STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:	)	CASE NO. 9253
IN THE MATTER OF CASE NO. 9253 BEING REOPENED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF DIVISION ORDER NO. R-8546	)	

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner

AUGUST 18, 1994

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the Oil Conservation Division on Thursday, August 18, 1994, at Morgan Hall, State Land Office Building, 310 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

I N D E X

August 18, 1994
Examiner Hearing
CASE NO. 9253

* * *

E X H I B I T S

* * *

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR MEWBOURNE OIL COMPANY:

CAMPBELL, CARR, BERGE & SHERIDAN, P.A.
Suite 1 - 110 N. Guadalupe
P.O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208
By: WILLIAM F. CARR

* * *

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 8:17 a.m.:

EXAMINER CATANACH: At this time we'll call first case, 9253, In the matter of Case Number 9253 being reopened pursuant to the provisions of Division Order Number R-8546, which order created the Santo Nino-Bone Spring Pool in Eddy County, New Mexico.

Are there appearances in this case?

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with the Santa Fe law firm Campbell, Carr, Berge and Sheridan.

I represent Mewbourne Oil Company in this case and I have two witnesses.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Are there additional appearances?

Will the two witnesses please stand to be sworn at this time.

(Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)

DAVID SHATZER,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

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

A. My name is David Shatzer.

Q. And where do you reside?
A. Midland, Texas.
Q. Mr. Shatzer, by whom are you employed and in what capacity?
A. I'm a petroleum geologist for Mewbourne Oil Company.
Q. Have you previously testified before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. At the time of that prior testimony, were your credentials as a petroleum geologist accepted and made a matter of record?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Are you familiar with the Santo Nino-Bone Springs Pool?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you prepared certain exhibits for presentation here today?
A. Yes, I have.
MR. CARR: Are the witness's qualifications acceptable?
EXAMINER CATANACH: They are.
Q. (By Mr. Carr) Mr. Shatzer, would you first briefly summarize for Mr. Catanach what Mewbourne seeks in this case?

A. We seek to get permanent 80-acre spacing pool rules for the Santo Nino-Bone Spring Pool.

Q. And who was the original Applicant in this case?

A. The original Applicant was Manzano Oil, based on their three wells, the Elliott Federals Number 1, 2 and 3.

MR. CARR: Mr. Catanach, this case was originally heard in November of, I believe, 1987. At that time, Order R-8546 was entered -- it was entered, actually, on November the 17th of that year -- adopting temporary rules for an 18-month period of time.

Mewbourne has plans for additional development, and it was discovered that the case had never been re-opened to adopt those pool rules on a permanent basis, and that's the reason we are here before you today, instead of Manzano, the original Applicant in this case.

Q. (By Mr. Carr) Mr. Shatzer, could you refer to what has been marked as Mewbourne Exhibit Number 1, please?

A. Yes, Exhibit Number 1 is a support letter from the only operator of the wells in the pool, Manzano Oil. It states their support of our Application to get the 80-acre pool rules made permanent and their support of our position.

Q. And Manzano, in fact, is the operator of all three wells currently producing from the pool?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. Let's go to what has been marked as Mewbourne Exhibit Number 2. Would you first identify this and then review it for the Examiner?

A. This is a land plat of the acreage involved in the Santo Nino Pool area. It's on a 1-inch-to-2000-foot scale.

The present pool outline for the Santo Nino-Bone Spring Pool is shown in the green outline, and it contains three standup 80-acre spacing units for the Elliott Federals Number 1, Number 2, Number 3, operated by Manzano Oil, and that's the only acreage dedicated at this time to the Santo Nino Pool.

And the outline in dark red-orange outlines the Mewbourne partial interest that we have obtained in this area.

And then the solid yellow colors are 100-percent Mewbourne Oil Company leases.

Our initial proposed location is shown in the southwest of the northwest of Section 29 for our Mewbourne Oil Company Santo Nino 29 Federal Number 1.

Q. This exhibit also contains a trace for a cross-section; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Let's go now to that cross-section, Mewbourne Exhibit Number 3, and I'd ask you to review the information

on that exhibit for Mr. Catanach.

A. Exhibit Number 3 is cross-section G-G', showing generally the first Bone Spring and second Bone Spring producing -- first and second Bone Spring sand producing intervals in the three Manzano wells in the Santo Nino Pool.

The cross-section runs from the Elliott Federal Number 3 on the left, and runs through Number 2 to the Elliott Federal Number 1, which was the initial well for the pool, on the right.

The upper portion is the first Bone Spring sand, and on the cross-section, lower, is the second Bone Spring sand.

Of the three wells, the best producer was the Elliott Federal Number 1. It has made 82,732 barrels of oil, 278 million to date.

The Elliott Federal Number 2 has made 43,786 barrels of oil and 247 million to date.

And the Elliott Federal Number 3 is the poorest producer at 20,099 barrels and 103 million. And the Number 3 represents an uneconomic well for this area.

Q. Now, from this exhibit you have determined net pay and water saturation, have you not?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. And could you review how you have done that for

Mr. Catanach?

A. Okay, the net pay -- The net pay is shown as the line at 12 percent log porosity, drawn in pink across the pay portions of each of these producing sections.

And we've arrived at a 12-percent cutoff for the Bone Spring sand through our work in other first Bone Spring sand fields where we've had core data that tells us, you know, exact relationship to permeability and producibility.

And also, we've been able to make some relative judgments as to which zones contributed most as these wells were completed from the detailed well files. So that's how we arrived at the 12-percent cutoff. It's something we've used for quite a long time.

And that -- Basically, I've gone down through and added up the amount of total feet in each of the zones that are greater than this 12-percent cutoff, and that's how I've come up with the net pay totals for the first sand and also the second sand.

And since these wells are produced in a commingled completion where the second Bone Spring sand is produced with the first Bone Spring sand, then these two numbers need to be added together, and they'll be input into the data that our engineer will produce in just a few minutes.

Q. Now, as to the water cut, how is that determined?

A. Water-saturation calculations were developed -- just basic, the log calculations, using an RW of .035 for the area, and that we just have an average of the water saturation calculations over the intervals that are perforated, and producing.

And in some of the areas that have the perforations a little more spread out, why, the water-saturation calculations are just from those intervals that are perforated and producing.

So that as far as net pay goes, the Number 1 well had a total of 53 feet of net pay, and the Number 2 well had a total of 58 feet of net pay, and the Number 3, the Elliott Federal Number 3 Well, had a total of only six feet of net pay.

And in the case of water saturations, it shows pretty much what we'd expect. We believe that the first Bone Spring sand is the dominant producer in these three wells, producing more of the oil and gas that's coming out of the first Bone Spring sand. Therefore, it has better net pay numbers, and also it has better water saturations.

The water saturation calculation averages for the first sand are in the range of 48- to 52-percent, whereas the second Bone Spring sand are more in the range of 52- to 58-percent water-saturation calculations, and therefore we

don't think the contribution of the second sand is as great.

But these numbers are averaged and totaled and will be used by our engineer in the calculations for drainage for this pool.

Q. Would you identify Mewbourne Exhibit Number 4, please?

A. Exhibit Number 4 is a structure map on the top of the first Bone Spring sand. It's also on a contour interval of 50 feet on a 1-inch-to-2000-foot scale.

And the pool outline for the Santo Nino field is again shown in the green outline.

Q. Is structure a significant factor in the drainage calculations that will be utilized in this case?

A. No, not really. The structure is gently dipping to the southeast, on a fairly consistent basis in this area, but it's not really relevant to our drainage calculations, really.

The data derived from the logs from the previous cross-section, G-G', is really where the basis for our calculations --

Q. And in that regard, you're talking about net pay, porosity and water saturation?

A. Yes.

Q. Will Mewbourne also be calling an engineering

witness to present drainage calculations to the Examiner?

A. Yes.

Q. Were Exhibits 1 through 4 prepared by you or compiled at your direction?

A. Yes, they were.

MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Catanach, we move the admission of Mewbourne Exhibits 1 through 4.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 1 through 4 will be admitted as evidence.

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

EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

Q. Mr. Shatzer, tell me again how you arrived at your 12-percent porosity cutoff.

A. We've used that in other Bone Spring sand fields for which we have core data. The core data shows that -- in general, below log porosity. But we don't have core data -- none of these Manzano wells were cored -- and so we don't really have a good handle on permeability and what would be contributing to actual pay.

Because Bone Spring completions are large intervals that are perforated and then massive frac jobs, you have to make some estimate as to -- rough estimate as to net pay, because you're putting in large fracture

treatments over a large interval.

But in these fields that we're familiar with that are -- For instance, Walters Lake, that's only five miles away, we've got core data that tells us that at generally less than 12 percent on the log of porosity, the corresponding permeabilities that we've seen in core data are insufficient to add much to net pay and that we need greater than that.

And also -- Manzano completed these wells in stages. We have seen the well reports and that the intervals that were most porous in the first Bone Spring sand came on a lot stronger when they were completed, rather than the second Bone Spring sand.

But 12 percent is something that we've worked with in basically Eddy and Lea County through several Bone Spring sand fields. And we -- In the absence of core data from these three wells, the relative contributions seem to be consistent with what we've seen in the past.

Q. How comfortable are you comparing the core data from the field five miles away with this field?

A. I think we're pretty -- I'm fairly confident, because we see the same zones. The Bone Spring is a submarine fan shelf slope sand that is rather widespread, and so some of these units can be correlated for literally townships; 20, 25 miles, you can correlate these same sand

packages.

Their reservoir continuity isn't that great, but their genetic relationships are -- they're fairly correlative.

EXAMINER CATANACH: That's all I have.

MR. CARR: At this time we would call Dan M. Wilkirson.

DAN WILKIRSON,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

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

A. My name is Dan M. Wilkirson.

Q. Would you spell your last name, please?

A. W-i-l-k-i-r-s-o-n.

Q. Where do you reside?

A. I reside in Tyler, Texas.

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

A. I work for Mewbourne Oil Company as their chief reservoir engineer.

Q. Have you previously testified before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. At the time of that prior testimony, were your

credentials as a petroleum engineer accepted and made a matter of record?

A. Yes, they were.

Q. In fact, you're a registered petroleum engineer in the State of Texas, are you not?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Mr. Wilkirson, how many years' experience have you had as a reservoir engineer?

A. Seventeen years.

Q. Have you reviewed the available data on the Santo Nino-Bone Spring Pool?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. And have you conducted a study of this pool to estimate the area being drained by each of the existing wells in that pool?

A. Yes, I have.

MR. CARR: Mr. Catanach, are the witness's qualifications acceptable?

EXAMINER CATANACH: They are.

Q. (By Mr. Carr) Mr. Wilkirson, you've prepared exhibits for presentation here today?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Would you refer to what has been marked as Mewbourne Exhibit Number 5, identify this exhibit and review the information thereon for the Examiner?

A. Exhibit Number 5 is a production history graph from the Elliott Federal Number 1, located in Section 30, Unit H, in the Santo Nino-Bone Spring. This was the discovery well for the pool.

This well was originally drilled in 1977 as a Morrow test and then re-entered in 1987 by Manzano and completed in the Bone Spring sand, the first and the second sand.

The initial potential test for this well was 245 barrels of oil per day, 180 barrels of water per day and 459 MCF per day.

As you can see, this well is, from most of our Bone Spring experience, is a fairly typical production profile: a rather rapid initial decline in a hyperbolic shape and then breaking over and reaching a more stable production rate.

I also used this well and the daily data from the original completion to estimate that the original gas-oil ratio in the pool was about 1100 standard cubic feet per barrel to use for estimating fluid properties for the pool.

Using that, I estimated that the -- and the gravities of the oil and the gas -- that the original volume factor for the pool was about 1.57.

Q. What was the estimated saturation pressure?

A. I estimated that the original saturation pressure

was probably around 3000 pounds, and that was probably very close to the original pressure in the pool.

Almost all the Bone Spring wells that we see exhibit very high gas-oil ratios very early in their completion life, within a matter of days, normally, of being put on production. The gas-oil ratio climbs very rapidly.

That's associated with the very low permeability that we normally see in the Bone Spring, on the order of 1 to 10 millidarcies. And this is an 11 -- 1000 to 1200 gas-oil ratios are fairly common for other Bone Spring pools in the area.

Q. Mr. Wilkirson, let's move on to Mewbourne Exhibit Number 6. Would you identify that?

A. Exhibit 6 is a similar graph for the Elliott Federal Number 2. This well was drilled in February, 1988, about six months after the Elliott Federal Number 1.

Its initial potential test was 125 barrels of oil per day, 30 barrels of water per day and 150 MCF per day. It also shows that characteristic hyperbolic decline in oil.

I forgot the mention, the oil is shown in green, the gas is shown in red, and the blue line is the gas-oil ratio.

Q. And now let's go to the last of these three

plots, Exhibit Number 7. Identify and review that.

A. Exhibit Number 7 is a similar graph for the Elliott Federal Number 3.

This well was drilled in July, 1988, or completed in July, 1988, four or five months after the Elliott Federal Number 2. Its initial potential was only -- was 160 barrels of oil per day, 180 barrels of water per day and 345 MCF per day.

It was put on pump immediately after it was frac'd. The initial potential test was on pump where the other two wells were flowing. And this well shows a very rapid decline, and you can -- The single lines projecting out is my forecast of the ultimate recovery. This well is very near its economic limit and will be a very marginal well.

Q. On each of these wells you have current production information?

A. Yes.

Q. And for what month is the most recent --

A. The most recent data we had was for April, 1994.

Q. Could you explain to the Examiner what each of the wells is currently producing?

A. Yeah, the Elliott Number 1 in April averaged 19 barrels of oil a day, 14 barrels of water a day, and 68 MCF a day, which comes to a gas-oil ratio of 3600 cubic feet

per barrel.

The Elliott Number 2 in April averaged 9 barrels of oil a day, 6 1/2 barrels of water, and 62 MCF, which is a gas-oil ratio of 6900.

And the Elliott Number 3 averaged 5 barrels of oil a day, 14 barrels of water, and 24 MCF, which is a gas-oil ratio of 4600.

Q. All right, let's go now to Exhibit Number 8. Would you identify that and review that for Mr. Catanach?

A. Exhibit 7?

Q. Exhibit Number -- I think Exhibit 7 was the plot --

A. Oh, I'm sorry, I've got different --

Q. -- on the Number 3, Exhibit 8 being an engineering calculation.

A. I'm sorry. All right. Exhibit 8 is a calculation to estimate how many acres are being drained by each of these wells in the pool.

For each of the three wells, it shows the geologic parameters per Mr. Shatzer's work for the first Bone Spring sand and the second Bone Spring sand. It shows the number of net feet, the porosity and the water saturation for each of those.

I then calculated an original oil in place, based on a one-acre area, using the fluid properties that were

estimated from the performance of the Elliott Number 1.

I also estimated the gas in place for each of those two zones, and then I totaled those two zones to give the amount of oil in place per acre for each well.

The column labeled Projected Ultimate Recovery is based on the decline curves shown on the previous three exhibits for each of the wells. Elliott Number 1, ultimate oil projected to be about 138,000 barrels; the Number 2, about 90,000 barrels; and the Number 3, about 25,000 barrels.

I then took this ultimate oil and divided it by an oil in place and an assumed recovery factor to get a guess on how many acres are being drained by each of the wells. The results of that is based on oil.

The Elliott Federal Number 1 would be draining about 65 acres; the Number 2, 40 acres; and the Number 3, 116 acres.

I used a recovery factor for oil of 12 percent, which, based on some of our other Bone Spring pools, may be a little high, but I wanted to try to make this a somewhat conservative estimate.

I also used 60-percent recovery for gas and did the same kind of estimate for how much is being drained by the gas -- on gas.

For some reason, this pool seems to be providing

less gas than some of the other Bone Spring pools. They typically have 6000 to 8000 average GORs, and this pool looks like over the life it may have an average of only 4000.

Q. What is the average drainage area for oil in this pool?

A. The average of those three is 73 acres per well.

Q. Are there other Bone Spring pools in the area that are, in fact, being developed on 80-acre spacing?

A. Yes, we identified three other Bone Spring pools that are currently on 80-acre spacing. One is the Culebra Bluff-Bone Spring Pool in Eddy County, one is the EK-Bone Spring Pool in Lea County, and the third is the Old McMillan Ranch Bone Spring Pool, which is an oil with associated gas pool. The oil is on 80-acre spacing.

Q. Mr. Wilkirson, these wells were fracture-stimulated when they were completed, were they not?

A. Yes, Manzano's standard completion was to fracture-stimulate each of these wells with at least 300,000 pounds of sand. Two of the wells were done in a stage frac, one of the wells was done in a single frac. And based on our experience with fracs in the area, I would estimate that these fractures should extend at least 400 feet on either side of the well, with that size of fracture job.

Q. Now, if you're on 40-acre spacing, what does this mean in terms of the potential for interconnection between the fractures?

A. It means that the fracs are oriented in the same direction that your wells are aligned.

You have a potential of getting two fractures very close together and the wells interfering with the production or drainage for each one.

You'd end up with a less efficient drainage pattern than you would if the wells were spaced farther apart.

Q. Let's go now to Mewbourne Exhibit Number 8. Would you identify and review that, please? I'm sorry, now we are to Exhibit Number 9.

A. Exhibit Number 9 is just some rough economics for our proposed Bone Spring well, with the estimated costs to drill the well through the second Bone Spring sand, and estimated operating costs based on 20 years, which is taken from the life of these other wells in the field. So we get a very rough total cost of the well over the life of the well.

And then I took average prices for oil and gas, reduced them by royalty and production taxes, and divided the cost of the well by these average revenues in constant dollars to get some estimate of what it takes for a break-

even well in the Bone Spring.

And the results of that are that it would take a 60,000- to 65,000-barrel well to make a real economic producer in the Bone Spring.

On 40-acre spacing, you -- if you get wells with as good a pay as the Elliott 1 and 2, you would only expect 80,000 to 90,000 barrels a well on a 40-acre spacing.

So if you then risk-adjust that, you reach a point where the wells -- the economics, from an exploration standpoint of drilling the wells, becomes kind of weak.

Q. Is it your recommendation that 80-acre well spacing be adopted in this pool on a permanent basis?

A. Yes, I believe that 80-acre well spacing should be adopted on a permanent basis, because that will encourage the drilling of wells which would result in the conservation of natural resources, the prevention of waste and the protection of correlative rights.

Q. Were Exhibits 5 through 9 prepared by you?

A. Yes, they were.

Q. At this time, Mr. Catanach, we move the admission of Mewbourne Oil Company Exhibits 5 through 9.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 5 through 9 will be admitted as evidence.

MR. CARR: That concludes my direct examination of this witness.

EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

Q. Mr. Wilkirson, the three wells that are being produced, have you seen any evidence of any kind of interference between these wells?

A. I haven't really seen -- I can honestly say that the Number 3 doesn't, and it's an 80-acre spacing.

The Number 2 and the Number 1 are very close together. They are essentially sitting side by side like a typical 40 acres.

But the decline on the wells are so rapid it's real hard to say whether they're truly interfering or not.

The sum of the -- I think that one of the reasons that recovery from the Number 2 appears to be low, based on the amount of net pay in it, is possibly because the Number 1 is interfering, but I can't point to any direct evidence that says that's occurring.

But you may be able to tell from the graph, the Number 2 declined quite a bit more rapidly than the Number 1 when it was initially completed.

Q. In your opinion, it would be uneconomic to drill these wells on a 40-acre spacing?

A. I don't work in our exploration department. I'd be real hard-pressed to state that as a matter of record. But when you start risk-adjusting the wells, it starts

making the economics look not nearly as attractive as it does on an 80 acres.

Obviously, the Number 3 well was uneconomic for Manzano at 25,000 barrels. It will never pay out. I'm sure that's why they ceased development.

Q. What did you use as your economic limit in these decline curves?

A. I used 100 barrels a month -- these were monthly rates -- which would equate to about 3 barrels a day. And I use that through most of New Mexico as a kind of a rough rule of thumb on a pumping well.

Q. How did you come up with your 12-percent recovery factor?

A. I looked at other Bone Spring pools that we have significant development in.

The most direct example would be Walter Lake, which is about five miles away, and that field is currently developed on 40s, but it's estimated the -- My estimated recovery factor followed that field as less than 11 percent. So I thought 12 percent was a fairly conservative estimate.

Q. Did you look at any other Bone Spring pools?

A. Well, I have experience in Querecho Plains-Bone Spring where we're currently starting waterflood operations, and it looked like that field would probably be

maybe 14 percent. But it tended to have a little bit better permeability than Walter Lake does, so far, from what we've seen.

Q. Do you expect a well in Section 29 to be comparable to the Number 1 well in Section 30?

A. That would -- I'm sure that's our hope. I didn't pick that location, nor have I really seen the maps that the exploration prospect were developed from.

And we have filed for a permit for that location. As far as I know, we have every intention of drilling it.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, I have nothing further of the witness. He may be excused.

Anything further, Mr. Carr?

MR. CARR: Nothing further in this case, Mr. Catanach.

EXAMINER CATANACH: There being nothing further, Case 9253 will be taken under advisement.

(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at 8:51 a.m.)

* * *

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 9253, heard by me on August 12 1993.

David R. Catanach, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

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

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL August 20, 1994.

STEVEN T. BRENNER
CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 1994

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARING

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Hearing Date AUGUST 18, 1994 Time: 8:15 A.M.

NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
Ernest Padilla	Padilla Law Firm	SF
Tom Kellahin	Kellahin & Kellahin	Santa Fe
Ernest L Carroll	Losee Law Firm	Artesia
Victor T. Lyon	[illegible]	SF
William F. Carr	Campbell, Carr, Berge & Sheridan	Santa Fe
Tom Weinheimer	Vastar Resources, Inc.	Farmington
Bill Hawkins	Amoco	Denver
David Sleitzer	Newbourne Oil Co	Midland
Dan W[illegible]	Mewbourne Oil	Tyler
Sharon Hamilton	Yates Energy Corp	Roswell
Kirk Ross	Yates Energy	Roswell
George [illegible]	Anadarko Pet. Corp	Midland, TX
Patrick Sm[illegible]	Anadarko Petroleum	Houston, TX
Brian Reid	Exxon Co USA	Midland, TX
Steve Speer	Palamo Res.	Roswell
Galen Buller	Montgomery & Andrews	SF
Karen [illegible]	Mobil E&P	Midland
Daniel [illegible]	Mobil E&P	Midland
Don W. [illegible]	Mobil E&P	Midland
Douglas [illegible]	[illegible]	Denver

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARING

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Hearing Date AUGUST 18, 1994 Time: 8:15 A.M.

NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
Maurice Trimmer	R.W. Byram	SF
James Bruce	Hinkle Law Firm	SF
[illegible]	Meridian Oil Inc.	Farmington
Louis Goldstein	Santa Fe Energy	Midland
[illegible]	Santa Fe Energy	Midland
J. H. Ashford, Jr	Enre Corporation	San Antonio
Jeff Kirn	Enre Corporation	Denver
Greg Jennings	Meridian Oil Inc	Farmington
Mike Dawson	Meridian Oil	Farmington
Tom Mullins	Meridian Oil	Farmington
Van L. Goebel	Meridian Oil	Farmington
Keith Baker	Meridian Oil	Farmington