1 2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
3	22 November 1988
5	EXAMINER HEARING
6	
7 8	IN THE MATTER OF:
9	Application of Standard Oil Product- CASE ion Company for compulsory pooling, 9534
10	Lea County, New Mexico.
11	
12	
13	BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner
14	
16	
17	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
18	
19	APPEARANCES
20 21	For the Division: Robert G. Stovall Attorney at Law
22	Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico
23 24 25	For Standard Oil Production Scott Hall Company: Attorney at Law CAMPBELL and BLACK, P. A. P. O. Box 2208
	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

			2	
1				
2		I N D E X		
3				
4	JAMES D.	SIKES		
5		Direct Examination by Mr. Hall	3	
		Cross Examination by Mr.	12	
'				
3				
·		EXHIBITS		
0				
1	Standard	Exhibit One, Plat	4	
2	Standard	Exhibit Two, C-102 Form	4	
3	Standard	Exhibit Three, List	5	
4	Standard	Exhibit Four, AFE	7	
5	Standard	Exhibit Five, Correspondence	8	
5	Standard	Exhibit Six, Affidavit	11	
7				
3				
9				
0				
'				
2				
23				
24				
5				

3 1 MR. STOGNER; We'll call next 2 Case Number 9534, which is the application of Standard Oil 3 Production Company for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico. 5 At this time I'll call for 6 appearances. 7 Mr. Examiner, Scott MR.HALL: 8 Hall from the Campbell & Black law firm on behalf cf the 9 applicant, with one witness this morning. 10 MR. STOGNER: Are there any 11 other appearances? 12 Will the witness please stand 13 and be sworn? 14 15 (Witness sworn.) 16 17 Mr. Hall. 18 19 JAMES D. SIKES, 20 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his 21 oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 22 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. HALL: 25 For the record please state your name Q

1 I'm Α James D. Sikes and I live in 2 Houston, Texas. 3 Mr. Sikes, who do you work for and in Q 4 what capacity? 5 Α Standard Oil Production Company 6 landman. 7 Q And you previously testified before the 8 Examiner and your credentials accepted? 9 Α I have. 10 And are you familiar with the subject Q 11 application and the proposed well? 12 Α I am. 13 MR. HALL: Mr. Examiner, are 14 the witness' credentials acceptable today? 15 MR. Mr. Sikes is so STOGNER: 16 qualified. 17 Briefly, would you please summarize what Q 18 it is Standard Oil seeks by this application? 19 We are asking to pool the interests in a 20 spacing, standard spacing unit under statewide rules, which 21 would be an exploratory test for a Strawn well in Section 8 22 of 17, 38. There are just a few small interests that are 23 outstanding that have not been accounted for that we would 24 like to pool at this time.

Q All right. Let's look at Exhibits One

25

and Two. I would note for the record Exhibit One is marked on the back. What do Exhibits One and Two reflect?

A Exhibit One is a photocopy of a map prepared by Midland Map Company showing the Section 8 and, more specifically, a proration unit in -- outlined in red there in the northeast quarter, northwest of the northeast, specifically.

Q All right, let's look at Exhibit Two. What does it show?

A It shows -- now this is a C-102 form prepared by John West Surveyors, which shows the location of the well but you will note that we have noted a revision there that we are having the surface location resurveyed due to a technical change of location.

Q All right, and what would your bottom hole location for the well be?

A Our bottom hole location for the well will -- is -- we're trying to get 660 from the north line and 1980 from the east line, and by moving the well south 200 feet our drilling department feels it can take advantage of the north directional drift that occurs in this area.

Q All right, and your objective is the Strawn formation, is that correct?

A It is.

Q Let's look at Exhibit Three, please, sir. Would you identify that for the examiner?

A This is a list of the outstanding interests that we are attempting to pool here. You can see that there are a total of five interests, three which we have had contact with and two which are interests that are lost to the title.

Q Explain what you mean "lost to title".

A Well, the interests appear in the records, the county of Lea County, but the last time of any evidence of they're being in the records is 1933. There were no addresses, no forwarding addresses. We have been unable to locate these interests whatsoever.

Q All right, and attached to Exhibit Three is a further breakout of interest. Would you briefly summarize for the examiner which interests are committed to the well and which are to be pooled?

The first page is the interests that are to be pooled and then the second two pages are interests which have been leased by Standard Oil Production Company and also by Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, which both have joined in the drilling of this well.

Q All right. Subsequent to the creation of the first page of Exhibit Three, has the ownership of any of those interests changed at all?

A It has. At the time we sent out notices, which was at least 20 days prior to this date, the list shown on -- as page one of Exhibit Three was as we believed it was.

Since then, most recently within the last week, we've discovered that the interest owned by Nell Beal Kimball has been leased to TXO Production Corporation. That lease did go of record the day before we sent out notice but at that time we did not know that they had executed a lease.

The Nell Beal Kimball interest had been negotiating with Standard Oil Production Company and had given a verbal agreement to giving us a lease; therefor, because we had not received the lease we decided it would be best to pool them in this interest, pool them in this hearing, but now that we have discovered they have leased with another party, we would like to omit them, omit that interest from this pooling.

Q And if I understand you correctly, TXO has not been afforded notice of this pooling proceeding, have they?

A No, they haven't. It's Standard Oil Production Company's wishes to, because this interest is such a small interest and because of the time involved in us getting this well drilled as quickly as possible, to

8 1 just carry that interest. 2 Have you spoken with anyone at TXO? 3 Α No, we haven't. All right, do you expect to in the Q 5 future? 6 Yes, we do. A 7 MR. HALL: And at this point, 8 Mr. Examiner, I would point out that we will undertake to provide notice of this proceeding to TXO and would antici-10 pate that would require keeping the hearing open in this 11 matter until they've been afforded an opportunity to come 12 in and either join the well or oppose the application. 13 MR. STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. 14 Hall. Please continue. 15 Let's look at Exhibit Four briefly, if Q 16 you'd identify that and explain what that's intended to 17 reflect. 18 This is Standard Oil Production Com-Α 19 pany's schedule of estimated and actual well cost, our AFE. 20 Q All right, why don't you review the 21 totals on there? 22 You can see on the back side, completed Α 23 well costs of \$714,700; dry hole cost, \$445,800. 24 Q Do you believe these costs to be in line 25 with what's being charged for like wells in the area?

A Yes, we do.

Q Let's look at Exhibit Five, if you would, and please summarize for the examiner what efforts you've made to seek the voluntary joinder of the pooled parties.

These are -- this is correspondence and copies of a lease that we sent to Ray F. Tissue, Jr., and Miss Dorothy Jane Tissue. If you go as far as reading the first paragraph, you can see that we had also verbal agreement from them that they would give Standard Oil Production Company a lease based on the terms indicated there.

We have since not been able to locate either of the Tissue parties. They've both relocated. The addresses that we sent notice to are last known addresses and they have never since deposited the drafts or forwarded us executed lease as we anticipated.

Therefor, we needed to pool their interests also.

Q All right, if you'll look at the last attachment to Exhibit Five, there's an affidavit addressing the Renoncourt and Balbaud interests. What -- summarize what happened with respect to those interests.

A This is an affidavit signed by Michael

J. Bennett. who is a contract lease broker that Standard

Oil employs. He basically states his qualifications as a

lease broker and then explains what process he went through to locate these interests and the circumstances of how these interests came up in title, and it addresses each interest one by one and you can see that -- the recording information, where they appear is there and that is the last evidence of these interests being of record.

Q All right. So in your opinion has Standard made a good faith effort to secure voluntary joinder of all the pooled parties?

A Yes, we have.

Q Has Standard drilled other Strawn wells in the immediate area?

A Yes, we have.

Q Are you prepared to make a recommendation to the Examiner as to the risk penalty that should be imposed against the nonconsenting interest owners?

A Yes. We believe that the risk should be assessed at 200 percent maximum penalty.

Q And what do you base that on?

A Due to the depth of the well and the cost of this test and the fact that this is a wildcat well with Strawn production being greater than 2-1/2 miles form this location, we believe that the risk of this well, and have summarized within our company, to be 30 percent for a break even probability of success.

1 Because of that we think the highest 2 allowable penalty would applicable. 3 All right, and has Standard made an 4 estimate of the overhead and administrative costs while 5 drilling and producing the well? 6 Yes, we have. Α 7 And what are those? Q 8 Α For drilling we used 6520 a month and 9 for producing, \$652 a month. 10 And have you -- are these charges also 11 in line with what's being charged in the area? 12 Yes, they are. A 13 And does Standard seek to be designated 0 14 operator of the well? 15 Α Yes, we do. 16 Q Is Standard requesting an expedited or-17 der for this well? 18 A We are. 19 And for what reason? Q 20 Our joinder by TXO -- or not by TXO, by Α 21 Anadarko Production Company, who owns approximately 23 per-22 cent of the leasehold in this tract, is contingent on us 23 drilling the well this year. Likewise, Standard Oil Pro-24 duction Company for budgetary reasons needs to drill this 25 well this year in order to see that a well does, in fact,

12 1 get drilled. 2 Without the 23 percent joinder of 3 Anadarko, and without our current 1988 budget fund, it's likely that we would be hard pressed to drill this well. 5 All right. Mr. Sikes, in your opinion Q 6 will the granting of this application be in the best in-7 terests of conservation, the prevention of waste, and 8 protection of correlative rights? 9 Yes, it will. Α 10 Q Let me show you what's been marked as 11 Exhibit Six. Is Exhibit Six a copy of the affidavit you've 12 directed your counsel to send out to the affected interest 13 owners? 14 It is. Α 15 Were Exhibits One through Six prepared Q 16 by you or at your direction? 17 Α Yes, they were. 18 MR. HALL: We'd move the ad-19 mission of Exhibits One through Six. 20 Do you have anything further you wish to Q 21 add? 22 Α Not at this time. 23 MR. HALL: That concludes our

MR.

STOGNER:

Exhibits One

24

25

direct.

13 1 through Six will be admitted into evidence at this time. 2 3 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. STOGNER: 5 Mr. Sikes, what was that overhead Q 6 charges again? 7 For a drilling rate it's \$6520 and \$652 Α 8 for a producing rate. 9 The way our company --10 Q Okay, hold it, 620 -- I'm sorry, that's 11 6520? 12 Α Yes. 13 And 652? Q 14 Α Yes. 15 Okay, please continue. Q 16 Our company uses figures that are in Α 17 line with major oil company overhead rates for this depth 18 and this particular part of the country. 19 And what depth are we talking about? 20 11,550. Α 21 For an oil well or a gas well, or both? Q 22 Α It would designated as an oil well but 23 all of the oil wells that we have drilled out there are --24 have gas production. 25 Have all the parties that have agreed to Q

join you, what kind of figures are they being charged?

A They are charged the same rate. Basically, Anadarko Production Company and Standard Oil Production own approximately 98-1/2 percent of the leasehold and Anadarko Production Company has agreed to our overhead rates and they are fairly in line with other operating agreements that we've signed with other operators in the area.

Q And how about some of the interest owners in this particular area, the smaller interest owners?

A Well, there are no unleased interest owners other than those that we're naming in the pooling.

Q Are you familiar with the Ernst and Whinney surveys?

A Vaguely.

Q Okay. You'll become more familiar with them.

Okay. Let's take a look at 200 percent risk. Now you were saying that a 200 percent risk you based on the depth and the cost of a test down to the Strawn and you suggested that the nearest Strawn production was what?

A Okay, Standard Oil is not drilling this well for any other objective other than the Strawn at this

15 time. 2 Q So at this time can we narrow it from 3 surface to the base of the Strawn to just the Strawn That's what you're telling me, right? formation? 5 That's -- that's true, however --Α 6 Okay, then we'll limit it to the Strawn Q 7 at this time. 8 Α -- when -- every well that we have 9 drilled in this area so far we penetrate the Atoka as a 10 marker bed. 11 But you don't wish those to be in the 12 pooling provision, is that correct? 13 Α We have no plans to complete in the 14 Atoka, so our application is to the base of the Strawn; 15 however, we will probably penetrate the Atoka as a marker 16 bed. 17 Okay, well, let's talk about -- we've Q 18 got a whole slew of formations up above the Strawn here. 19 A Okay. 20 And how about those? Q 21 Α At this time we don't see any need to 22 pool those. 23 Okay, so we can just limit to the Strawn Q 24 only, 40 acres.

Now, is the Atoka -- where is the Atoka

in response to -- in respect to the Strawn?

2

MR. HALL: Excuse me just a

Well, there is, to the best of my know-

3

minute.

Α

5

Mr. Examiner, it is our wish to pool all Α the formations from the surface to the base of the Strawn.

6

7

in that respect for some of your formations up

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Let's talk -- so this is not a wildcat above, is that correct?

Abo production within a mile of -- well, not within a mile, within two miles of the location, but that is the closest production.

For argument's sake, within a mile of Q two pool boundaries, so that is not a wildcat for the West Garrett Devonian and the Knowles Abo Pools.

let's talk about your 200 percent So risk penalty for these formations. Do you still wish that or how should we handle these?

Well, we feel for the Strawn formation the 200 percent penalty is what should be granted.

As for the other formations, because it's not actually a standard oil objective to produce in those formations, we're not asking for any special penalty for those formations at this time.

If we would fall in pool rules under one

1 of those other formations, then, you know, this wouldn't 2 technically be an exploratory wildcat for those formations. 3 Are you familiar with what a wildcat is Q 4 pursuant to general rules in the State of New Mexico? 5 I believe it's greater than one mile 6 distance from the nearest producing well of that formation. 7 Q That's correct, and you're within a mile 8 of two pools. Do you still want 200 percent for those? 9 Now, I'm looking at your map. Is there 10 any -- let me rephrase that. 11 Α I don't --12 MR. HALL: Mr. Examiner, if I 13 understood the witness' testimony correctly, I believe he 14 stated they were not seeking a position of penalty against 15 the interest above the Strawn. 16 MR. STOGNER: And so can we 17 limit this pooling order to just the Strawn? 18 Α Yes. 19 Okay. Okay, when I look at your page 1 Q 20 of Exhibit Three, this is the listing of, as I understand 21 it, the interest owners which you wish to pool at this time 22 with the exception of the Kimbell --23 Α Yes. 24 -- is now being leased to TXO. Q 25 Α Yes.

		18
1	Q	Okay, now let's we'll talk about that
2	separately but	these others, the Tissue, the Fernando
3	Renoncourt, R-1	E-N-O-N-C-O-U-R-T, and Paul how do you
4	pronounce that	last name?
5	А	Balbaud.
6	Q	Balbaud, these are the interests which
7	you're force poo	oling, is that correct?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Okay, when was when were your first
10	contacts with th	nese parties?
11	А	The Tissues we contacted initially by
12	phone on Augus	st of this year and followed up with written
13	correspondence S	September 5th, 1988.
14	Q	Now, is that September 5th, are those
15	is that correspo	ondence in here?
16	А	Yes, it is.
17	Q	It is, okay.
18	A	That is Exhibit Five.
19	Q	Five, okay. Now how about the other two
20	parties?	
21	A	The other two parties are the ones that
22	we have been com	mpletely unsuccessful in locating.
23	Q	And your first, initial search for these
24	people, when did	d that occur?
25	A	That also occurred this year in the

19 1 summer of 1988. 2 MR. STOGNER: Now then, I'm --3 sure about the TXO here, are you going to carry I'm not those interests, is that right, Mr. Scott, you wish to 5 continue this case? I guess I'm not following this. 6 If it's permis-MR. HALL: 7 sible, Standard would prefer to carry their interest and 8 receive the order as soon as possible so it can commence the well. 10 MR. Well, I'm not STOGNER: 11 sure what you mean by carry their interest. 12 What we would propose on that interest 13 is just to pay their cost. You can see, it's .1667 percent 14 of the total cost and without getting into great details on 15 what it would be like to make a deal with them, you know, 16 because of the small size of the interest, we would just 17 rather pay their cost and let them come in --18 Q Okay. 19 -- at payout. Α 20 Okay, so you're wishing to exclude them Q 21 the compulsory pooling order but you will then --22 okay. 23

And we will pay their --Α 24

25

I understand that. Okay. Q

MR. HALL: But for the record,

1

so that everyone is clear on it, they have not been provided with notice of this proceeding. We just recently became aware of their acquisition of the Kimball interest.

4

3

MR. STOGNER: Are you going to be getting a notice out to them in the next --

5

MR. HALL: Yes, sir.

7

MR. STOGNER: -- day or two?

8

MR. HALL: Yes, sir.

9

MR. STOGNER: So you wish to

10

keep the record open until what time?

able thing to do in the meantime.

11

MR. HALL: It will have to be

12

22 days from today.

13

MR. STOGNER: Okay. So we're

14

going to continue this case to the December 21st --

15

MR. HALL: Yes. I'd like to

16

point out we are not seeking the imposition of a penalty

17

against the TXO interest. We simply haven't had an oppor-

18

tunity to contact them to seek their joinder yet and Stand-

19

ard has stated their wish to carry the interest but in the

20 21

event a deal is not worked out with them, it may be neces-

22

sary to keep the record open. I think that's the advise-

23

If, however, we are able to secure their joinder, or if it's agreeable with the Examiner for us to carry their interest without keeping the

24

25

1 record open, we will do so. 2 STOVALL: MR. So you would 3 to pool their interest without penalty in effect is what you're saying, is that right? 5 MR. HALL: That's correct. 6 STOVALL: And, I'm sorry, MR. 7 I missed part of this proceeding, which other parties are 8 being pooled with the subject pooling application? 9 MR. HALL: They're shown on 10 Exhibit Three. 11 MR. STOVALL: Okay, so --12 MR. HALL: Our problem is that 13 we only recently became aware of the acquisition of the 14 Kimball interest by TXO. They've not been given notice of 15 this hearing. 16 I would question whether or not, you Α 17 if Standard wants to pay their cost whether or not 18 they really need to be noticed. 19 MR. STOVALL: Well, if they --20 if they agree to join the well with Standard paying their 21 cost, then they would not be force pooling them or maybe 22 not subject to the notice requirements. 23 I'm going to suggest that what

we do is keep the record open, not issue an order, to give

you an opportunity to discuss that with them, and maybe you

24

25

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can get them to join, or whatever, we don't care what terms you give them. If they join, then they would not be subject to the order.

I'm concerned that if you give them notice and they elect not join for any reason, you could be forced to come back in and allow them to appear in this case.

If you can get them to join, we could then close the record. That would also resolve another problem which concerns me in that I have a little bit of a problem, and if you wish -- if that's what we end up doing, Mr. Hall, I'd ask that you give us some authority as to how we can force pool a number of parties and apply different penalty provisions to different parties in that pooling situation.

That bothers me a little bit. I haven't come across it and have never researched it, so that's my recommendation to the examiner, is that this case be left open to the December 21st -- the second hearing in December, if that's the 21st, and if in the meantime you are able to get the joinder of TXO, on whatever terms, we don't care what the terms are, then there is no problem issuing an order.

Ιf it turns out that you're to force pool TXO, then submit some sort of legal going

HALL: And another alter-

1

authority for the proposal that you're making.

their interest, as well, is another scenario.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HALL: Yeah, it's unusual.

I think there may be a way for the examiner to take this

MR. STOVALL: Correct, yes.

If we continue it to the 21st, then you get your notice taken care of and we have the opportunity to come back and (not clearly understood.)

MR.

native, if they are not able to work out a deal with TXO we

could come back in, seek imposition of a penalty against

Well, let me ask you a ques-Mr. Hall, the examiner has raised a question, Mr. tion, Hall, and I would ask you, and put it on the record, as to whether we need to continue the case, in which case it's got a firm setting till the 21st, or merely hold the record open, and again, when I say the 21st, bear in mind I'm not looking at a calendar, I'm assuming that is the date of the second December hearing, or if we leave the record open in order for you to contact TXO, and if you are successful in getting them to join, close the record and take the case under advisement prior to that December 21st date. Do you have a feeling about the legality of that under -- I apologize for not being able to answer that myself, but I've never had any problem before.

under advisement and I think that authority might spring from 72-18-B which seems to provide for a party seeking a pooling or dedicating acreage to a proration unit to either obtain voluntary pooling agreements or in the event he does not do that or fails to apply for an order directed against those interests, to carry that interest at that full percentage interest without any restriction against it.

That may be the authority.

MR. STOVALL: You're setting

out 72 --

MR. HALL: 18-B.

MR. STOVALL: Let me recommend that what we do is keep the record open up to 22 days prior to the second December hearing, which I believe, if it's the 21st, that would be about the 30th of November.

MR. HALL: Okay.

MR. STOVALL: If at that time, but if by that time you're able to get TXO's interest, advise the examiner and we can -- we will then close the record.

If, in fact, you have not been able to get their interest joined, then we will continue the case and that will give us adequate time to notice the case for the 21st hearing.

Does that sound acceptable?

Is that an acceptable procedure?

2

MR. HALL: I believe so. The

3

purpose is to keep the --

4

MR. STOVALL: I'm kind of

5

shooting off the cuff, I will admit --

6

MR. HALL: -- hearing --

7

MR. STOVALL: -- in this, in

8

this case, but --

9

MR. HALL: Well, it's unusual.

10

Our preference is for the record to be kept open on the

11

basis of notice given for this case as opposed to contin-

12

uing it and starting the notice anew. We think the author-

13

ity for that is probably 72-18-B.

14

That would -- that --

15

MR. STOVALL: The examiner has

16

got a suggestion, if I may, and I think it makes sense to

17 18

me, is that we continue the case to the 7th and then at

19

that time you will probably have made some determination of

20

what's going to happen with TXO, and if notice will be

21

required, you'll then have to give notice and then we'll

22

have to continue it again to the 21st. Bear in mind that when we do that, you're still going to have to watch your

23

notice time periods for that 21st hearing.

24

Does that sound acceptable?

25

MR. HALL: We'll do that.

I think in the meantime that will afford the Division an opportunity to decide whether or not notice is at all necessary for an interest owner whose interest is being carried pursuant to 72-18-B. MR. STOGNER: Or if you could get something from TXO in writing submit to the record on the 7th. MR. HALL: Exactly. MR. STOGNER: Okay. We'll continue this case to the 7th of December for the Exam-iner's hearing at that time. (Hearing concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

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

Sally W. Boyd CBR

I do have y certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 9534 neard by me on 22 formula 1988.

Oil Conservation Division

1 2 3 4	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 21 December 1988
5 6	EXAMINER HEARING
7 8 9	IN THE MATTER OF: Application of Standard Oil Product- CASE ion Company for compulsory pooling, 9534 Lea County, New Mexico.
11 12 13 14	BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner
15 16 17 18	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
19	APPEARANCES
20 21 22	For the Division: Robert G. Stovall Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico
23 24 25	For Standard Oil Product- ion Company: CAMPBELL and BLACK, P. A. P. O. Box 2208 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

MR. STOGNER: Now we'll go

back to the first page and call Case Number 9534.

MR. STOVALL: Application of Standard Oil Production Company for compulsory pooling, Lea

County, New Mexico.

MR. STOGNER: Call for appear-

ances.

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with the law firm Campbell & Black, of Santa Fe. We represent Standard Oil Production Company.

This case was heard on November 22nd, 1988. At that time it was discovered that notice had not been provided to TXO and the case was continued for the purpose of providing that notice.

Notice has been provided. I can advise you that the parties have met. We believe a farmout agreement is going to be reached today, although we do not have anything signed at this time.

I therefore would like to offer Applicant's Exhibit Number Seven, which is my affidavit, copies of all of our notice letters and return receipts to show that notice has been given, that the 20 days has run, and I would move the admission of this exhibit and request that the case be taken under advisement.

MR. STOGNER: Any questions? Any comments? Exhibit Number Seven will be admitted into evidence. Is there anything further in this case, Mr. Carr? MR. CARR: Nothing further. MR. STOGNER: Does anybody else have anything further in Case Number 9534? This case will be taken under advisement. (Hearing concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C. S. R. DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division (Commission) was reported by me; that the said transcript 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 here years that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 2534, heard by me on 21, Dec. 1985.

Oil Conservation Division