BEFORE THE
NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
April 10, 1974

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Establishment of Temporary Rules for the Dublin-Ellenburger Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico

Case No. 4790

BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets, Examiner.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission: Thomas Derryberry, Esq.
Legal Counsel for the Commission
State Land Office Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico

For the Applicant: Clarence Hinkle, Esq.
HINKLE, BONDURANT, COX & EATON
600 Hinkle Building
Roswell, New Mexico

I N D E X

MR. STAMETS: Call the next case, 4790.

MR. DERRYBERRY: Case 4790, in the matter of Case Number 4790, being reopened pursuant to the provisions of Order Number R-4370, which order established temporary rules for the Dublin-Ellenberger Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, including a provision for six hundred and forty acre spacing.

MR. HINKLE: Mr. Examiner, Clarence Hinkle of Hinkle, Bondurant, Cox and Eaton, and appearing on behalf of the Petroleum Corporation.

The Petroleum Corporation would like to have this case continued until the first examiner's hearing in May.

MR. STAMETS: Case 4790 will be continued until May the eighth, 1974.

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

I, SIDNEY F. MORRISH, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission was reported by me, and the same is a true and correct record of the said proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

SIDNEY F. MORRISH, Court Reporter

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 4796, heard by me on 4-10, 1974.

Richard L. Stamets, Examiner
New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

THE NYE REPORTING SERVICE
STATE-WIDE DEPOSITION NOTARIES
225 JOHNSON STREET
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501
TEL. (505) 982-0386

BEFORE THE
NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
May 8, 1974

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Case No. 4790 being reopened pursuant to provisions of Order No. 4370, which order established temporary rules for the Dublin-Ellenburger Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, including a provision for 640-acre spacing.

Case No. 4790

BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets, Examiner.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission: Thomas Derryberry, Esq.
Legal Counsel for the Commission
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico

For the Applicant: Clarence Hinkle, Esq.
HINKLE, BONDURANT, COX & EATON
Hinkle Bldg.
Roswell, New Mexico

I N D E X

E X H I B I T S

	Marked	Admitted
Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 4	--	9

MR. STAMETS: First Case 4790.

MR. DERRYBERRY: Case 4790 is reopened and continued from April 10th, 1974 in the matter of Case No. 4790 being reopened pursuant to provisions of Order No. 4370, which order established temporary rules for the Dublin-Ellenburger Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, including a provision for 640-acre spacing.

MR. HINKLE: Clarence Hinkle of Hinkle, Bondurant, Cox and Eaton, appearing on behalf of the Petroleum Corporation. We have one witness.

MR. STAMETS: Are there any other appearances in this case? If the Witness will stand and be sworn please.

LARRY SHANNON

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HINKLE:

Q State your name, your residence and by whom you are employed.

A My name is Larry Shannon; I reside in Dallas, Texas and I am employed by the Petroleum Corporation.

Q What is your position with the Petroleum Corporation?

A Petroleum engineer.

Q Have you previously testified before the Commission?

A Yes, I have.

Q And, your qualifications a a petroleum engineer are on record with the Commission?

A Yes, that is correct.

MR. HINKLE: Are his qualifications accepted?

MR. STAMETS: They are.

BY MR. HINKLE:

Q Have you previously testified in connection with this Case, this particular Case?

A Yes, I have.

Q At the original hearing?

A At the original hearing.

Q At which special pool rules were adopted, this 640-acre spacing?

A Yes, that is correct.

Q Have you prepared or has there been prepared under your direction, exhibits for introduction at this hearing?

A Yes, that is correct.

Q They are the ones that have been marked Exhibits 1 through 4?

A That is correct.

Q Referring to Exhibit No. 1, would you explain what this is and what it shows?

A Exhibit No. 1, a reproduction of the exhibit we submitted last year for the original hearing, it shows the area in which we have our discovery, the Tenneco Federal, Well No. 1, located in Section 12. The Order establishing a temporary field rule for this hearing allowed us to allocate 280 acres to this well. That 480 acres is shown in yellow within the Section 12 boundary. We also show the production from different horizons in the area and it is color coded as to what depths some of the wells have been drilled to.

Q Have there been any additional well drilled since the original hearing?

A No, there has not been any other development or drilling.

Q Referring to Exhibit No. 2, will you explain that?

A Exhibit 2 is also a copy of the exhibit we submitted at the original hearing and shows the productive-pay interval of the Ellenburger Section within the Tenneco Federal, Well No. 1.

Q And that is the Section from which gas has been

produced at the present time?

A From which gas and condensate has been produced at the present time.

Q Now I refer you to Exhibit 3, will you explain that?

A Exhibit 3 is also a duplication but we think it is a significant part of our field rules. This is the Core Laboratory report of the reservoir fluid study that shows this Ellenburger Reservoir to be retrograde in nature and that the condensate and gas were in a gas phase under reservoir pressures and temperatures.

Q Which shows it is primarily a gas reservoir?

A Which shows that it is a gas reservoir, yes, sir.

Q Now referring to Exhibit No. 4, will you explain that?

A Exhibit No. 4 is a one-year production interval. It so happens that in this well we received a one-year certificate from the Federal Power Commission to sell our gas and it covers the period from March the 27th, 1973 to March 27th, 1974, after which the well was shut in until we received another certificate just last Friday to place the well back on production, so this is in essence a one-year production history of the well showing the condensate, the

gas production, the yield in barrels per million, the static surface pressures as obtained in the months that they were obtained and the average flowing pressure. Unfortunately we have a swab in our tubing in this well and we cannot obtain a bottom-hole pressure. As we brought the well in the swab broke and we didn't want to kill the well to retrieve this, so we have a barrier as far as obtaining bottom-hole pressures.

Q What conclusions do you reach from Exhibit No. 4?

A The conclusions are that we think the production history shows that we are satisfactorily draining the 480 acres allocated to the well, and I would like to also point out that we are restricting the deliverability from this well. We have never used more than a 11/64th choke, and our gas sells line pressure is 30 to 50 pounds, so we have quite a bit of surplus deliverability, but we are prudently holding our rates.

Q In your opinion this well will sufficiently drain the 480 acres which has been dedicated to it?

A Yes, we feel it will.

Q This acreage was originally, I believe, a farmout from Tenneco, is that right?

A That is correct.

Q What is Tenneco's position at the present time?

A The well has paid out in the first year of production and Tenneco had the option to convert their overriding royalty to a working interest which they have notified us that they are doing, and they now have a working interest in this well rather than an override.

Q Has Tenneco voiced any objection to extending the field rules?

A No, they told me in a telephone conversation that they would support and would send a wire indicating their support; I don't believe they have done this.

Q What recommendations, if any, do you have to make to the Commission with respect to extension of the present rules?

A We asked that the temporary pay rules be made permanent for the Dublin-Ellenburger field.

Q In your opinion if these rules are made permanent, would it be in the interest of conservation and the prevention of waste and protect royalty rights?

A Yes, it will.

Q We would like to offer Exhibits 1 through 4.

MR. STAMETS: Without objection, Exhibits 1 through 4 will be admitted into evidence.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits 1 through 4 were admitted into evidence.)

MR. STAMETS: Does that complete your direct testimony?

MR. HINKLE: That's all.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STAMETS:

Q Mr. Shannon, do you anticipate that there will ever be another well drilled in this pool?

A I don't know. I really can't answer that; we have no other acreage ourselves. What will happen to the south of us, I'm not sure, Mr. Stamets.

Q Referring to Exhibit No. 4, if I do my map properly, it looks like you've produced about 69,000,000 cubic feet of gas for every hundred pounds of pressure drop. Does this give you any indication that you are indeed draining all of the reservoir that is there?

A I think that it is a good comparison, please bear in mind that it's difficulte to collate the surface pressures with the bottomhole pressures because of the large amount of condensate that's within this gas and I think it may give us a distorted picture sometimes and it may be that the column of gas and liquids will be much

higher and the bottomhole pressure probably is not dropping at the rate we see at the surface. We compare this in a lot of ways to the Custer-Ellenburger Field some six or seven miles north and east and it is the only two Ellenburger Gas Fields that we are aware of in Lea County, New Mexico, the other Ellenburger Fields being oil.

Q Tenneco is the owner of the off-set acreage immediately to the south, and if they thought that there was more productive acreage they could run in there and drill a well?

A Yes, that is true.

MR. STAMETS: Are there any other questions of this Witness? If not, he may be excused. Anything further in this Case? We did receive a telegram from Tenneco.

MR. DERRYBERRY: Mr. Examiner, we have here a telegram from Tenneco which states (Reading) Please be advised Tenneco Oil Company wishes to support the position of the Petroleum Corporation in that the current temporary-field rules for the Dublin-Ellenburger Gas Pool were R-4370 should be made permanent. (End of reading.) It's signed by Tenneco Oil Company by D.D. Meyers.

MR. STAMETS: If there is nothing further in this Case we will take the Case under advisement.

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

I, RICHARD L. NYE, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission was reported by me, and the same is a true and correct record of the said proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

RICHARD L. NYE, Court Reporter

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 4790 heard by me on 5-8 1974

Examiner
New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

THE NYE REPORTING SERVICE
STATE-WIDE DEPOSITION NOTARIES
225 JOHNSON STREET
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501
TEL. (505) 982-0386

BEFORE THE
NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
CONFERENCE ROOM, STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

August 9, 1972

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:	
Application of the Petroleum Corporation for special pool rules and a non-standard proration unit, Lea County, New Mexico.	Case No. 4790

BEFORE: Elvis A. Utz,
Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. UTZ: Case 4790.

MR. HATCH: Case 4790: Application of the Petroleum Corporation for special pool rules and a non-standard proration unit, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. HINKLE: Clarence Hinkle, appearing on behalf of the Petroleum Corporation. We have one witness and four exhibits.

MR. UTZ: Are there other appearances in this case?

(No response)

MR. UTZ: You may proceed.

* * * *

HAL DEAN,

was called as a witness, and after being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HINKLE:

Q State your name and your address.

A Hal Dean, my address is Midland, Texas.

Q Are you a petroleum engineer?

A No, I am a petroleum geologist.

Q Are you acting in a consulting capacity?

A Yes, for the Petroleum Corporation.

Q Are you employed by the Petroleum Corporation as a consultant in this case?

A Yes, sir.

Q Have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Commission?
A Yes, I have.
Q And have your qualifications as a petroleum geologist been made a matter of record with the Commission?
A Yes, sir.
Q Have you made a study of the area which is involved in Case 4790?
A Yes, I have.
Q Are you familiar with the wells that have been drilled in the area?
A Yes, sir.
Q And all the other information that is available?
A That is correct.

MR. HINKLE: Are the witness's qualifications acceptable?

MR. UTZ: Yes, they are.

Q (By Mr. Hinkle) Have you prepared or has there been prepared under your direction exhibits for introduction in this case?
A Yes, I prepared the exhibits.
Q And they are the exhibits that have been marked Exhibits One through Four?
A Yes, sir.
Q Are you familiar with the application of the Petroleum

Corporation in this case?

A Yes, I am.

Q What is the Petroleum Corporation seeking to accomplish?

A The Petroleum Corporation seeks special pool rules for the Dublin-Ellenburger Gas Pool in Lea County, New Mexico, including a provision for 640-acre spacing units. The Petroleum Corporation further seeks approval of a 480-acre non-standard unit in the Dublin-Ellenburger Pool comprising the South half of the South half of the Northeast quarter in the East half of the Northwest quarter of Section 12, Township 26 South, Range 37 East, to be dedicated to its Tenneco Federal Well Number 1 located in Unit N of Section 12.

Q Is that the discovery well in the pool?

A This is the discovery well in the Dublin-Ellenburger Pool, yes.

Q Now, referring you to Exhibit Number One, will you explain what this shows?

A Exhibit One is a land map on which the original Ellenburger contours have been drawn. The Ellenburger production is found in the Dublin area, located in Section 12, 26 South, 37 East. Approximately three and a half miles to the Northwest is the Crosby-Devonian, and this map shows the contour from the sub-surface formation and the seismic information on the Ellenburger

formation.

Q It also shows the acreage ownership in the area, does it not?

A Yes, it does. The Petroleum Corporation has obtained a farm-out from Tenneco in Section 12.

Q Now, referring you to Exhibit Two, will you explain what this shows?

A Exhibit Two is a diagram of the testing and completion of the Humble Oil and Refinery Number 1 Federal Leonard. The Dublin field was discovered by the Humble Federal Leonard which is located 660 feet from the South and West lines of Section 12. This was on December 20th, 1944, and it produced from the Ellenburger formation from a depth of 11,895 to 11,933. The well potential information shows 297 barrels a day on a five and three-eighths inch choke. The gas-oil ratio was 1,600 to one. During the drilling of this well, separate open hole tests of the Ellenburger formation were made, and it flowed gas at the rate of 10,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day, and the oil rate was 1,848 barrels a day. The gas test as shown on this diagram was from 11,870 to 11,891, the oil test was from 11,881 to 11,913. We would like to show here that the Ellenburger formation had a high flow capacity, and this was one of the earliest Ellenburger wells drilled in New Mexico. The

well had been penetrated below the oil-water contact, and the completion interval was immediately below the gas-oil contact. You can see on our production test that it was attempted from 11,889 to 11,929 and water was tested at 11,948. Gas was tested down to 11,891. So it doesn't give them much of an interval to work in.

Now, after producing a total of 39,660 barrels of water, the well was temporarily abandoned in October of 1946. However, before plugging the well, Humble attempted to squeeze the original perforation and redrill the upper portion of the Ellenburger. The procedure was unsuccessful and the well was plugged and abandoned in January, 1947. The production information for the ten month period during 1946 prior to abandonment was 12,759 barrels of oil and 61,558 MCF of gas, which is a gas-oil ratio of 4,789 to 1.

A detailed study of all Humble production records indicate that the well was non-commercial due to mechanical producing difficulties rather than from depletion of the reservoir. These mechanical difficulties stemmed from poor cement jobs and repeated killing of the well.

Twenty-five years later, the Petroleum Corporation Number 1 Tenneco Federal located 1,650 feet East and slightly to the North of the Humble Federal Number 1

Well was completed. This was on February 29th, 1972, and it was completed in the Ellenburger formation from 11,634 to 11,828 with an open flow potential of 4.25 million cubic feet of gas per day and 178 barrels of condensate with a gas-liquid ratio of 5,652 to 1. The top of the Ellenburger was 177 feet high to the Humble Number 1 Leonard, and the total depth of the Petroleum Corporation Well was 11,854, which was approximately 100 feet above the oil-water contact established by open hole testing in the Humble Number 1 Leonard. The base of the perforation in the Petroleum Corporation Number 1 Tenneco was 11,828, which is 122 feet above the oil-water contact. The perforations were treated with only a total of 2,000 gallons of mud acid over a 194 foot interval, and no attempt was made to obtain a high flow rate during open hole pressure testing.

I believe the experience gained from the Ellenburger completions over the years was instrumental in designing this completion procedure to get the maximum reserves.

Now, the reservoir rock from sample analyses evidenced fractures, and the porosity determination from the electric log analyses in the Petroleum Corporation Number 1 Tenneco ranged from four to eight percent. The calculated permeability from open hole test data is 5.2 milidarcies. Studies of the pressure data and

dearnley, meier & mc cormick
209 SIMMS BLDG.• P.O. BOX 1092•PHONE 243-6691•ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87103
1216 FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. EAST•ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87108

reservoir fluid conditions indicate that the flow rate is indicated to be 2,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day. The gross thickness of the gas-oil column above water is 330 feet in the pool. The calculated bottom hole pressure is 4,755 pounds, and this compares with the only bottom hole pressure we were able to find on the Humble Number 1 Leonard, which was 5,000 pounds. It is our opinion that a single well can effectively drain 640 acres in this Ellenburger zone.

I would like to submit a structure contour map of the top of the Yates formation--

Q Is that Exhibit Three?

A Yes, sir.

Q Will you explain what Exhibit Three is?

A This is a Yates structure map, and is also a production map showing the Blinebry and Drinkard production limits approximately two miles north, which is the South end of the Justice Pool. Immediately West of Section 12 are two Seven-Rivers producers and two miles South of Section 12 is the South Leonard Pool producing from the Queen formation.

The structure map shows a closure in the Justice Pool, a smaller closure in the Dublin field area, and a third closure in the South Leonard Pool. The Yates structure map generally reflects a deeper structure.

Q Now, referring you to Exhibit Number Four, would you explain that Exhibit?

A Exhibit Four is a structure map on the Ellenburger formation. The Ellenburger formation is much more structurally completed as you can see than the Yates formation. This interpretation is based upon sub-surface data supplemented by seismic information. As you can see, the Humble Well is located in the Southwest of the Southwest of Section 12, and the Petroleum Corporation Number 1 Tenneco Federal is located 1,650 feet from it. Now, separating this producing area are a series of faults on the East side of the Dublin Pool. This fault is down to the East, and the fault trend is North-South, and it limits the Justice field and the Ellenburger production on the East. This fault continues to trend South of the Dublin area, and passes on the East side of the South Leonard Pool. Displacement of this fault is approximately 1,000 feet. The Dublin Pool is limited on the Northeast by the fault, which is indicated on our map. This fault is down to the Southwest and this fault is indicated by seismic information, but more readily by the difference in the fluid levels. As you can see in the Northeast, the Stanley Number 2 Leonard tested in the Ellenburger formation from 11,195 to 11,235, and recovered 1,900 feet of salt water.

Q How does that compare with the level in the discovery well?

A This is approximately 800 feet high to the oil-water contact established by open hole testing in the Humble Number 1 Leonard Federal, and also the Stanley Number 1 Leonard in the Southeast of the Southeast of Section 11.

Q So that would also indicate the fault exists?

A Yes, sir, these separate fluid levels are very significant.

On the West side of the Dublin Pool, we have what we call fault D. This fault trends Northeast and Southwest, and limits the Dublin field on the West. Now, this is a reverse fault, and is repeated approximately 300 feet in the Humble Number 1 Leonard. The drill stem test of the Humble Number 1 Leonard in the Ellenburger formation recovered 4,000 feet of salt water. Now, these three faults which are apparentl from sub-surface and seismic information tend to limit the field to the North, the West, and the East. However, to the South, we have a Yates high, and we are of the opinion that production could extend in this southerly direction. No wells have been drilled to the Ellenburger formation in this direction.

Q That covers Sections 13 and 24?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that all that you have with respect to this exhibit?

A Yes, sir. From the fault pattern, it can be seen that the probability exists that the West half of the Northwest quarter and the North half of the Northeast quarter of Section 12 are probably not productive of gas.

Q And is that the reason you are asking for a non-standard unit to be dedicated to the well in Section 12?

A Yes, sir.

Q I take it from your testimony in regard to the Humble Well that you consider that a better well really than is indicated by the records?

A Yes, sir. From the records, it would indicate that an attempt to complete an oil well in this thin oil column would prove to be disastrous throughout the permean basin, trying to complete immediately above the water in which you get a lot of vertical water and fractures, and which would also permit the gas from the gas cap to penetrate in the well bore causing a lot of producing problems.

Q In your opinion, has the Humble Well depleted the area in which it is located, the immediate area in which it is located?

A No, I do not believe it depleted that area.

Q And it is in the same reservoir in your opinion as your discovery well?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are you asking for temporary pool rules for one year?
A Yes.
Q Do you have any particular recommendation as to the type of pool rules to be adopted?
A No.
Q Only 640-spacing?
A Yes, sir.
Q With the usual location for 640 acres, and you are requesting an exception in this case or a non-standard unit of 480 acres to be dedicated to the producing well in Section 12, is that right?
A That's right. To date, we have not produced this well, and no gas contact has been made, so we do not have any production data.
Q Are you in the process of negotiating a contract for it?
A Yes, we are in the process.
Q In your opinion, would the adoption of special pool rules in this case be in the interest of conservation and the prevention of waste?
A Yes.
Q And tend to protect correlative rights?
A Yes, sir.
Q And that is also true of the designation of the non-standard unit as far as Section 12 is concerned?
A Yes, sir.

MR. HINKLE: We would like to offer Exhibits One through Four.

MR. UTZ: Without objection, Exhibits One through Four will be entered into the record of this case.

(Whereupon Applicant's Exhibits One through Four were entered in evidence.)

MR. HINKLE: That's all we have on direct.

* * * *

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. UTZ:

Q Mr. Dean, I didn't understand what kind of unit you are asking for here, about how many acres?

A Four hundred eighty acres.

Q Do you anticipate more wells to be drilled in the pool?

A Well, we don't have any more acreage, but if we had some, I think we would.

Q To the South?

A Yes.

MR. UTZ: Are there any other questions of this witness?

(No response)

MR. UTZ: If not, the witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. UTZ: Any statements?

(No response)

MR. UTZ: Case 4790 will be taken under advisement.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

I, RICHARD E. McCORMICK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, in and for the County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission was reported by me; and that the same is a true and correct record of the said proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

Richard E. McCormick
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 4790 heard by me on Aug 9 1972.

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

I N D E X

E X H I B I T S

APPLICANT'S		ADMITTED	OFFERED
Exhibit #1	Land map	14	5
Exhibit #2	Diagram	14	6
Exhibit #3	Structure contour map	14	9
Exhibit #4	Structure map	14	10

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARING

SANTA FE, **NEW MEXICO**

Hearing Date MAY 8, 1974 **TIME:** 9 A.M.

NAME	**REPRESENTING**	**LOCATION**
Paul Eaton	Hinkle Firm	Roswell
Reginald C. Keyes	Texas Pacific Oil Co	Midland
Joseph W. Jeffers	Mesa Petroleum Co	Midland
Gerald L. Murphy	Texas International Petr. Corp.	Midland
D. Nelson	" " " "	"
[illegible]	[illegible] Co.	Roswell
	Kellahin + Fox	Santa Fe
Tom Kellahin		
Bob Leggott	Atlantic Richfield	Midland
Nelson Robertson	Atlantic Richfield	Midland
Kenneth H. Griffin	Griffin & Burnett, Inc.	Midland
Charles F. Koltayer	Gulf Oil Corp	Midland
Chas. C. HAIRSTON	GULF Oil Corp	Midland
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Jack Huff	Burleson & Huff	Midland
Peyton Yates	Yates Petroleum	Artesia

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARING

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Hearing Date MAY 8, 1974 TIME: 9 A.M.

NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
Don Ward	Atlantic Richfield Co.	Denver
Gary Hoff	Atlantic Richfield Co.	Denver
Roland Hoit	Atlantic Richfield Co	Farmington
Ben Donegan	Leland A. Hodges, Trustee	
Roy Crow	General Am. Oil.	Loco Hills
Lendell Hawkins	General Am. Oil	Loco Hills