencement date in  
6 terms of expiring farmouts or any other kinds of scheduling  
7 problems, such as that?

8           A           Yes, we do. The majority of the inter-  
9 ests in this tract of land is being acquired on a farmout  
10 from Texaco, Inc., and the farmout will expire in January,  
11 1985.

12           Q           In order to hold the term of the farmout  
13 experience would you have to have a well drilling prior to  
14 the expiration of the farmout or must you have a completed  
15 well by the end of the farmout term?

16           A           Drilling.

17           Q           Were Exhibits One through Four compiled  
18 by you or prepared under your direction and supervision, Mr.  
19 Hundley?

20           A           Yes, they were.

21                       MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,  
22 that concludes my examination of Mr. Hundley.

23                       CROSS EXAMINATION

24           BY MR. STOGNER:

25           Q           Mr. Hundley, on Exhibit Number Three how  
were these figures -- how were these figures on all cases  
figured out on the overhead charges?

1  
2           A           Are you familiar with the COPAS attach-  
3 ment to operating agreements?

4           Q           Is that going to be submitted as part of  
5 the evidence today?

6           A           No, COPAS is an acronym for an accounting  
7 organization that sets out standards for the oil and gas in-  
8 dustry, and we attach, as do most other companies, an ac-  
9 counting procedure to our operating agreement that is pre-  
pared by or under the direction of COPAS.

10          Q           How thick is this COPAS?

11                   MR. KELLAHIN:   Mr. Examiner,  
12 we'll be happy to bring you a copy of the COPAS attachment  
13 this afternoon.

14                   It's a model form used by, I  
15 believe, virtually all operators in handling their account-  
16 ing procedures, one of the provisions of which includes the  
calculations of what we characterize as overhead.

17                   I'd be happy to submit one of  
18 those to you.

19                   MR. STOGNER:   Please do and we  
20 will just make that a part of Exhibit Number Three.

21                   MR. KELLAHIN:   All right, sir.

22          Q           Mr. Hundley, I'm somewhat confused also  
23 on your statements about the interest of Mr. Shipp and Fel-  
24 mont Oil Corporation. You have these on the list but you  
stated that they are not included in that. For what reason?

25          A           Okay. When we received the farmout



1  
2 agreement from Texaco, Texaco also allowed us to examine  
3 their title opinions which they had prepared on this tract  
4 of land. The title opinion was dated May of 1982.

5 Subsequent investigations into the title  
6 and curative work revealed that the interest of Mr. Shipp  
7 would not be applicable to forced pooling hearing, and the  
8 same with Felmont Oil Corporation.

9 Q Okay.

10 MR. STOGNER: I have no further  
11 questions of Mr. Hundley.

12 Are there any other questions  
13 of this witness? If not, he may be excused.

14 JOHN TITTL,  
15 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his  
16 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

19 Q Mr. Tittl, will you please state your  
20 name and occupation?

21 A My name is John Tittl. I'm a geologist  
22 for TXO Production Corporation in Midland, Texas.

23 Q Mr. Tittl, have you previously testified  
24 before the Oil Conservation Division as a geologist?

25 A Yes, sir, I have.

Q And pursuant to your employment as a geo-

1  
2       logist   have you made an examination of the various geologic  
3       and producing facts involved in this application?

4               A               Yes, sir.

5                               MR. KELLAHIN:   Mr. Examiner, we  
6       tender Mr. Tittl as an expert geologist.

7                               MR. STOGNER:   He is so quali-  
8       fied.

9               Q               Let me refer you, Mr. Tittl, to what we  
10       have marked as Applicant Exhibit Number Five and have you  
11       identify that for us.

12               A               Yes, sir.   That's a production map for  
13       approximately one mile, a one mile radius around our pro-  
14       posed drill location.

15                               It's been color coded as to production,  
16       starting shallow or going deeper, Paddock formation is  
17       colored in green and production is given in cumulative pro-  
18       duction of oil and gas over current production as of June or  
19       average daily rate as of March, 1984.

20                               Next is the Drinkard in pink and finally  
21       the Strawn in blue.

22               Q               The Paddock wells are spaced on 40 acres?

23               A               Yes, sir.

24               Q               And the Strawn and Drinkard are on 80  
25       acres.

              A               Uh-huh, that's correct.

              Q               All right, let me direct your attention  
              first of all to the Paddock wells, Mr. Tittl.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

If you'll look to the south in the Unit letter A of Section 4.

A Uh-huh.

Q There's a Mesa Petroleum Hightower well --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- with a dry hole symbol? Would you describe for us what that well, what formation that well penetrated?

A Yes, sir. The Mesa Hightower was drilled to the Drinkard and both the Paddock and Drinkard formations were tested with DST's. I've got the DST data.

Mesa decided after DSTing both of those formations that the well was uneconomic and thus it was plugged.

Q All right, sir, let's look to the north of the proposed location to the Texaco Carter Well and have you describe for us generally the quality of that well in all three of these pools.

A Yes, sir, the Texaco Carter Well was drilled recently to the Strawn formation as a west offset to the Casey Strawn Pool.

Upon completion, Texaco completed in the Strawn, made 565 barrels and the well went inactive. They could not make their production expectations and they plugged back to the Drinkard formation, which has cumed only 4000 barrels of oil and was making 6 barrels of oil a day.

1 It's almost a stripper rate.

2 Q All right, let's go to Exhibit Number  
3 Six, Mr. Tittl, and have you describe that one for us.

4 A All right. Exhibit Six is mapped on the  
5 top of the Paddock formation. You can see the Paddock pro-  
6 ducers are colored in green on here.

7 There are a number of significant wells  
8 on here.

9 The Mesa Hightower, earlier described on  
10 the letter A of Section 4, is a dry hole in the Paddock.

11 The Mesa Meyers No. 2, location C of Sec-  
12 tion 3, just to the east of there, was also dry in the Pad-  
13 dock, and the Texaco Carter, another significant well, as  
14 per this request, just north of the tract was not tested in  
the Paddock. Log analyses indicates it to be unproductive.

15 I can give DST data on this Mesa High-  
16 tower or the Mesa 2 Meyers in Section 3, but it would almost  
17 suffice to say neither one indicated a productive horizon in  
18 the Paddock.

19 Q As a geologist, Mr. Tittl, do you have an  
20 opinion with regards to the risk factor penalty percentage  
21 that ought to be included in the forced pooling order when  
22 we're discussing the possibility of a successful commercial  
well in the Paddock formation?

23 A Yes, sir, I believe we should receive the  
24 maximum penalty of 200 percent.

25 Q Upon what do you base that opinion?

1  
2           A           Well, the fact that the three wells I  
3 just mentioned, the two Mesa wells and the Texaco well, all  
4 are unproductive in the Paddock formation.

5                   The Mesa Petroleum Meyers Well has cumed  
6 38,000 barrels from the Paddock and I believe we would re-  
7 quire just a bit more oil from the Paddock to -- to meet our  
8 economics on that well, so there is quite a bit of risk.

9                   As you can see, we're going down dip from  
10 the main Paddock production which extends from the Cox wells  
11 in the north half of 33 back toward the west in the  
12 Lovington Paddock Pool.

13           Q           All right, sir, let me direct your  
14 attention to the Drinkard Pool now and have you identify for  
15 us and describe Exhibit Number Seven.

16           A           All right, Exhibit Number Seven is also  
17 mapped on the top of the Drinkard formation; contour  
18 interval 100 feet. The Drinkard producers are outlined in  
19 pink. A number of wells here also penetrated the Drinkard  
20 and proved to be unproductive.

21                   The two good examples again drilled to --  
22 for a Drinkard test were the Mesa Hightower, Letter A,  
23 Section 4, Mesa Meyers No. 2, Letter C, Section 3, and the  
24 Texaco Carter, which had been plugged back to the Drinkard  
25 and is proving to be uneconomic, having cumed only 4000  
barrels of oil.

                  The wells, the Hightower and the Mesa No.  
2 again were DST tested when drilled by Mesa and were quite  
tight.

1  
2 I've got a DST result on the C&K No. 1  
3 Shipp, which is 1980 south and west of Section 34, a real  
4 good well. It's cumed 314,000 barrels of oil in the Drinkard and the DST data from that well and the cumulative production suggest that these wells were dry and there was no  
5 bypass production, establishing a risk to the south and to  
6 the north of our location with an unproductive oil,  
7 seemingly unproductive cumulative production of the Texaco  
8 Carter.  
9

10 Q When you look at the Mesa Petroleum  
11 Meyers No. 1 Well in the far northwest quarter of Section 3,  
12 you find both a dry hole above and below the structural position of the Meyers No. 1 Well in the immediate offsets on  
13 each side.

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q In terms of assessing the penalty risk  
16 factor for purposes of the Drinkard production, Mr. Tittel,  
17 what is your opinion?

18 A I believe the Drinkard in there results,  
19 production results primarily from fractures, and the Mesa  
20 No. 1 Meyers has been completed in the Drinkard. It's only  
21 making 5 barrels of oil a day and now it's cumed 7000; quite  
22 uneconomic considering the depth to drill.

23 And the fractures are on the flank of  
24 this structure that are on the 42 -- -4200 contour and possibly the limited production may be explained by a very  
25 limited fracture system resulting in a small amount of poro-

1  
2 sity in that well and a lack of it in the two offsetting dry  
3 holes.

4 Q What percentage, then, concerning the  
5 risk factor penalty would you recommend for the Drinkard?

6 A Again I would like to ask for the 200  
7 percent penalty. Looking at our production map we see the  
8 best Drinkard wells are the four wells in the eastern area  
9 of Section 34; the C&K No. 2 Shipp in location M of Section  
10 34 has cumed 55,000 barrels of oil and is just barely economic by our corporation economics.

11 Q All right, sir, let's turn your attention  
12 now to the Strawn production and Exhibit Number Eight.

13 A All right. The Strawn map is again mapped  
14 on top of the Strawn. You can see most of the wells  
15 weren't drilled deep enough. There is three dry holes on  
16 the map, Getty Meyers, Section 33; Mesa No. 7, West Knowles,  
17 location G in 34 and location P in 34, also drilled by Mesa,  
18 No. 1 West Knowles.

19 Q In terms of assessing the penalty factor  
20 for the Strawn potential, Mr. Tittl, do you have an opinion  
21 as to that percentage?

22 A I'd like to ask for the maximum penalty  
23 in this case, also. This can be demonstrated most effectively  
24 by looking at the cross section, the next exhibit.

25 Q All right, let's go to Exhibit Number  
26 Nine.

27 A Okay, you can see this well goes between

1  
2 the best Strawn producer in the Casey Strawn Pool, the Mesa  
3 West Knowles No. 4, location B of 34. The well has cumed  
4 706,000 barrels of oil, 680-million cubic feet of gas, and  
5 it was making 320 barrels a day in March.

6 And you'll note the Texaco well, which  
7 was drilled in '82, the other side of the cross section.

8 This is hung stratigraphically on this  
9 Strawn marker at the base. You'll note the top of the  
10 Strawn is interpreted as an erosion horizon up here.

11 And what I'd like to demonstrate from  
12 this cross section is you see the perforations on the West  
13 Knowles Unit from 11,350, approximately, down to 11,400; the  
14 porosity indicated by the CNL-FDC log on here I think is  
15 correlative with the porosity perforated in the Texaco Lea  
16 Carter No. 1, correlating straight across.

17 This well was opened in all these zones,  
18 acidized, flowed some oil, 41 barrels of oil, eventually was  
19 IPed for pumping 43 barrels of oil a day, but it only cumed  
20 565 barrels of oil. It appears either, which is always pos-  
21 sible in a well, Texaco had a difficulty in their completion  
22 attempt, or just the porosity there has either been drained  
23 by the Casey Strawn Pool or the permeability is limited and  
24 would only surrender 500 barrels of oil to that wellbore.

25 Q Mr. Tittl, were Exhibits Five through  
Nine prepared by you?

A Yes, sir, they were.

Q In your opinion, Mr. Tittl, will approval



1  
2 of this application allow TXO to have an opportunity to pro-  
3 duce oil and gas that might not otherwise be produced?

4 A Yes, sir, I believe so.

5 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, we  
6 move the introduction of TXO's Exhibits One through Nine.

7 MR. STOGNER: Exhibits One  
8 through Nine will be admitted into evidence.

9 I have no questions of this  
10 witness.

11 Are there any further questions  
12 of Mr. Tittl? If not, he may be excused.

13 Mr. Kellahin, is there anything  
14 further that you have in this case?

15 MR. KELLAHIN: Just the submit-  
16 tal of the COPAS procedure and we'll do that, Mr. Examiner.

17 MR. STOGNER: Will that be done  
18 today sometime?

19 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes.

20 MR. STOGNER: Does anybody else  
21 have anything further in Case Number 8383?

22 If not, this case will be left  
23 open pending the receipt of the COPAS.

24  
25 (Hearing concluded.)

## C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY  
that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Con-  
servation Division was reported by me; that the said tran-  
script is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing,  
prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

Oct 3 8383  
84  
Michael E. Stagner  
Oil Conservation Division Examiner