

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
4 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
5 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6 29 March 1989

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of Yates Petroleum Corp- CASE
10 oration for compulsory pooling, 9629
11 Chaves County, New Mexico, and

12 Application of Yates Petroleum Corp- 9630
13 oration for an unorthodox gas well
14 location, Chaves County, New Mexico,
15 and

16 Application of BHP Petroleum Company, 9631
17 Inc. for compulsory pooling and an un-
18 orthodox gas well location, Chaves
19 County, New Mexico.

20 BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner

21 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

22 A P P E A R A N C E S

23 For the Division:

24 For Yates Petroleum
25 Corporation:

Chad Dickerson
Attorney at Law
DICKERSON, FISK & VANDIVER
Seventh & Mahone/Suite E
Artesia, New Mexico 88210

For BHP Petroleum Company
Inc.

W. Thomas Kellahin
Attorney at Law
KELLAHIN, KELLAHIN & AUBREY
P. O. Box 2265
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

I N D E X

1		
2		
3	STATEMENT BY MR. DICKERSON	3
4		
5	KATHY COLBERT	
6	Direct Examination by Mr. Dickerson	3
7	Cross Examination by Mr. Kellahin	11
8	Redirect Examination by Mr. Dickerson	29
9		
10	LESLIE BENTZ	
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Dickerson	28
12	Cross Examination by Mr. Kellahin	44
13	Redirect Examination by Mr. Dickerson	53
14	Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach	55
15		
16	ROBERT G. SPRINGER	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Dickerson	57
18	Cross Examination by Mr. Kellahin	67
19		
20	RANDALL L. DAVIS	
21	Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	78
22	Cross Examination by Mr. Dickerson	103
23	Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach	110
24	Redirect Examination by Mr. Kellahin	111
25	Recross Examination by Mr. Dickerson	112

I N D E X Cont'd

1
2
3 WILLIAM J. MORRIS

4 Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin 113

5 Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach 120

6
7 HAL CRABB

8 Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin 121

9
10 STATEMENT BY MR. KELLAHIN 137

11 STATEMENT BY MR. DICKERSON 141

12
13 E X H I B I T S14
15 Yates Exhibit One, Plat 5

16 Yates Exhibit Two, Summary 6

17 Yates Exhibit Three, Letters 8

18 Yates Exhibit Four, Operating Agreement 9

19 Yates Exhibit Five, Structural Map 29

20 Yates Exhibit Six, Cross Section 36

21 Yates Exhibit Seven, Two AFE's 58

22 Yates Exhibit Eight, Comparison 61

23 Yates Exhibit Nine, Affidavits 67

24
25

E X H I B I T S Cont'd

1		
2		
3	BHP Petroleum Exhibit One-A, Letter	86
4	BHP Petroleum Exhibit One-B, AFE	86
5	BHP Petroleum Exhibit One-C. Operating Agreement	86
6	BHP Petroleum Exhibit One-D, AFE	86
7	BHP Petroleum Exhibit One-E, Letter	86
8	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Two-A, Letter	94
9	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Two-B, AFE	94
10	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Two-C, Operating Agreement	94
11	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Three-A, Letter	95
12	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Three-B, AFE	95
13	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Three-C, Operating Agreement	95
14	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Four-A, Letter	97
15	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Four-B, AFE	97
16	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Five, Land Plat	79
17	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Six, Structural Map	114
18	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Seven, Structural Map	115
19	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Eight, Diagram	119
20	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Nine, Schematic	130
21	BHP Petroleum Exhibit Ten, Certificate	136
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Cata-
2 nach, the subject matter of Cases 9629, 9630 and 9631 de-
3 scribe -- Case 9630 was filed for an unorthodox location.
4 Since the filing of these applications it's my understand-
5 ing that all the parties have agreed that the nonstandard
6 location described in Case 9630, which is also described in
7 BHP's application 9631, are the preferable -- or is the
8 preferable location for a well, so your file will, in Case
9 9629 will reflect a letter by myself last week requesting
10 that the Yates application in that case be amended to the
11 unorthodox location which has been requested in Case 9630.

12
13 KATHY COLBERT,
14 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon her
15 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

16
17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. DICKERSON:

19 Q Ms. Colbert, will you state your name,
20 your occupation and by whom you're employed, please?

21 A My name is Kathy Colbert. I'm employed
22 by Yates Petroleum Corporation, Artesia, New Mexico, as a
23 landman.

24 Q You have previously testified before
25 this Division as a landman several times, have you not?

1 A Yes, I have.

2 Q And are you familiar with the underlying
3 land ownership situation in the area involved in these con-
4 solidated cases?

5 A Yes, I am.

6 Q Will you summarize briefly for us the
7 purpose of Yates' applications in these cases?

8 A Yates Petroleum is seeking an order
9 pooling all the mineral interests from the surface to the
10 base of the Ordovician formation underlying the east half
11 of Section 36, Township 10 South, Range 26 East, to form a
12 standard 320-acre gas spacing unit, with Yates Petroleum
13 designated as operator.

14 Q And what --

15 A We --

16 Q -- excuse me --

17 A Excuse me.

18 Q -- go ahead.

19 A We are also requesting approval of an
20 unorthodox gas well location to be located 1650 from the
21 north line, 2310 from the east line of the said Section 36.

22 Q Now Yates anticipates drilling the well
23 from the surface to the base of the Ordovician but the
24 pooling order is understood to affect only the zones which
25 would be developed on 320-acre spacing, is that correct?

1 A Yes, that's correct.

2 Q Okay, refer to the plat submitted as
3 Exhibit Number One and describe for us the information
4 you've shown on that.

5 A Exhibit Number One is the land plat that
6 shows this proposed unorthodox location and its relation-
7 ship to the surrounding acreage.

8 We have colored all the surrounding ac-
9 reage where Yates does have an interest.

10 Q Now notwithstanding the amendment by
11 Yates of its application in Case 9629, all the parties ne-
12 cessary to be notified of either application have been
13 notified --

14 A Yes, they have.

15 Q -- prior to this point.

16 A Yes.

17 Q So it did not change any parties or the
18 true situation.

19 A That's correct.

20 Q Before we leave Exhibit Number One, just
21 orient us with respect to the development which is taking
22 place in this area and tell us who's doing it and over what
23 period of time it's occurred.

24 A During the last twelve months this has
25 been a very active area. Yates and BHP have been drilling

1 the Ordovician gas wells. BHP is primarily located with
2 their wells to the south of this particular location.

3 Q Indicate for Mr. Catanach where those
4 wells that you're referring to are shown on the plat.

5 A Okay. The most recent one would be the
6 BHP well located in the west half of Section 36, their well
7 that's located there in the north half of 5 in the township
8 directly below on the plat.

9 Q So the well in Section 5 was drilled
10 first. Approximately when was that drilled?

11 A I am not familiar with the exact date.
12 I understand that that was the first well drilled.

13 Q The last quarter of 1988, you would
14 think?

15 A Oh, I would, yes, sir.

16 Q Refer to Exhibit Number Two, Ms.
17 Colbert, and tell us what that is.

18 A Exhibit Number Two is simply a summary
19 covering the acreage in the 320 acres located in the east
20 half of 36. It shows the parties that own the acres, the
21 percentage that they would have out of the 320-acre spacing
22 unit. It further goes on to show what the interest would
23 be in an initial test well in the east half before and
24 after payout.

25 Q And tell us what those figures show.

1 What -- what do the Yates Petroleum Corporation parties
2 control in the east half of Section 36?

3 A Yes. Yates has 160 acres out of the
4 east half, being -- being the southeast quarter.

5 Valley Oil and Gas out of Roswell owns
6 the oil and gas lease covering the northeast quarter. This
7 is the 160 acres that has been later reflected to be split
8 up between BHP and Samedan where they would be drilling
9 with that 50 percent interest with Yates on the other 50
10 percent.

11 Q So this exhibit takes into account the
12 contractual agreements of the various parties as they ac-
13 tually exist to the best of your knowledge?

14 A That's correct. It reflects the farmout
15 which gives BHP and Samedan their interest before payout.

16 It also reflects when Valley backed in
17 after payout, if they exercise their option.

18 Q And summarize these figures for us.
19 What amount, 50 percent of the acreage is controlled by
20 Yates Petroleum Corporation?

21 A That's correct. Yates would have 50
22 percent of the interest not only before payout but after
23 payout of this well.

24 After payout BHP and Samedan each are
25 reduced to 18-3/4. That leaves Valley with the remaining

1 12-1/2 percent.

2 Q And that is prepared based on your un-
3 derstanding of the arrangement between Valley Oil & Gas and
4 BHP and Samedan?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q All right. Identify Exhibit Number
7 Three and tell us what those letters are.

8 A Exhibit Number Three are copies of the
9 transmittal letters sent to BHP and Samedan when the formal
10 operating agreement and AFE covering this unorthodox loca-
11 tion was sent. It was sent certified return receipt. That
12 notification is on the back of the transmittal letter.

13 Q Ms. Colbert, what is your understanding
14 of the nature of the dispute between these parties because
15 of which we're here today?

16 A As far as I understand it, as you
17 earlier stated, both parties do agree that the best loca-
18 tion for all involved, including the State of New Mexico,
19 is the unorthodox location. There is no argument or discus-
20 sion between Yates, Samedan, BHP. The only question here
21 is that Yates feels with their majority interest that they
22 should be the operator. We feel we have the expertise in
23 the area. We feel our costs are lower, not only drilling
24 but overhead costs, and that is our main case, that we feel
25 that controlling interest should drill the well.

1 Q All right, identify Exhibit Number Four
2 for us and tell us what it is.

3 A Exhibit Number Four is an operating
4 agreement covering our proposed well in the east half of
5 36. This is on the standard AAPL Form 610, the 1977
6 agreement. This was a copy of the agreement that was
7 transmitted with the certified letters.

8 Q All right, and Exhibit A to that joint
9 operating agreement is another summary, is it not, of the
10 ownership of the various parties within the east half of
11 Section 36?

12 A That's correct. It lists all the
13 parties and shows their before and after payout status
14 under this east half.

15 Q So as I understand your earlier state-
16 ment, the current controversy revolves solely around which
17 party, BHP or Yates Petroleum Corporation, should be desig-
18 nated the operator of this proposed well?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q Does it appear from the communication
21 between the parties that all are, in fact, desirous of
22 drilling a well at the proposed unorthodox location?

23 A Yes.

24 Q So even though these cases are set up as
25 forced pooling cases, it would appear that most likely who-

1 ever is designated as operator, as far as you know the
2 other parties still intend to participate?

3 A Oh, I feel that's certain because all
4 parties have stated that they agree that this is a good
5 location if it's to be drilled at this unorthodox -- like
6 you stated, it's simply both parties feel that they should
7 be the operator.

8 Q In addition to designating Yates Petro-
9 leum Corporation as operator under your proposed operating
10 agreement, Exhibit Number Four, does it set forth the over-
11 head and supervision charges requested by Yates in the
12 event that it is designated as operator of this spacing
13 unit?

14 A Yes. The COPAS form does set out our
15 drilling and producing rates. The one that we transmitted
16 to BHP and Samedan is no different than any other we've
17 been using in the area. It shows a drilling rate of 3500,
18 producing rate of 350.

19 Q And what was the basis, how were those
20 rates arrived at, to your knowledge?

21 A Every year we review the COPAS recom-
22 mendation that's sent out by the petroleum accountants and
23 also we do look at the Ernst and Whinney Survey that they
24 send out.

25 Our rates have not been changed during

1 the last year. Like I say, this is what we have been using
2 for a well of this depth.

3 Q You previously mentioned Yates' exper-
4 ience in the area. Do you have other Ordovician wells
5 which have been drilled in the general area, and if so,
6 tell us generally where those wells are.

7 A They are located for the most part north
8 of the proposed location in Section 36; I believe somewhere
9 around ten wells, maybe even twelve.

10 Q And do your requested overhead rates in
11 these cases coincide with voluntary rates which are paid by
12 the parties in your existing wells?

13 A That's correct.

14 MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Catanach,
15 I'd move admission of Yates Exhibits One, Two, Three and
16 Four. I have no further questions of Ms. Colbert.

17 MR. KELLAHIN: No objection.

18 MR. CATANACH: Exhibits One
19 through Four will be admitted as evidence.

20 Mr. Kellahin, any questions?

21 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes. sir.

22

23 CROSS EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

25 Q Ms. Colbert, let me ask you to direct

1 your attention to your Exhibit Number One.

2 A Yes.

3 Q In response to Mr. Dickerson's question
4 you told us there was approximately ten to twelve Yates'
5 wells north of this specific area of Section 36.

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q Are those each Ordovician wells?

8 A I do not know if exactly Ordovician
9 would be the right. I know sometimes they're completed
10 considering Montoya --

11 Q Ellenburger, --

12 A Yes.

13 Q -- Ordovician, in that general --

14 A It's my understanding that it's the Or-
15 dovician formation. I know that some of them up to the
16 north may be dually completed and I would not have the
17 facts to tell you which ones are.

18 Q Can we find on -- by looking on Exhibit
19 One, any of those ten to twelve wells?

20 A I don't believe so. You notice we did
21 not use a legal size. We cut it down to letter size.

22 Q My question is where is the closest of
23 the ten or twelve wells that --

24 A Okay, in the --

25 Q -- Yates operates in this general forma-

1 tion?

2 A Okay, the Pathfinder over in Section 21
3 of 10, 27, would be on the east end of your map, north and
4 east?

5 Q Yes, ma'am.

6 A The others would be, let's see --

7 Q The others are farther away, are they
8 not?

9 A Five, six miles. I'm guessing, because
10 I don't have the rest of this map. I believe that there is
11 two wells, there are two wells up in 36 in the next town-
12 ship.

13 Q The Pathfinder Well has just been re-
14 cently potentialled by Yates in the last few weeks, has it
15 not?

16 A You're probably right. I do not have
17 that information.

18 Q Okay. Does Yates operate any of the
19 wells located in any of the acreage outlined in yellow for
20 this formation?

21 A Outlined in yellow?

22 Q Yes, ma'am.

23 A No, sir, there's only one well outlined
24 in yellow.

25 Q The initial well was drilled by BHP.

1 That's that Urban Ranch well in the north half of 5

2 A That's my understanding, yes.

3 Q And then the second well is the well in
4 which Yates does have an interest in the west half of 36.

5 A An interest, right.

6 Q Yes. Did you participate on behalf of
7 your company with negotiations with BHP concerning the
8 drilling of the well in the west half?

9 A Did I personally? No, sir.

10 Q Have you reviewed the documentation to
11 understand that Yates farmed out its acreage in the west
12 half of 36 to BHP --

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q -- for the drilling of that well?

15 A Yes, sir, I do know that.

16 Q Okay. You did not seek to operate that
17 well, did you?

18 A No, sir, we farmed out.

19 Q When we look at the Exhibit Number Two,
20 which is the summary of ownership, have you examined the
21 Valley Oil & Gas Company's farmout agreement with BHP Pet-
22 roleum Company?

23 A No, sir, that is not with our company.
24 It is with BHP.

25 Q You said you were familiar with the

1 Valley farmout and utilized that information in the tabula-
2 tion.

3 A Sir, I said I was familiar with the
4 interest because we were furnished those interests by BHP.

5 Q So you have not examined the farmout
6 agreement.

7 A No, sir, we are not privy to that.

8 Q You would not know, then, to what ex-
9 tent, if the Division allowed Yates to be the operator in
10 the east half of 36, what impact that might have, if any,
11 on the farmout agreement with Valley and BHP.

12 A I would have no idea to any of the con-
13 ditions.

14 Q Are you aware of any of the time con-
15 straints with regards to when BHP must spud the well on the
16 Valley acreage in order to earn its farmout interest?

17 A Yes, sir, simply through BHP. We have
18 not contacted Valley.

19 Q And what is your understanding of the
20 date at which the well must be commenced in the east half
21 of 36?

22 A It was our understanding through tele-
23 phone conversations that it must be commenced by May 15th.
24 That is under the original agreement with no consideration
25 given for any kind of time extensions.

1 Q Is Yates in a position where they can
2 commence the well in order to satisfy the conditions of the
3 spud date, using May 15th as the date by which the well
4 must be started?

5 A Yes, sir, and we have indicated this to
6 the other parties.

7 Q Exhibit Number Three represents Yates'
8 first correspondence to BHP in which it proposes that Yates
9 drill the Valley State No. 1 Well in the east half of 36?

10 A Yes, sir, this is the first formal
11 transmittal, that's correct.

12 Q Am I correct in understanding that it in
13 fact was BHP Petroleum Company that first proposed the well
14 to Yates?

15 A They first proposed an orthodox location
16 to Yates before the well in the west half was even down.

17 Q The proposal for the drilling of a well
18 in the east half of 36, the initial proposal, came from BHP
19 to Yates in January of this year, did it not?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q In response to BHP's request to have
22 Yates participate in the well in the east half of 36, then,
23 the parties discussed sharing data, developing new seismic
24 information from which to agree upon a well location, is
25 that not correct?

1 A That's my understanding, yes, sir.

2 Q Is it also your understanding that the
3 parties have now agreed on the unorthodox location which
4 would be located in the northeast quarter of Section 36 on
5 the Valley Oil & Gas Company lease?

6 A That is my understanding, that the other
7 parties have agreed with our proposed location.

8 Q In responding to BHP Operating -- BHP
9 Petroleum Company's request that they operate the well in
10 the east half of 36, regardless of where it's drilled --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- what specific reasons did Yates com-
13 municate to BHP were the reasons that Yates sought to oper-
14 ate instead of BHP?

15 A The main reason being the majority in-
16 terest.

17 Q All right, that was the main reason.
18 Did you communicate or anyone else on behalf of Yates, to
19 your knowledge, communicate to BHP personnel any other
20 reasons?

21 A Sure.

22 Q What are they?

23 A Mainly our expertise in the area under
24 which would come into account the drilling cost, completion
25 costs, being the AFE, and, of course, the operating agree-

1 ment, the reduced overhead that are using in this Foor
2 Ranch area.

3 Q There are no other reasons that you're
4 using to contend before this Division that Yates ought to
5 be the operator.

6 A There are no other reasons that we wish
7 to bring forth.

8 Q Have you expressed to BHP personnel that
9 these were the reasons that you were opposing BHP being the
10 operator of the well in the east half of 36?

11 A It is my understanding; I did not do it
12 personally.

13 Q Who was the land person in charge of
14 negotiating with BHP over the operations?

15 A Robert Bullock would have been the ini-
16 tial contact. Most of the conversations after the first
17 proposal was received before the west half well was com-
18 pleted, were between the geologists, because when it was
19 first proposed to us, we did not agree with the location;
20 we weren't sure it was prudent to drill a well then, and
21 like I say, discussions passed from the Land Department to
22 the geologist based on the technical data.

23 Q Did land discussions take place between
24 the corresponding land personnel with regards to the oper-
25 ating agreements?

1 A On a limited basis.

2 Q Did not BHP propose an operating
3 agreement and furnish it to Yates before they furnished
4 their operating agreement back to BHP?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q And in fact you have utilized one of the
7 exhibits in your Exhibit Number Four taken from the BHP
8 operating agreement, haven't you?

9 A That is correct. Exhibit Eight is the
10 BHP one because we were not privy to the Valley farmout.

11 Q On top of Exhibit Eight, Ms. Colbert, it
12 says, "Attached to and made a part of that certain
13 operating agreement dated January 12th, 1989, between BHP
14 Petroleum Company, Inc. as operator and Yates Petroleum
15 Corporation, et al, as non-operators"?

16 A Right, because the landman did copy the
17 agreement exactly as it was in the operating agreement sent
18 to him.

19 Q That is certainly not your intent,
20 though. You're --

21 A No, sir.

22 Q -- going to change that language?

23 A No, sir.

24 Q Have you satisfied yourself that the
25 other information on Exhibit A is correct?

1 A Yes, they have.

2 Q What's your understanding of Mr. Randy
3 Patterson's involvement with regards to negotiating your
4 company's position with BHP Petroleum?

5 A He is the Land Manager and when it be-
6 came obvious that the problem was not going to be easily
7 resolved, as I'm sure BHP and Yates and Samedan would have
8 liked to have seen it avoid a hearing, he became active in
9 the negotiations. He is more experienced than the landman
10 handling this. He had many conversations simply because he
11 was dealing with the land manager of BHP.

12 Q Is Mr. Patterson here today?

13 A No, he's not.

14 Q Tell me specifically what your personal
15 involvement was?

16 A My personal involvement?

17 Q Yes, ma'am.

18 A I am Robert Bullock's direct supervisor.
19 I attended the January meeting between Yates, BHP, Samedan,
20 at which time we formally showed the geology, some back-
21 ground as to why we thought the location in the east half
22 should be unorthodox rather than the standard location pro-
23 posed to us by BHP.

24 So I have to say I was present, as BHP
25 knows, on many of the telephone calls with the land

1 manager speaking to their land manager.

2 Q Are there any particular reasons that
3 Yates has utilized the 1977 GAO form as opposed to the 1982
4 form?

5 A That is our -- the (unclear) that we use
6 for all wells. We have not formally changed our policy,
7 our way of doing things. We are still using the 1977 form,
8 not only in this area, throughout our other dealings.

9 Q I want to make sure I'm focused on the
10 areas in which there is an opportunity for disagreement
11 that the Examiner must resolve.

12 Am I correct in understanding that BHP's
13 operating agreement submitted to you was on the 1982 form?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q Is there any material difference between
16 the two companies as to what form is utilized, in your
17 opinion?

18 A I don't think as far as the form. There
19 are a couple of options that we did not like in the BHP
20 agreement; however, we did not argue them because we pre-
21 ferred to try and operate and use the '77 form, but we have
22 used the '82 form with other people operating. We like to
23 see the language where it says each party shall take in
24 kind, we like to add in there, shall have the right to take
25 in kind. There are a few minor changes, but we have no ob-

1 jections that we can state against using the 1982 form.

2 Q So that is one of the issues that's not
3 in contention today.

4 A No, sir. Like I say, the basic form, we
5 have no problems with '77 or '82.

6 Q During any of these conversations in
7 which you participate or have knowledge between your com-
8 pany and the BHP personnel in negotiating a resolution of
9 who should operate the interests and the wells in the east
10 half of 36, were you ever present or did you understand
11 that one of the principal contentions of your company was
12 that they had the ability to obtain a price advantage by
13 the connection of this well to Transwestern's pipeline
14 system only if Yates was the operator?

15 MR. DICKERSON: Excuse me.
16 Mr. Catanach would you and Mr. Kellahin have any problem
17 with us going off the record for just a minute? We have a
18 very brief --

19 MR. CATANACH: Sure, go ahead
20 and do that.

21
22 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

23
24 MR. CATANACH: Call the
25 hearing back to order and I believe Mr. Kellahin was still

1 cross examining the witness.

2 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr.
3 Examiner.

4 Q Ms. Colbert, let me ask you some ques-
5 tions with regards to your position on the fact that you
6 believe Yates has the ability to drill the well using AFE
7 costs that are lower than BHP costs. All right, you raised
8 that this morning as one of your points for urging the Ex-
9 aminer to award operations to Yates.

10 A Based on the AFE's, that's true.

11 Q All right. Have you made a comparison
12 of other wells that Yates either operates or has an inter-
13 est in to see what the AFE costs were versus the completed
14 well costs for those various wells?

15 A Yes, sir, we have.

16 Q Are you prepared as part of your presen-
17 tation to talk about those points or is that another wit-
18 ness?

19 A I believe that's another witness. Drill-
20 ing is not my field.

21 Q Well, sure. You also mentioned one of
22 your points was the opinion that the overhead rates that
23 Yates had proposed for the well were going to be lower than
24 the BHP rates.

25 Let me see if I remember correctly, I

1 believe your JOA has got 3500 and 350 --

2 A 350, that's correct.

3 Q -- as the proposed overhead rates?

4 Have you utilized those overhead rates on any similar well
5 in the immediate vicinity?

6 A Yes.

7 Q For this depth?

8 A For all the Ordovician gas wells, that's
9 correct.

10 Q Okay. When we look at your Exhibit Num-
11 ber One, there is an area up in the northwest corner of
12 that display which is the Yates Petroleum operated
13 Sunnyside Unit?

14 A That's correct. It's a State unit.

15 Q Okay. The overhead rates in that unit
16 agreement to which BHP participates are \$5400 and \$540 a
17 month, are they not?

18 A I could not tell you. I haven't looked
19 at this unit since it was put together.

20 Q All right. I understand. The unit
21 operation --

22 A It is a unit, State exploratory unit,
23 not a single spacing unit well.

24 Q You do not know what rates Yates, as
25 operator, is using in the Sunnyside Unit?

1 A I'm sorry, I don't. I should because I
2 did that, but, like I say, since it was put together last
3 year and drilled, I have not looked at it.

4 Q Okay. Let's look at the overhead
5 charges in the west half of 36. Now, that's -- that's an
6 area in which after payout, then, Yates will participate as
7 a working interest owner.

8 A That's correct, yes.

9 Q And Yates has signed the BHP operating
10 agreement for the well in the west half of 36, haven't you?

11 A I'm sure we have.

12 Q And that agreement, to which Yates has
13 signed, provides for overhead rates on that well of \$4100 a
14 month drilling well and then a producing well rate of \$410
15 a month. Is that not true?

16 A I'm sorry, I don't know.

17 Q You don't know?

18 A No. I would assume they sent the AFE,
19 the operating agreement on the east half that it would
20 match a west half, but I don't know this.

21 Q You made a comment this morning about
22 looking at the Ernst and Whinney overhead rates that are
23 tabulated by the accounting firm?

24 A When we set our rates every year, that's
25 correct.

1 Q Have you looked at the 1988 Ernst and
2 Whinney publication for wells at this depth to determine
3 what they show to be the average prices for wells?

4 A No, sir, not recently.

5 Q Okay. Let me show you the 1988 book,
6 Ms. Colbert, and I'll turn to page 18 and 19 and if you'll
7 go down that schedule and find for me the particular depth
8 and locate for me, then, what they suggest for overhead
9 rates.

10 A Well, where you turned is the Gulf of
11 Mexico and I --

12 Q I'm sorry, did I miss the page?

13 A -- don't think will apply.

14 Q You don't work there?

15 A No, sir.

16 Q That wasn't a quiz. That was just a
17 mistake on my part.

18 A Oh, I thought it was a test. Okay.

19 Okay, this would fall under this 1988
20 survey results for Region V, which is West Texas/Eastern
21 New Mexico.

22 Q That's found on what page of the report?

23 A It's found on page 15 as to the gas
24 wells and, of course, they refer to a gas well over 5000
25 feet but not over 10,000, with the average being 4109 and,

1 of course, they trim that down to 5 -- 419.

2 Q Thank you very much. I have no further
3 questions.

4 MR. CATANACH: Any further
5 questions?

6 MR. DICKERSON: Just one.

7
8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. DICKERSON:

10 Q Ms. Colbert, you -- did I understand
11 your answer in response to question of Mr. Kellahin to be
12 that Yates Petroleum, if designated operator of this unit,
13 is willing to commit to spud the well to accommodate any
14 time problems under its farmout arrangements that BHP and
15 other parties in the northeast quarter of Section 36 have?

16 A Well, that's how I responded this
17 morning, that not only were we able and willing to, that we
18 had relayed that to the other parties in the well.

19 Q So Yates is firmly committed that you're
20 not in a position where you're trying to delay the drilling
21 of the well in order to create any problems, expiring
22 farmout, or anything of that nature. Yates will comply
23 with BHP's time problem if they're named operator?

24 A That's exactly correct.

25 MR. DICKERSON: I have nothing

1 further.

2 MR. CATANACH: No questions.

3 The witness may be excused.

4

5 LESLIE BENTZ,

6 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon her

7 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

8

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. DICKERSON:

11 Q Ms. Bentz, state your name, your occupa-
12 tion and by whom you're employed, and in what capacity,
13 please.

14 A My name is Leslie Bentz. I'm employed
15 as a petroleum geologist by Yates Petroleum Corporation of
16 Artesia, New Mexico.

17 Q And, Ms. Bentz, you have previously
18 qualified and testified before this Division on numerous
19 occasions as a petroleum geologist, have you not?

20 A Yes, I have.

21 Q And are you familiar with the available
22 geologic data which is available to you regarding the area
23 which is the subject of today's application?

24 A Yes, I am.

25 Q Refer to the structure map which was

1 submitted as Exhibit Number Five and review this for us.

2 A The map is a subsurface structure map on
3 top of the PrePenn unconformity. This surface is near or
4 at the top of the productive interval Ordovician formation
5 and it is used as it provides the best seismic marker. The
6 contour interval used is 25 feet.

7 Datum points are noted by circles and
8 the appropriate datum is listed next to the well. Yellow
9 lines indicate the seismic data incorporated into this map
10 and the calculated subsea depth conversions are located
11 next to the associated shot points. The well spots colored
12 in red indicate the Ordovician producers in the area. They
13 are the BHP Yates "36" No. 1 in Section 36, and BHP's Ervin
14 Ranch State No. 1, which is the discovery well in Section
15 5.

16 Production from the Ordovician formation
17 in this area occurs when there is sufficient structural
18 relief to provide a trapping mechanism. The structure map
19 provided shows a narrow, tilted fault block trending north-
20 slightly northeast. Closure into the bounding fault, which
21 is downthrown to the west provides the western limits of
22 production.

23 To the east the beds dip very steeply
24 and provide the eastern limits to production.

25 The north and the south limits of this

1 field have not yet been defined but indications are that
2 anti-regional dip to the north provides the northern limits
3 and that regional dip to the south provides the southern
4 limits.

5 Q Ms. Bentz, we've heard previous testi-
6 mony relating to other Yates Petroleum Corporation wells
7 in this same general area possibly some distance away. Re-
8 late to us a little bit more about other Ordovician wells
9 in this vicinity in which Yates has an interest, where
10 they're located, and tell us some of the factors which bear
11 on both risk in drilling these Ordovician wells and in
12 making the decision as to the best allowable location
13 within a given spacing unit when you're dealing with the
14 Ordovician.

15 A Okay. In 1982 Yates Petroleum drilled
16 two wells at the Foor Ranch Field. Both of these wells
17 were drilled in an attempt to complete in the Ordovician
18 formation. At the time we did not employ the uses of
19 seismic. Both of those wells, we missed our objective. One
20 well we drilled on the PreCambrian Knob (sic) and missed
21 the Ordovician entirely. The other well, on the eastern
22 side of the Foor Ranch, was 200 feet low to prognosis.

23 So after that we sat back and we recon-
24 sidered our position and area and we decided that we prob-
25 ably needed to employ seismic. Since then we've drilled 12

1 Ordovician tests and 10 of them have been completed as
2 producers.

3 Q Relate to us a little more about exact-
4 ly -- you referred to the Foor Ranch Field and some of the
5 other Ordovician wells that you're talking about. Where,
6 in general terms, are these wells located with regard to
7 the west half of 36 that we're concerned with?

8 A The closest Foor Ranch production is in
9 Section 36 of 9, 26, which puts it exactly one township due
10 north.

11 The nearest production Yates Petroleum
12 has to this particular section is in Section 21 of Town-
13 ship 10 South, 27 East, and that is the Pathfinder No. 3.
14 In fact, the Pathfinder No. 3 was completed within a week
15 of the Ervin, BHP's Ervin Ranch State No. 1.

16 We have also been to the Commission --
17 10 of those wells that have been completed, 3 of them have
18 been unorthodox locations.

19 Q Now why is that? Why is there seem to
20 be a necessity in the operators' opinions for unorthodox
21 locations when drilling to test the Ordovician in the area?

22 A Often the structure, as in the case with
23 the Ervin Ranch area, the structures are very narrow and
24 very complex. We have been shooting seismic lines just to
25 pick one location and where we see the best location seis-

1 mically is where we have been drilling the wells and we
2 don't feel like that we can compromise in where the loca-
3 tion of the well is, not only due -- it has a bearing on
4 whether or whether or not you make a well, but the higher
5 you can get structurally, the longer that well will pro-
6 duce. These are water drive reservoirs and when you start
7 having water encroachment on a gas well it makes production
8 really tough, and so some of these wells, because we had
9 drilled unorthodox, we had recovered more reserves and
10 these may produce years longer than if we had drilled at an
11 orthodox location.

12 Q So do I understand you that you use a
13 combination of borehole data obtained, subsurface data, and
14 seismic information to come up with these prospective loca-
15 tions?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q What are the yellow lines indicated on
18 your Exhibit Number Five?

19 A Okay. The yellow lines indicate the
20 four seismic lines that were used -- well, four of them
21 were used picking this location. The fifth line was used,
22 was shot to verify the location.

23 Q Okay, tell us which lines are which.
24 Which --

25 A Okay.

1 Q -- line was used to verify?

2 A BHP Line 6 was available before the
3 location was chosen; BHP Line 5, BHP Line 2 and Yates Line
4 11. We shot the Ervin Ranch Line 2, or actually BHP shot
5 the line and we paid for 50 percent of that line to verify
6 this location.

7 Q Now that BHP Line 2 that you're refer-
8 ring to is the vertical north/south seismic line extending
9 --

10 A Right the Ervin Ranch Line 2 is the one
11 that goes the proposed location.

12 Q From east to west.

13 A From east to west.

14 Q All right. By looking at the Exhibit
15 Number Five, tell us what you see on this exhibit that con-
16 vinces you as a petroleum geologist with access to both
17 this borehole data and the seismic information obtained by
18 all the parties here, that your proposed unorthodox at the
19 footage previously given is superior to any standard loca-
20 tion for a spacing unit on the east half of Section 36.

21 A From information obtained from the Ervin
22 Ranch State No. 1, a drill stem test and detailed log cal-
23 culations of Yates "36" No. 1, we have established a water
24 -- gas/water contact at approximately -2524, and I would
25 put this in the range of plus to minus 10 feet of error.

1 By locating the well at the unorthodox
2 location, it is possible that we may get 90 feet of gross
3 pay, whereas if we move this to the closest orthodox loca-
4 tion, which would be at 1980/1980, we are down to 40 feet
5 of gross pay.

6 The next pay the porosity comes in any-
7 where from 20 to 30 feet below the top of the Ordovician
8 which I define as the gross pay, so then you're down to
9 maybe 10 to 20 feet above the gas/water contact. By the
10 time you throw some error in there, as your agreement with
11 seismic may be plus or minus 30 feet, it is a very real
12 possibility that that well will be located at or below the
13 gas/water contact.

14 Another thing is that the dolomite re-
15 servoir, Ordovician reservoir, has very good vertical per-
16 meability and it is fractured. If you get within 10 or 20
17 feet of the gas/water contact, even though you may have 10
18 or 20 feet of pay, it is possible that you may not be able
19 to make a good completion from water coming up from below
20 you through the fractures.

21 So I feel like that by placing it at the
22 unorthodox location, that we are lowering our risk; we have
23 a better chance of making a well; if we do make a well, we
24 will be higher and that will increase the life and we will
25 ultimately recover more reserves that would otherwise have

1 been left behind.

2 Q Is it your opinion that the proposed
3 well location for this east half spacing unit is the best
4 geologic location for a well to drain that east half?

5 A It is the best geological location in
6 Section 36 without moving it completely up to the north
7 edge of that line, which would be, you know, very unortho-
8 dox. So I picked the best geological location I could near
9 an orthodox location.

10 Q So as I understand it, there are two
11 principal factors that you look at to determine risk. One,
12 if you get below the gas/water contact, you get oil or not
13 -- you get oil or water and not gas.

14 A That's right.

15 Q A dry hole.

16 A A dry hole.

17 Q And the other is based on structural
18 position in the reservoir so that if you get higher rela-
19 tively speaking, structurally you have a better opportunity
20 for larger reserves in that spacing unit?

21 A That is correct. One other thing is
22 you'll notice that the blue area on this map indicates
23 areas in which the Mississippian formation, which is the
24 PrePenn unconformity surface, too, doesn't exist in the Er-
25 vin Ranch State No. 1 and the Yates "36" State No. 1 we've

1 picked up approximately 50 feet of Mississippian.

2 By moving east regionally you may pick
3 up more Mississippian section, so we feel like by staying
4 as far west as we can that we have a chance to not pick up
5 a lot of additional Mississippian section which would de-
6 finitely make (unclear) and again increase the risk.

7 Q So except as noted by blue, the Missis-
8 sippian either does not exist there or was not deposited or
9 has been eroded away in the interim.

10 A On the blue area the Mississippian has
11 been eroded away or nondeposition, probably erosion. In
12 the white area you do have a Mississippian section where
13 the PrePenn nonconformity was (unclear).

14 Seismically you cannot distinguish
15 between the top of the Mississippian and the top of the
16 Ordovician in this area, so this is the best we can do .

17 Q Do you have anything further you'd like
18 to add about Exhibit Number Five?

19 A No.

20 Q Okay, identify your cross section, Exhi-
21 bit Number Six and review it for us.

22 A Okay. Exhibit Number Six is a struc-
23 tural cross section and it shows the relationship between
24 the two completed gas wells to our proposed location. As a
25 datum we've hung it at -2050 and it shows all of the perti-

1 nent formation tops in the area.

2 As you will note, the PrePenn unconfor-
3 mity is our mapping surface, which in the case of the BHP
4 Ervin Ranch No. 1 is the top of the pay, the top of the
5 Ordovician formation. By the time you get over to the
6 Yates "36" State No. 1, we have picked up approximately 40
7 to 50 feet of Mississippian, so the mapping surface is ac-
8 tually 50 feet above where the actual pay is.

9 What we're showing at the proposed loca-
10 tion is we expect to be slightly down dip from the BHP
11 Yates "36" State No. 1. I have left the Mississippian
12 about the same interval thickness but there is a chance
13 that may increase with a little bit more Mississippian sec-
14 tion.

15 We are -- I'm also showing my gas/water
16 contact. It's at -- estimated at -2524 and again I think
17 that's probably within 10 feet.

18 Q Ms. Bentz, tell us, if you would, your
19 involvement in picking this location, specifically with BHP
20 and the other parties which we are here for today, as far
21 as how this current location has been evolved, been agreed
22 upon by all parties.

23 A Okay. About the time that the Yates
24 "36" No. 1 was being completed, we received an AFE from
25 BHP.

1 Q Now that was in January of this year,
2 right?

3 A That was in January of this year. The
4 location was 1980 from the south and 1980 from the east. I
5 did not immediately act on this until I could get in touch
6 with Bill Morris, which is the geologist with BHP, and I
7 felt like that neither one of us would be prudent to ap-
8 prove or not approve the location without trying to work
9 out some kind of seismic exchange.

10 So BHP swapped the three existing lines
11 that they had over that section that were pertinent to the
12 location and I in turn swapped the one line that I had over
13 that section.

14 After -- I did not immediately have a
15 problem with the location until I was able to obtain BHP's
16 seismic data. After I reviewed not only my line, and their
17 three lines, I felt like that that location was not the
18 best location --

19 Q Now let me ask you --

20 A -- could have.

21 Q -- what -- what location was proposed by
22 BHP?

23 A Okay, it was the 1980 from the south and
24 1980 from the east.

25 Q The standard location --

1 A The standard location --

2 Q -- for an east half spacing unit.

3 A Right, but in the southeast quarter.

4 Q All right, and upon your review of all
5 the data you determined what?

6 A I determined that that was not the best
7 location for the east half of Section 36. Once I decided
8 that I was very worried about the location, I had talked to
9 Bill Morris with BHP about the location and he admitted
10 that he had some reservations, there was also a dipmeter on
11 the Yates "36" No. 1 that indicates that dip is 4 to 6 de-
12 grees to the southeast, which when you use the dipmeter
13 computations versus what we had with the seismic, that in-
14 dicated that there was a very real possibility that we were
15 going to be below the gas/water contact, maybe even 30 or
16 40 feet below it, plus with the Mississippian thickening to
17 the southeast.

18 So I had thrown my well location to Bill
19 but all this was done very informally, two geologists
20 speaking over the phone discussing what we could do tech-
21 nically.

22 Then it became my understanding through
23 conversations with the Land Department that there was a
24 very real possibility that Yates Petroleum was going to be
25 force pooled at that location.

1 Q At the standard --

2 A At the standard --

3 Q -- orthodox location proposed?

4 A -- location proposed. So we had -- and
5 I had heard this, we made arrangements with BHP and we went
6 to -- Kathy Colvert and I flew to Midland, went into BHP's
7 office and I made my maps and my interpretation available
8 to BHP at that time, and to Samedan.

9 Q And since that time has an additional
10 seismic line been conducted?

11 A Yes. They called back several days
12 after the meeting and said that Samedan was still exer-
13 cising, you know, they were worried about the location in
14 general, and they felt like the best thing we could do was
15 shoot a seismic line through the proposed location, the new
16 proposed location, the Yates location. We thought that
17 that was a very prudent thing to do, so within probably two
18 days of that Bill Morris FAX'ed an AFE to our office con-
19 cerning seismic. We signed it and FAX'ed it back that very
20 same afternoon.

21 So then we had put everything on hold on
22 this location until we could get the additional seismic in,
23 which we did shortly --

24 Q And --

25 A -- before this hearing.

1 Q And what, briefly, is the current con-
2 sensus of the parties, if there is one?

3 A I think the current consensus after
4 shooting this line is that we affirm that we do need an
5 unorthodox location and this well deserves to be drilled.

6 Q So to your understanding BHP now sup-
7 ports the same location as originally proposed by you?

8 A Their force pooling us at that location.
9 I assume that they liked it.

10 Q Now you have discussed the factors which
11 bear upon the risk involved in drilling an Ordovician well
12 at this location. Based upon those factors, Ms. Bentz,
13 have you come to an opinion as to what would be an appro-
14 priate risk penalty to be imposed in any pooling order is-
15 sued out of these cases?

16 A Yes, I have.

17 Q And what in your opinion is an appro-
18 priate risk penalty?

19 A 200 percent.

20 Q The maximum 200 percent permissible?

21 A Yes.

22 Q From your study of this data which is
23 available, Ms. Bentz, do you know whether or not these
24 existing two wells appear to be in the same geologic reser-
25 voir?

1 A The pressures indicate, as well as the
2 gas/water indicates that they are in the same reservoir.

3 Q Would that be consistent with what you
4 find in the other Ordovician wells in the area in which
5 Yates has an interest?

6 A Yes, it would.

7 Q You generally find a reservoir defined
8 by the structure and limited by the gas/water contact or
9 any other factors, but once discovered there's more than
10 one well produced from those reservoirs?

11 A That is correct.

12 Q Now tell us the time frame, the Ervin
13 Ranch State No. 1 Well, do you know exactly when that well
14 was drilled? That's the wells in the northwest quarter of
15 Section 5. That was the first --

16 A I can tell you when --

17 Q -- discovery well, wasn't it?

18 A Yes. I can tell you when they did their
19 4-point test. It was in November and early December of
20 1988.

21 Q Okay, and tell us the timeframe for the
22 drilling and completion of the Yates 36" State Well in the
23 west half of Section 36.

24 A Okay. I don't have an exact date on the
25 4-point test but it was down and logged over New Year's and

1 completed shortly thereafter, so it would have put it the
2 very first to middle of January.

3 Q Now, neither of these wells are current-
4 ly -- there is no pipeline in the area; the wells are not
5 currently producing, are they?

6 A No, they're not.

7 Q From -- based on your experience in de-
8 veloping pools in the Ordovician, absent the time problems
9 that we understand BHP has under its farmout arrangements
10 in order to earn the additional acreage by the drilling of
11 the third well in the east half of 36, which is the subject
12 of this hearing, would it ordinarily be necessary to drill
13 a third well at this time or at the end of January to a
14 proposed third well?

15 A No. They're really not, there is no
16 pipeline immediately accessible. I have the same problem,
17 I've mentioned the Pathfinder, which is the closest Yates
18 production, we know that we have additional locations in
19 that area but as we have no pipeline connection, we feel
20 like it is not prudent of us to go invest the money in a
21 hole that may sit there for an indefinite period of time
22 without producing. As soon as a pipeline becomes available
23 we will go drill the offset well.

24 Q But notwithstanding those concerns, you
25 share what we understand is Yates' commitment to drill that

1 third well at the proposed unorthodox location for the
2 reason of accommodating BHP's lease expiration -- or farm-
3 out timeframe?

4 A Yes. We intend to drill the well as
5 soon problems are resolved to honor that commitment.

6 MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Catanach,
7 move admission of Yates Exhibits Five and Six. I have
8 nothing further of Ms. Bentz.

9 MR. KELLAHIN: No objection.

10 MR. CATANACH: Exhibits Five
11 and Six will be admitted as evidence.

12 Mr. Kellahin?

13
14 CROSS EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

16 Q Ms. Bentz, let me take you
17 back to the structure map, Exhibit Number Five. Tell me
18 again what your opinion is of the approximate location of
19 the current gas/water contact.

20 A -2524. It's not actually located on the
21 well but it is on the -- I mean on the map, but it's on the
22 cross section.

23 Q Your estimate of the gas/water contact
24 would place that gas/water contact to the east of Section
25 36 the way this is contoured.

1 A Yes, but you have to realize that this
2 map is on top of the PrePenn unconformity, which is not
3 necessarily the Ordovician top.

4 Q What I'm looking for is to have you
5 explain for me where you think the gas/water contact is
6 within the boundaries of the east half of 36. What contour
7 line do I follow?

8 A Well, it's not quite as simple as that.

9 Q I understand, but I'm a simple person
10 and I can't figure it out.

11 A Well, --

12 Q I want to use a contour line on here and
13 I know this is mapped --

14 A You can't -- okay, it's mapped on the
15 PrePenn unconformity --

16 Q That's right.

17 A -- which is a top of a surface.

18 Q Yeah.

19 A You have the Mississippian section in-
20 creasing to the south/southeast.

21 Q Well, I understand all that. I want --

22 A So, okay --

23 Q -- you to tell me where the water is.

24 A Okay. The water is at -2524 in subsea
25 depth. That doesn't necessarily mean that you can draw one

1 line on this map and say, you know -- you would have to map
2 the top of the PrePenn dolomite to be able to do that.

3 Q Project this to the top of the PrePenn
4 dolomite for me and give me your best estimate of where you
5 think the likely gas/water contact is within the boundaries
6 of the east half of 36.

7 A Okay, well, obviously, if I felt their
8 location at 1980/1980 was very risky and near that, then
9 probably what you're doing is that is going to run down the
10 middle of that east half. So you're going to have 80
11 acres in the northeast quarter and approximately 80 acres
12 in the southeast quarter.

13 Q Well, it will -- you will have to honor
14 the contour lines that you've display, will it not?

15 A Right.

16 Q Can I follow the -2425 contour line on
17 the display? Does that approximate --

18 A Very, very roughly.

19 Q All right. Okay. What I'm trying to
20 find out is the relationship geologically between your
21 proposed unorthodox location that everyone, I assume, now
22 agrees to, and the closest standard location. I'm trying
23 to have you draw for us the distinction. All right, what
24 are we --

25 Q Okay, I guess I'm a little curious as to

1 why we're discussing this because I thought that BHP ap-
2 proved that location.

3 Q Because Mr. Catanach's got a memo from
4 the Director today telling him to consider imposing a pen-
5 alty on an unorthodox well location even if there's no
6 opposition to that.

7 A So you're speaking for Mr. Catanach?

8 Q I'm speaking for both of us trying not
9 to get this well penalized.

10 A Okay.

11 Q Bear with me, I'm on your side.

12 A Okay. Well, I -- that's what -- I was
13 trying to respond there for a second.

14 Q When we look at the closest standard
15 location for an east half well.

16 A The closest is 1980 from the north and
17 east.

18 Q That's right.

19 A That's the location I discussed.

20 Q Well, let's look from the north 1980 and
21 bring yourself 660 from the western boundary of the spacing
22 unit.

23 A Okay.

24 Q All right, you said east, let me make
25 sure we're at the same point; 1980 form the north --

- 1 A 1980 from the north.
- 2 Q 660 from the west --
- 3 A No, no.
- 4 Q -- 660 from the western boundary of the
- 5 spacing unit.
- 6 A Yeah, but 1980 from the east line.
- 7 Q Yes, all right, same point. Okay, what
- 8 structural position on this exhibit does that put you at?
- 9 A That puts you below the -2385 but again
- 10 you're going to have additional Mississippian section,
- 11 which I threw in approximately 30 feet north of Mississip-
- 12 pian section, so you're looking at a point on the top of
- 13 the Ordovician which is 30 to 40 feet below that particular
- 14 point.
- 15 Q So if I take -2385, approximately, sub-
- 16 tract 40 feet, that's going to get me in the top of the pay
- 17 of the Ordovician.
- 18 A Hopefully.
- 19 Q All right.
- 20 A And then there is a factor for when
- 21 you're dealing with seismic there is also an error factor
- 22 or two that you could go either way on either location.
- 23 Q And that's a plus or minus 30 feet.
- 24 A 30, 35 feet.
- 25 Q All right. Now give me the structural

1 position on the top of the Ordovician for the proposed
2 unorthodox location which is 1650 and 330, 330 from the
3 western boundary of the spacing unit. What's that point?

4 A That point is between -2380 and -2375.

5 Q What then is the vertical difference --

6 A But you --

7 Q -- between the closest standard location
8 and the unorthodox location?

9 A Okay. You're going to have less Missis-
10 sippian there, so you're looking at roughly, maybe 10 to 15
11 feet structurally on the Mississippian and then you had the
12 30 to 40 feet, so you're looking at approximately, maybe 55
13 feet of difference.

14 Q Okay, we gain approximately 55 feet of
15 vertical structure in the primary pay formation.

16 A Yes.

17 Q All right. And that to you as a geolo-
18 gist is a significant enough number that requires you to
19 assert an unorthodox location as opposed to the closest
20 standard location.

21 A That is correct.

22 Q And that coupled with the opinion of the
23 gas/water contact is your justification, then, for the un-
24 orthodox location.

25 A Correct.

1 Q All right. Does this location gain any
2 unfair advantage over the interest owners in the west half
3 of the section?

4 A I have not sat down and calculated the
5 exact drainage.

6 Q Well, it wasn't intended --

7 A But you are --

8 Q Excuse me.

9 A But it wasn't intended to do that. That
10 was not the intention of it, but it is 330 -- 330 feet
11 nearer the line, the center line.

12 Q I don't expect you to calculate the
13 drainage calculations for me. Geologically, though, you
14 have told us there's a significance in being up structure.

15 A Right.

16 Q And avoiding the gas/water contact.

17 A That's correct.

18 Q Geologically, by approval of this loca-
19 tion without a penalty are the owners in the east half
20 gaining an unfair advantage over the owners in the west
21 half?

22 A You're 330 nearer their line.

23 Q What is the structural relationship be-
24 tween the Yates State 36 - 1 Well in the west half of 36 to
25 the unorthodox location?

1 A Structurally I expect the Yates "36" No.
2 1 to be higher than the proposed location.

3 Q So it already has some structural ad-
4 vantage, then.

5 A It does have some structural advantage.

6 Q What contour line do I follow as I move
7 through the west half of 36 to find the -- the size and
8 shape of the reservoir?

9 A Well, it's the fault on the lefthand
10 side is one boundary factor.

11 Q Okay.

12 A And then as you have already, around --
13 between -2425 and -2450 would be the gas/water contact over
14 on the eastern side. It's not bound by a fault, it's just
15 steep dip.

16 Q Did you participate as a geologist in
17 Yates' decision to farmout its interest in the west half of
18 36 rather than --

19 A Yes, I did.

20 Q -- participate in that well?

21 A Yes, I did. May I explain that deci-
22 sion or are you just wanting to know if I was involved?

23 Q I wanted to know if you were involved.

24 A Yes.

25 Q You've answered my question, thank you.

1 A Sure.

2 MR. DICKERSON: Would you like
3 to explain --

4 MR. KELLAHIN: Well, when you
5 get a chance to.

6 MR. DICKERSON: I'm sorry, I
7 thought you were --

8 MR. KELLAHIN: It's my turn,
9 honey.

10 Q Using Ms. Colbert's Exhibit Number One
11 that she talked about Yates' acreage position, am -- am I
12 correct in understanding that Yates, other than a working
13 interest owner in its -- in the well, the BHP well on the
14 west half of 36, there aren't any other of these similar
15 type gas wells in which Yates operates or has a working in-
16 terest?

17 A On the -- are you talking about the yel-
18 low colored acreage?

19 Q The yellow color, yes, ma'am.

20 A Well the only well on the yellow
21 coloring that is an Ordovician well is the Yates "36" No.
22 1.

23 Q Okay, and then to the south of that we
24 have the Ervin Ranch well in the northeast of 5.

25 A Right.

1 Q And that's outside the yellow, and then
2 we have to move over into the northeast corner in Section
3 21 to the Pathfinder Well.

4 A It's not the northeast quarter; it's the
5 southwest quarter.

6 Q Would it be your responsibility for your
7 company to make an analysis of the availability and the
8 cost in bringing a pipeline into this particular portion of
9 the pool to have the wells connected and then produced;
10 just not something you would do, would it be?

11 A No.

12 MR. KELLLAHIN: Thank you, Mr.
13 Examiner.

14 MR. CATANACH: Redirect, Mr.
15 Dickerson?

16 MR. DICKERSON: Just a couple
17 of questions.

18
19 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. DICKERSON:

21 Q Ms. Bentz, in picking your location for
22 this proposed well, you weigh the geologic factors and the
23 risk factors that you've discussed, do you not?

24 A Yes, I do.

25 Q You don't -- you don't weigh and take

1 into consideration the relative merits as to how far it is
2 from the boundary line.

3 A No, other than I almost never go beyond
4 330 towards the particular boundary.

5 Q But in choosing that particular unortho-
6 dox location you have attempted to pick the best geologic
7 location for the maximum recovery or chance of recovery of
8 oil and gas anywhere in that spacing unit that we're rele-
9 gated with since the west half is already dedicated.

10 A That's right.

11 Q All right.

12 A Without going on top of the lease line.

13 Q Mr. Kellahin asked you whether or not
14 you were involved and you stated that you were in the deci-
15 sion to farmout the Yates acreage in the west half of Sec-
16 tion 36. Would you like to explain your participation in
17 that decision?

18 A Yes, I would. At the time BHP brought
19 the Ervin Ranch prospect to us we were looking at joining
20 them in this project but also at the same time we were
21 drilling numerous step out wells in the Foor Ranch area and
22 at the same time they were drilling the Ervin Ranch State
23 No. 1 we were drilling the Pathfinder. So we had two other
24 areas that we were involved with that were the same forma-
25 tion that we felt like we should do.

1 We wanted to see BHP drill a well;
2 therefore we gave them support in the form of a farmout
3 option on the west half of Section 36. We did not give
4 them all of our acreage in 36. Yates has a back-in in that
5 well and we left ourselves an offset location if we so de-
6 sired. So it was a business decision.

7 Q But that decision to support BHP's
8 drilling of the Yates "36" State Well, as it turned out BHP
9 took the risk in drilling that well, it appears to have
10 established a commercial well, and have benefitted not
11 only themselves but Yates Petroleum Corporation as a prac-
12 tical matter.

13 A That is correct.

14 Q And in your experience is that the way
15 this business customarily operates, the companies support-
16 ing each other in a mutual endeavor to establish oil and
17 gas production?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Okay, I have nothing further.

20
21 CROSS EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. CATANACH:

23 Q Ms. Bentz, just a couple of questions.
24 You said that you gain approximately 55 feet structure at
25 the proposed location.

1 A Yes.

2 Q Yet the -- you said that the standard
3 location would be at about -2385?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And at the proposed between 2375 and
6 2380.

7 A Yes, but I expect by moving further to
8 the south and to the east, as would be the proposed loca-
9 tion, your Mississippian section is going to thicken very
10 rapidly, so I'm expecting to pick up 30, 40, and maybe even
11 50 feet of additional Mississippian section. From the
12 Ervin Ranch State No. 1, which was original discovery well,
13 there was no Mississippian present whatsoever. By moving
14 up to Yates "36" State No. 1 they have picked up addition-
15 al nearly 50 feet of Mississippian and they're basically
16 still on the structural ridge, so when you get off on the
17 flanks you're going to pick up Mississippian very rapidly.

18 Q Ms. Bentz, if you -- if you were forced
19 to drill a standard location, would you recommend that lo-
20 cation to your management? Would you recommend that well
21 be drilled?

22 A I would have to think about it very
23 seriously and point out to them the additional risk and
24 then I think from there forward it would be a management
25 decision.

1 MR. CATANACH: No further
2 questions.

3
4 ROBERT G. SPRINGER,
5 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
6 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

7
8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. DICKERSON:

10 Q Mr. Springer, will you state your name,
11 your occupation and by whom you're employed, please?

12 A My name is Robert G. Springer, III. I'm
13 employed by Yates Petroleum Corporation, Artesia, New Mexi-
14 co; engineer over drilling operations.

15 Q You have previously testified before
16 this Division as an engineer, have you not?

17 A Yes, I have.

18 Q And in connection with the applications
19 pending here today have you reviewed certain of the costs
20 inherent in drilling an Ordovician well in this area for
21 the purpose of making some cost comparisons between the
22 Yates proposed cost and those proposed by BHP?

23 A Yes, I have.

24 Q All right, identify the AFE's for us
25 that we have submitted as Exhibit Number Seven and review

1 those for us.

2 A Exhibit Number Seven has two AFE's
3 composed in it, the first one being Yates Petroleum AFE and
4 that was made out by myself; the second (unclear) location
5 that we feel that we being the operator could save a sub-
6 stantial amount of money in drilling this well.

7 To back that up I'll have to go into a
8 little background. This area has an individual drilling
9 characteristics. About a year and a half ago our manage-
10 ment asked me to take a look at the area to see if we
11 couldn't come up with some way to substantially cut costs.
12 If we could, we could drill a lot more wells.

13 So I went about it by looking at the
14 area that causes us the most risk and the most potential
15 cost in drilling that area and that turns out to be shale
16 problems from the Abo shales and the Wolfcamp shales. They
17 tend to be very water sensitive in this entire region. Be-
18 cause of that you have to mud up early and carry your mud
19 for a long time, it slows down drilling and adds to costs.

20 So I, along with some other people, have
21 been working on that particular problem, since it was the
22 most costly one.

23 During that period of time and original-
24 ly the cheapest way to drill a well was just plain with
25 fresh water. You couldn't even get a well down if you

1 drilled with fresh water in that country.

2 The next thing that I went to was
3 drilling with brine water. The sodium and the chloride in
4 the water helps create -- the shale wants to absorb the
5 water. When it absorbs the water it expands the shales and
6 causes them to break up and in a sense it falls into the
7 wellbore causing all sorts of problems with drilling, drag,
8 difficulty in getting logs down, difficulty in pulling
9 DST's off, drill stem tests.

10 The brine water helps but it did not
11 solve the problem. It works in an osmosis type of effect
12 where if the brine water is strong enough it tends to keep
13 the fresh water from going into the shales.

14 Back last year we kind of went at it
15 with everything we could. We went at it with brine water.
16 We went at it with adding 3 to 5 percent oil into it to in-
17 hibit the shales, plus then finally we went ahead and added
18 potassium chloride to the mud, which is another shale inhi-
19 bitor. We were using those three things up until about
20 November of last year. From looking at well records I
21 could find that is the same type of mud system that BHP
22 employed on their two wells.

23 Q Let me, before we get into that, let's
24 just for a minute, summarize for us, you prepared these
25 Yates AFE for this drilling of this well based on the

1 factors that you've related, which come from Yates' exper-
2 ience in drilling through these Abo and Wolfcamp formations
3 in this area.

4 A That's correct.

5 Q Now, your calculation shows an estimated
6 dry hole cost of \$191,300.

7 A That's correct.

8 Q The BHP AFE, I presume this is the one
9 furnished to Yates when BHP proposed this well?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q What's the correlative figure for a dry
12 hole under that AFE?

13 A \$210,950.

14 Q And for the completed well cost?

15 A \$396,450.

16 Q For BHP as compared to what estimate for
17 Yates?

18 A \$334,400.

19 Q Now we all understand that these AFE's
20 are merely estimates. Actual costs incurred may be more or
21 less than the estimate.

22 A That is right.

23 Q And so for what it's worth, there is
24 some difference shown in the estimates of the two parties.

25 A I might point out one thing that may be

1 of interest. The -- it's hard to see how this compares be-
2 cause your contracts with drilling contractors and every-
3 thing are different and I don't have access to them, but
4 the footage rate that we have on ours is \$12.80, and that's
5 for a partial turnkey type basis.

6 Looking at their footage rate for their
7 drilling contractor, they're showing \$14.00 a foot and with
8 the day work I don't know how close it would be to our kind
9 of contract, but it certainly isn't any more turnkey.

10 Q What you're saying is since you did not
11 have the BHP actual data you had to make projections and to
12 some extent some estimates of -- of what those figures
13 were?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q All right, and Exhibit Number Eight is
16 where you summarized these projections?

17 A Yeah, Exhibit Number Eight, the informa-
18 tion, the best information I could get for correlation is
19 going back to daily drilling records that were submitted on
20 our wells and theirs and it's difficult to compare apples
21 to apples, so I took a point, as noted on here, of -- to
22 determine a cost after the well had been drilled and the
23 production pipe had been put in place and cemented in the
24 Wrigley lease.

25 I did not continue on further than that

1 for the purpose that once you get past that point you've
2 got several zones you may be testing and various other
3 things, it's too hard to compare one well to the other one;
4 too many different approaches that you could take. That's
5 the best cutoff point I could find. And these are just the
6 numbers I came up with on BHP's two wells, which are about
7 350 feet deeper than ours as an average. They were 263,000
8 -- well, the two wells on the bottom left column here aver-
9 age \$266,128.

10 The two wells that we drilled at that
11 same time, or approximately the same time, we drilled these
12 the first month and a half of this year, these are about
13 five miles north of there, averaged \$239,556 at that point,
14 which is approximately \$24,000 difference. This is an
15 indicator of a difference and the difference that I claim
16 to have primarily is a new technology and mud system that
17 we've come up with recently.

18 Q Let me ask you to talk about that in
19 just a minute.

20 A Okay.

21 Q State again why you chose the two --
22 it's obvious you chose the two BHP wells because they're
23 the most recent wells in the -- involved in the pool which
24 is the subject of this hearing.

25 A Right.

1 Q Are the Yates Petroleum Corporation
2 wells which you've used the most recent chronologically in
3 time to be relevant to this hearing?

4 A They're the most recent ones that we've
5 drilled in time, approximately the same time, only a month
6 later. They're also, with the exception of the Pathfinder,
7 probably as close as any of the other ones. Pathfinder has
8 been mentioned before. I did not compare that because the
9 first part of that well was drilled with cable tool.

10 Q All right, why did you exclude, let's
11 say, some of the other approximately 7 or 8 Yates Ordovi-
12 cian wells within five or six miles of this location?

13 A Well, we've been drilling those wells
14 over the last five or six years and we've had all sorts of
15 changes in the industry. We've had cost of casing double
16 in price and drop back again. We've had changes in mud
17 system, as I kind of pointed out, drilling.

18 The only way I could compare at all, and
19 it's a tough comparison, is to go with the closest things
20 we have, which are these four wells right here.

21 Q Okay, and to the best of your ability
22 from the limited information you've had, how do you explain
23 the apparent difference between Yates' cost in drilling
24 these wells and similar wells drilled by BHP?

25 A Okay. As of about December through the

1 research that I've been doing to develop a -- a new techno-
2 logy, if you would, it turned into that, we had done some
3 experimenting with a new polymer. It's not a new polymer,
4 it's been around, but we started trying different types of
5 polymers to see what kind of effect they had. In the pro-
6 cess of doing that we found some very interesting stuff on
7 some samples.

8 We decided to try it in -- Pathfinder
9 No. 1 was the first well we tried it in; had some very in-
10 teresting results from it. It eliminated pretty much as you
11 would drill, if you made connections you'd get fill; if you
12 made the trip with fill, and sometimes you tried to do a
13 DST, you couldn't get back down; or try to get a log, some-
14 times it would take 3 or 4 attempts to get logs because of
15 shales, washouts, make it difficult.

16 We saw from using it, we were kind of
17 primitive at that time because it was the first time that
18 the polymer in combination with the brine allowed us to
19 eliminate the oil and the KCL and we did that on the next
20 well, the Energy No. 1 that we drilled, and with each one,
21 the last one, the Energy No. 2, I don't believe that we had
22 fill on any of our trips at all, but the nice thing about
23 it, it really is kind of an exciting thing. I do not have
24 enough data to present a technical paper on it; at the
25 moment we're developing it, but it's going -- it has shown

1 the drilling contractors that we use that it has made their
2 risk so much less that they have dropped their cost to us
3 considerably, in the range of -- just here in the last few
4 months -- of \$1.00 to \$1.50 a foot, plus they are willing
5 to take more of the responsibility for getting logs down
6 and pulling DST's off than they used to be able to, prim-
7 arily through the fact that they're slowly becoming com-
8 fortable. We're just getting into it and I think, as we
9 develop it more, they will become more comfortable for it
10 and I think it's really going to promote drilling in the
11 area, to be honest with you, and it's got other things for
12 other areas, too.

13 Q As I understand it, anyone drilling in
14 this area was faced with a problem, heaving shale, what-
15 ever, caused by water absorption into these Abo and Wolf-
16 camp formations?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q And your development of this technique
19 is an attempt to avoid or decrease some of those problems
20 which come up in the drilling?

21 A Now, it's primary advantage is that it
22 reduces the risk involved in drilling considerably.

23 Q All right, and how does that correlate
24 to a cost saving in drilling the well?

25 A Well, I don't have the numbers yet.

1 That's why I'm using these numbers as exhibits for, oh, a
2 way to get at an idea of what -- how it does change the
3 risk. The things it does do is it may save on an extra day
4 of day work if you have to make an extra attempt on a DST;
5 save extra money for mud because you had to mud up more
6 because of the shale. It saves extra money because you
7 don't have these tremendous wash-ups, if you look on the
8 logs, in the Abo and Wolfcamp. We are both cementing our
9 wells back to surface right now. It saves on that cost
10 quite a bit on cement that goes back to the wash-up, plus
11 you get better bonding because your hole is more (unclear).

12 Q And from your review of this limited in-
13 formation, Mr. Springer, is it your opinion that the cost
14 of Yates drilling the wells in accordance with its tech-
15 niques developed in this area would lead to a substantial
16 cost savings if those techniques are not used by BHP in
17 drilling its well?

18 A Yes, it would. It would definitely add
19 to both of our cost savings, plus it's a (not clearly un-
20 derstood.)

21 Q And any costs saved incurred in drilling
22 and completing these wells would correlate, would it not,
23 to prevent economic waste caused by expending those unnec-
24 essary costs?

25 A Exactly.

1 MR. DICKERSON: Move admis-
2 sion of Yates Exhibits Seven and Eight, Mr. Catanach. I
3 have nothing further of Mr. Springer.

4 Exhibit Nine consists of affi-
5 davits of mailing to the parties in accordance with Rule
6 1207 and I believe the parties involved are here.

7 MR. CATANACH: Exhibits Seven,
8 Eight and Nine will be admitted into evidence.

9 Mr. Kellahin?

10 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr.
11 Examiner.

12
13 CROSS EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

15 Q Mr. Springer, when we look at Exhibit
16 Number Seven, the first two pages are the AFE you proposed
17 for the subject well?

18 A Just one page.

19 Q The second page on mine doesn't have
20 anything on it.

21 A Yeah. That's correct, on yours and one
22 on mine.

23 Q And then on the last two pages are Mr.
24 Hal Crabb's AFE for the same well.

25 A Correct.

1 Q I heard you express two, if not three,
2 times in your direct case, Mr. Springer, that the compari-
3 son between the two AFE's and the position of information
4 of both engineers that did the work, this was a difficult
5 task.

6 A Yes, it is, indeed it is, to be precise
7 and correct on it. Without the information, without having
8 access to your information.

9 Q Let me make sure I understand the se-
10 quence.

11 Mr. Crabb's AFE is, at least the revised
12 one we have here, is dated February 21st of '89. Shown in
13 the middle of the third page next to his signature.

14 Am I correct in understanding you had
15 available to you his AFE at the time you were working on
16 your AFE dated March 7th of '89?

17 A No, I did not.

18 Q You worked independently of his AFE?

19 A Yes, I did.

20 Q When did you receive his AFE?

21 A I did not see his AFE until just the
22 other day.

23 Q How many days ago was that?

24 A Three days.

25 Q Do you know when you received the AFE

1 from BHP into Yates Petroleum Corporation?

2 A I don't know when Yates Petroleum re-
3 ceived it, no, I do not, unless it's stamped. I don't see
4 a stamp.

5 Q Do you know Mr. Crabb with BHP?

6 A No, I don't. I do not.

7 Q The gentleman sitting right here; never
8 met him before?

9 A No, I have not.

10 Q Did you call him and seek to obtain in-
11 formation from him on how he prepared his AFE?

12 A No, I did not.

13 Q Your AFE shows that you haven't allo-
14 cated any expenditures to drill stem test the well? Is
15 that correct?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q Is it not the customary practice of the
18 operators to drill stem test these wells?

19 A It is and it isn't. It depends on the
20 well.

21 Q Why have you chosen not to drill stem
22 test this particular well?

23 A I do not recall exactly why I left that
24 one off.

25 I might tell you how we develop these

1 AFE's.

2 Q Well, if I ask you that question, you
3 can answer that.

4 When we look at Exhibit Number Eight,
5 the Yates Petroleum well in the top right column, the
6 Energy "AFY" State 1 Well? I'm looking here at only the --

7 A Yes.

8 Q I don't have completion costs on this,
9 right?

10 A That is correct.

11 Q Okay.

12 A That's a rig release from drilling.

13 Q All right. Does that well in this cost
14 number have a charge for a drill stem test?

15 A I believe it did. In fact, we've got
16 some variables in here. These are the best ones I had. I
17 believe both of the wells were DST'd.

18 Q Both of the Yates wells on the display
19 here?

20 A Both of your wells, one of our wells
21 was.

22 Q The State No. 2 was not, or you don't
23 know, just one of those was not.

24 A No. 2 was not.

25 Q Okay. All right, when we look at the

1 Ervin Ranch State No. 1 Well, that's the -- that's the well
2 in Section 5. That's -- that's the wildcat exploratory
3 well, is it not?

4 A Yes, it is.

5 Q All right. When we look at the develop-
6 ment well, which is the north offset, the Yates "36" State
7 1 Well?

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q It looks like that number is about \$6000
10 less than the comparable charges for the Energy "AFY" State
11 No. 2 Well.

12 A Okay. What I did, when I pulled these
13 off the drilling reports --

14 Q Yes, sir.

15 A -- I added in -- they did not have a
16 figure cumulative in there for casing. I put in a figure,
17 and that's why the stars are there, for a conservative
18 price for that casing to make an attempt at making it com-
19 parable. If you look at the --

20 Q Let's back it up the other way, Mr.
21 Springer. What's the casing charge on the State No. 2
22 Well, so I can back it out of the number?

23 A Probably about \$38,000.

24 Q Okay. Is that a similar casing charge
25 for the State No. 1?

1 A Yes. I would assume so without looking
2 at it.

3 Q All right. So we come up with a price
4 differential of about 20,000 plus, maybe?

5 A 24 is about right.

6 Q 24 between the two AFE's? Into which
7 major components, then, of the AFE do you attribute that
8 cost difference?

9 A It's hard to contribute. You've got,
10 probably, 101 different components that make up those
11 costs. I feel because of the mud programs, I'm trying to
12 get at a representative risk. It's like determining risk
13 geologically, it's hard to say this number is going to say
14 how much risk is. This is just an indicator to me of the
15 potential savings one might have. It's still a little bit
16 early. Full potential savings are to be seen in the next
17 few wells.

18 Q You said initially in your direct exam-
19 ination words to the effect that Yates has continued to
20 modify and change its drilling program and its AFE's for
21 these type of wells.

22 A That's correct.

23 Q All right. How far back can we take
24 this AFE from March of '89 in time to find out when you
25 have stopped making significant alterations in the AFE's?

1 A Well, this exact AFE? I'm not -- I
2 couldn't tell you, exactly, but I imagine four months,
3 maybe.

4 Q Okay. Can you describe for us in a
5 general way what significant alterations, if any, that re-
6 sulted in material price differences, have existed between
7 early '88 in the type of wells you were drilling, and the
8 type of well you propose to drill here under the current
9 AFE?

10 A In early '88. Cost of casing was pro-
11 bably changing then, I'm not sure. That is usually a
12 dominant factor in a lot of these things.

13 Other than the cost of casing, drilling
14 contractors that you use make a difference, too, availabil-
15 ity of drilling contractors, and I'm not sure what the
16 availability was then.

17 Q Okay. At the bottom of your Exhibit
18 Seven on the first page just above your signature, it has a
19 note in here. It says, "Approval of this AFE constitutes
20 approval of the operator's option to charge the joint ac-
21 count with tubular goods from operator's warehouse stock at
22 the rate stated above."

23 A Yes, sir, it says that.

24 Q I know what it says, I don't know what
25 it means, though. What does that mean, Mr. Springer?

1 A Well, I couldn't honestly -- I didn't
2 put it there. What it is, it says basically that we can
3 charge you for casing at these rates so posted.

4 Q Well, in my own simple way --

5 A As I understand it.

6 Q Well, are you buying at wholesale and
7 charging the working --

8 A No, we're not.

9 Q -- interest owners retail on tubular
10 goods?

11 A I do not personally buy. You can go
12 through a purchasing agent, but we bid out all our tubular
13 goods (not clearly understood), all the tubular goods from
14 local people, Houston, Midland, north Texas, all over the
15 place, and we go (not clearly understood) figures (unclear)
16 have it delivered directly from the factory.

17 Q Let me ask you this. On the tubular
18 goods, when you start preparing an AFE, you know approxi-
19 mately the quantity of tubular goods you're going to use
20 and you put a price on it and fill in the column, right?

21 A Yeah.

22 Q It's in here.

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q Okay, when you get the price from the
25 warehouse, is there a profit factor applied to the number

1 so that it's different than what you paid for it?

2 A Not to my knowledge.

3 Q Okay, so you --

4 A I don't do that but I don't believe it's
5 done, but not to my knowledge. I'm not responsible for
6 that.

7 Q All right, so the figure in here is what
8 you had to pay for those tubular goods.

9 A No.

10 Q It's not?

11 A No. The figure that's in there is the
12 figure that I guessed might be the approximate value at the
13 time.

14 Q Mr. Springer, let me show you an AFE
15 that you prepared dated February 16th, 1988, which is on
16 the Sunnyside State Unit 1 Well. That's going to be up in
17 your Sunnyside Unit up to the north and west of -- of the
18 subject well. It's dated February 16th and it shows a
19 total dry hole cost of \$237,000 and a completed well cost
20 of \$394,000.

21 Does that represent your work for that
22 well?

23 A I do not recall how (unclear) the cost
24 comparison. I did not. By saying does it represent my
25 work, does that mean if I made up these numbers or are you

1 asking me does it compare with the actual costs?

2 Q No, I'm asking you did you do it. Your
3 name's on it. Is that your signature?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay, that represents your work?

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q That's a similar type well to the well
8 that you're proposing that Yates operate in this case, is
9 it not?

10 A It's similar. It has one difference
11 that I can think of, but it's similar, yes.

12 Q Okay. What is the material difference
13 that you can think of?

14 A Well, vague differences. One of them
15 that we have potential for some lost circulation up at this
16 point to the north in the surface hole. And then the
17 shales are slightly -- they tend to grade as you go to the
18 north and east, slightly more sensitive to water, but basi-
19 cally they're similar, yes.

20 Q Okay. When we look at Exhibit Number
21 Eight, are either one of your Yates wells classified in
22 your understanding as wildcat wells?

23 A The No. 1 definitely was a wildcat.

24 Q Okay. How about the number --

25 A No. 2, I don't know how we classified

1 it. It could have been.

2 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr.
3 Examiner.

4 MR. CATANACH: I have no ques-
5 tions. Anything further, Mr. Dickerson?

6 MR. DICKERSON: No.

7 MR. CATANACH: The witness may
8 be excused.

9 MR. DICKERSON: We rest, Mr.
10 Catanach.

11 MR. CATANACH: Let's take a
12 short break here.

13

14 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

15

16 MR. CATANACH: Go ahead.

17 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,
18 at this time I'd like to call Mr. Randall Davis, who is a
19 petroleum landman with BHP Petroleum Corporation.

20

21 RANDALL L. DAVIS,
22 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
23 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

24

25

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

3 Q Mr. Davis, for the record would you
4 please state your name and occupation?5 A My name is Randall Davis. I'm the
6 Regional Land Manager for BHP Petroleum in Midland, Texas.7 Q Mr. Davis, would you summarize for us
8 what has been your educational background?9 A Yes. I was graduated from Texas Tech
10 University in December of 1984 with a degree in business
11 management and I have worked for Cities Service Company --
12 I worked for Cities Service Company from January of '75 to
13 February of '79 and have been with BHP Monsanto, combined
14 companies, since February of '79.15 Q Has it been your direct responsibility
16 as a petroleum landman for your company to negotiate, ob-
17 tain title opinions, obtain administrative approvals, for
18 various well locations and, in essence, manage the land
19 title matters with regards to BHP's development of what is
20 called the Ervin Ranch prospect?

21 A Yes, sir.

22 Q When did your first involvement with
23 that prospect begin?24 A My first involvement with the prospect
25 actually began several years ago with Monsanto Oil Company,

1 who actually developed the prospect under the name Mon-
2 santo Oil Company.

3 Monsanto was acquired in December of '85
4 by BHP Petroleum and I have been in the capacity of Region-
5 al Land Manager with BHP Petroleum since the acquisition.

6 Q When we make reference to the Ervin
7 Ranch prospect, can you take what is marked as BHP Exhibit
8 Number Five and show us generally what area that describes?

9 A Yes, sir. On Exhibit Number Five, what
10 we have here, the acreage that's colored in yellow is the
11 acreage that BHP Petroleum actually has under lease or has
12 obtained by way of farm in from other companies, and has
13 either drilled the wells on the acreage and earned the ac-
14 reage, or is in the process of drilling wells -- a well on
15 the acreage to earn the acreage.

16 The area that's outlined in red is the
17 working interest unit that's in question today. The blue
18 acreage is the State Lease LG-6319, of which Yates, the
19 Yates, et al, group has the interest in.

20 The northeast quarter of Section 36 is
21 the acreage that BHP has acquired by farm in from Valley
22 Oil & Gas.

23 Q Have you continued with your involvement
24 and responsibility for the land management matters with re-
25 gards to the Ervin Ranch prospect all the way down through

1 the negotiations with Yates Petroleum Corporation and the
2 other Yates entities for participation in the well in the
3 east half of 36?

4 A Yes, sir. Basically, for BHP I have
5 been the project leader for this particular prospect from
6 the onset, from the time that we sought a partnership with
7 Yates till the time that we have drilled all of the Ervin
8 Ranch discovery well, the subsequent Yates "36" Well, the
9 well that we're currently drilling in the north half of
10 Section 8, and the well that we've proposed in the east
11 half of Section 36.

12 MR. KELLAHIN: At this time,
13 Mr. Examiner, we tender Mr. Randall Davis as an expert pet-
14 roleum landman.

15 MR. CATANACH: He is so qual-
16 ified.

17 Q In order to bring us down to your cur-
18 rent position on behalf of your company with regards to
19 the development of the east half of 36, would you begin by
20 explaining to us in chronological order the first occasion
21 in which you had reason to contact any of the Yates person-
22 nel concerning their interest ownership in the oil and gas
23 minerals to be developed in this particular area?

24 A Yes. My first contact was actually in
25 January of 1988 with Randy Patterson, first by telephone

1 conservation of January the 20th, and a follow-up letter of
2 January 21st, 1988, in which we proposed the formation of a
3 working interest unit for the drilling of the initial Ervin
4 Ranch State No. 1 Well.

5 Q What was the general area to be included
6 in this working interest unit area?

7 A The initial contact that we made with
8 Yates was actually only going to cover the east half of
9 Section 5, and Section 5 is an odd section, so I'm refer-
10 ring to that quarter section and the odd lots to the north,
11 and the southwest quarter of Section 36.

12 Q And Yates' interest at that time in the
13 property was in the southwest quarter of 36?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q All right. Tell us what proceeded.

16 A Okay. What proceeded after we proposed
17 the formation of the working interest unit was that Yates
18 had wanted to review our seismic before making a decision.
19 In a normal course of business generally you make an agree-
20 ment with the company if they're going to review your seis-
21 mic and you get them to agree that they will, after having
22 reviewed your seismic, they will either agree to partici-
23 pate or to farm out on some specific terms.

24 We did work out an arrangement whereby
25 Yates did review the seismic. We took the seismic to Arte-

1 sia. Bill Morris and one of our other landmen took the
2 seismic for the initial prospect to Artesia. We had worked
3 out an agreement with Yates whereby Yates would either
4 agree to participate or to farm out based upon a 30 percent
5 back-in.

6 After Yates had reviewed the seismic,
7 they had made the decision, actually the decision was
8 around May the 27th, to go ahead and farm out to BHP, but
9 at that time they had asked BHP to consider the formation
10 of a State working interest -- or State exploratory unit,
11 which would include the west half of Section 36, because
12 there was some question. Initially there was some question
13 about whether the production would be oil or gas and we
14 went ahead and included the west half of the section as
15 well as all of the -- all of Section 5, in the event that
16 we established gas production or it would have been
17 40-acres spacing if it had been oil production. So we
18 needed to have the whole proration unit for additional
19 drilling.

20 It turned out, though, that after some
21 thought there would be some segregation problems by not
22 including all of State Lease LG-6319, which is the west
23 half and southeast quarter of Section 36. So all parties
24 eventually agreed in July that Yates would grant BHP an op-
25 tion farm out of the southwest quarter of Section 36 if we

1 got an oil discovery in Ervin Ranch, or they would grant us
2 an option farm out of the west half of Section 36 if we
3 made a gas discovery, and at that time we entered into the
4 agreement. BHP drilled the Ervin Ranch well in Section 5
5 and made the initial well discovery.

6 Q Was Yates at that time interested in
7 being either operator of the well or participating in the
8 well?

9 A No. Yates did farm out to us. They did
10 not -- they did not participate in the initial well. Under
11 our agreement with Yates we had until November the 15th in
12 which to actually drill on the Yates lease in the west half
13 of Section 36, having completed the well as a gas well.

14 Q This is November 15th of 1988.

15 A '88, that's correct, in the west half of
16 Section 36, and State Lease LG-6319 had an expiration date
17 of 2-1-89, contrary to what it has on the Midland land map.
18 It actually had an expiration of February 1st, not -- not
19 January the 1st.

20 We picked our location of 1980 from the
21 south and 990 from the west in Section 36. It was on
22 November the 9th that we got a call from one of the Yates
23 landmen who advised us that Yates management believed that
24 our proposed location of 1980 from the south and 990 from
25 the west would actually not make a well and that Yates

1 would lose a valuable lease. We advised Yates the next day
2 by letter that we were going to go ahead and proceed with
3 that particular location that we had chosen.

4 At the time that we had the conversa-
5 tion with the landman from Yates we had been requested to
6 actually swap some acreage as opposed to having the west
7 half be the farmout area, make the south half be the farm-
8 out area and we felt like, well, if they felt like we
9 weren't going to make a well, why would you want to swap
10 the acreage and have them participate in the south half
11 location. So we chose not to swap the acreage and just to
12 continue on with the west half as we had planned.

13 We did go ahead and drill and complete
14 the well, the Yates "36" State No. 1 Well, in the southwest
15 quarter as a shut-in Montoya gas producer.

16 Q That was completed when, Mr. Davis?

17 A That was completed, the actual comple-
18 tion reports, I believe, were filed on January the 20th,
19 1989. And that, we had talked about the Valley farmout or
20 farm in agreement that BHP had and the time constraint that
21 we had under our farmout agreement from Valley.

22 Q Let's talk about the terms of the Valley
23 farmout agreement. What were you required to do?

24 A Okay. We were required to furnish
25 Valley with information from the drilling of the well that

1 we were drilling, the Yates "36" State No. 1 Well. By
2 furnishing them that information we would have the right to
3 drill a well, to begin the drilling operations of a well
4 within 120 days from the completion date, which would have
5 been the January 20th date, so it would have put it, you
6 know, circa around May 19th or 20th for our obligation date
7 to actually drill on the Valley lease or on something that
8 would be pooled with the Valley lease.

9 Under our farmout agreement from Valley
10 we have a consent to assign, so in order for us to even
11 change operations at all or in order for us to have brought
12 in the partner Samedan that we did, we had to have Valley
13 consent to Samedan's, to our consenting to assign to Same-
14 dan, and we would have to do the same thing if we ever
15 changed operations in here.

16 Q Well, let me make sure I understand the
17 point.

18 If the Division grants Yates' request to
19 be operator of the well in the east half of 36, is there
20 currently in place a contractual arrangement with Valley
21 that will allow BHP to earn an interest in the Valley lease
22 if Yates operates it?

23 A Yates -- Valley would have to consent to
24 Yates' operation under our farmout agreement.

25 Q And nothing the Commission order --

1 A No.

2 Q -- would do would require, then, the
3 commitment of Valley to allow you to participate in that
4 acreage.

5 A That is correct.

6 Q Where is the well to be located, Mr.
7 Davis?

8 A The well in the east half of 36?

9 Q Yes, sir.

10 A It's to be located 1650 from the north
11 line and 2310 from the east line.

12 Q When did you first propose to Yates
13 Petroleum Corporation and the other Yates entities that
14 they participate with BHP in the drilling of the well in
15 the east half of 36?

16 A I had an initial telephone conversation
17 on January the 10th with one of the Yates landmen in which
18 I advised that we were nearing the completion of the Yates
19 "36" State No. 1 Well and that we would shortly after the
20 well was completed, we would be proposing a location in the
21 east half of Section 36. We did follow up that conversa-
22 tion, a letter did go from our Land Department to Yates and
23 that letter is Exhibit One-A, B and C.

24 Q All right, let me distribute the exhibit
25 package, Mr. Davis.

1 This first set of documents comes from
2 your file.

3 A Yes.

4 Q And it's marked Exhibit One.

5 A One-A, B, C, D, E.

6 Q All right.

7 A And the markings are on the backs of the
8 exhibits starting from One-A on the top.

9 The letter of January the 20th was from
10 Robert Elliott from BHP Petroleum, who works directly for
11 me, to Robert Bullock at Yates Petroleum, proposing the
12 formation of the working interest unit in the east half of
13 Section 36 and our initial proposal was the location of
14 1980 from the south and 1980 from the east line, and the
15 initial AFE that went out with that, which is Exhibit
16 One-B, does indicate that location of 1980 from the south
17 and 1980 from the east.

18 The operating --

19 Q The initial AFE that went out was on
20 January 19th?

21 A January the 20th.

22 Q January 20th --

23 A Yes.

24 Q -- of 1989 --

25 A -- 19 -- yes.

1 Q You caused Mr. Elliott to send this
2 letter along with the AFE to --

3 A Along with the --

4 Q -- Yates.

5 A And the operating agreement that are
6 attached thereto.

7 Q And the AFE is dated on January 19th of
8 '89.

9 A That's correct.

10 Q All right, what then happened?

11 A After we had sent the proposal to Yates
12 we had several subsequent telephone conversations in the
13 Land Department. On February the 2nd was the actual first
14 time that we had been advised by Yates that they wanted to
15 operate the well in the east half and they wanted to oper-
16 ate -- the primary reason for operations at that time that
17 we were informed of, was that they would be able to get, by
18 their operations not only Yates but anybody else's gas that
19 they sold under the working interest unit, a premium
20 through Transwestern.

21 Q Did they raise with you at that time the
22 contentions made this morning in the hearing that the pri-
23 mary reason that they chose to seek operations were they
24 were a majority interest owner in the east half of Section
25 36?

1 A We have had a telephone conversation
2 concerning that. That was not the primary reason for
3 operations. That was my understanding and in my telephone
4 conversations, my subordinate telephone conversations with
5 the Yates representatives, that the primary reason was not
6 what we've just discussed but was instead the trend's
7 western gas premium.

8 Q Was it ever a subject of contention as
9 you understand it between you and Yates that they should
10 have operation based upon the fact that they believe they
11 had a 50 percent interest in the acreage in the east half?

12 A One of the landmen, and also Leslie
13 Bentz, had raised that point at the time that they were --
14 at the time Leslie was in the Midland office in our Feb-
15 ruary 21st meeting, stating the fact that Yates had 50
16 percent interest. My contention of that was that we also
17 had a 50 percent interest committed to the working interest
18 unit with the BHP and Samedan partnership.

19 I do not know what relationship the four
20 Yates corporations have and why they are separate. I pre-
21 sume that they are separate for tax purposes or for some
22 other unknown reason to me. But we looked at it, the situ-
23 ation that, you know, here was the fact that we were pro-
24 posing the working interest unit. We had done all the
25 groundwork for the working interest unit, and it is not a

1 highly unusual situation for even in the end result, if
2 that were the case, it's not a terribly, highly unusual
3 circumstance for an operator to have less interest than
4 some other parties in a unit agreement.

5 BHP is the operator of the Madden Unit
6 in Wyoming, which at one time, it may still be, the largest
7 Federal on-shore unit, and we have a 12 percent interest
8 compared to with some other parties that have a 25 percent
9 interest.

10 Q Did the Yates personnel ever raise with
11 you their contention that they ought to operate the proper-
12 ty in the east half of 36 based upon the fact that they
13 were contending that their overhead costs attached to the
14 operating agreement were significantly lower than the rates
15 you propose?

16 A No, they did not. As a matter of fact,
17 from the time that we sent the operating agreement on
18 January the 20th to them with the overhead rates that we
19 had in the operating agreement of \$4100 and \$410, we never
20 received anything from Yates until after March. So there
21 was a long -- there was almost a month and a half lag time
22 before we even saw Yates' overhead rates.

23 Q Describe for us your understanding and
24 recollection of whether or not Yates ever made a contention
25 that their AFE costs for the well were so significantly be-

1 low yours that that should be the reason by which they
2 should operate the property.

3 A Again, we sent the AFE to Yates on the
4 -- the first AFE with the 1980 and 1980 location, to Yates
5 on January the 20th. We revised the AFE the day that
6 Leslie was in our office on February the 21st and re-sent
7 them that same AFE, same cost, the only thing we changed
8 was the well location, and, again, we did not receive an
9 AFE from Yates until after the March 7th date when they
10 sent the AFE by mail to us.

11 Q After the correspondence of January
12 20th, 1989, and the subsequent meeting in February, I be-
13 lieve it was, refresh my recollection on the February
14 meeting, what that the 2nd or the 21st?

15 A That was the 21st.

16 Q You've referred to the 21st meeting,
17 okay.

18 What was the next bit of correspondence
19 that transpired between you and Yates Petroleum and the
20 other Yates entities with regards to the drilling of the
21 well in the east half of 36?

22 A Okay. At that particular meeting of
23 February the 21st, we left the meeting with several under-
24 standings at least from BHP's point of view. The Yates
25 group had asked that, again, that we exchange some acreage,

1 the southeast quarter and the northwest quarter, and lay
2 down our Yates "36" State No. 1 Well and just make the
3 north half the proration unit for the well that would be
4 drilled. That would create quite a bit of additional paper-
5 work for us, for the Commission. We would have had to gone
6 back and gotten a nonstandard location approved for the
7 well that had already been drilled. We had, at the meeting
8 of the 21st, advised Yates that we would not exchange the
9 acreage.

10 Leslie had brought up the point about
11 the location and moving it from 1980 from the south and
12 1980 from the east to the 2310 and 1650. When she brought
13 her data here, or to Midland, we had already made an ex-
14 change of seismic data for three BHP lines for one Yates
15 line in order to give us a little bit better handle on
16 where a better location might be. Certainly any operator
17 would want to have all the facts available to them that
18 were possible prior to spudding a well. The object is, of
19 course, to drill producing wells, not to drill dry holes.

20 At the end of the meeting it was my im-
21 pression that I felt like I had left upon the participants
22 of the meeting that BHP would consider very strongly the
23 new proposed location and that we would so advise Yates of
24 what our position would be.

25 At that particular meeting I was asked

1 by the Yates people (unclear) and get on the docket in
2 order to establish the rights of operations here.

3 So from that point, the next day, the
4 very next day, in Santa Fe was the state land sale and
5 Robert Elliott from my office did advise Robert Bullock in
6 person that BHP was in fact force pooling Yates at the non-
7 standard location that we had discussed in the February
8 21st meeting, and we proceeded with that and our next con-
9 versations pursued basically were by -- we then also
10 received in turn forced pooling procedures at the 1980 from
11 the north and 1980 from the east location from Mr. Dicker-
12 son's office, as well as Yates had proposed the nonstandard
13 location.

14 We had not, to my recollection, talked
15 about the standard location of 1980 from the north and 1980
16 from the east, at least in the February 21st meeting. Per-
17 haps the geologists had talked about that independently. I
18 do not know.

19 But from that point on we began to have
20 various conversations with the Yates representatives
21 through the Land Departments and I specifically was told by
22 telephone conversations from Yates representatives that
23 they believed that the Transwestern premium was the key is-
24 sue to operations, but, in turn, they could not fully dis-
25 close the Transwestern issues because it was a confidential

1 settlement and therefore we were in a Catch 22 situation.
2 BHP could not make a reasonable business decision about
3 what Yates was offering to us without actually knowing what
4 the terms of the settlement agreement were. We didn't
5 know, for example, if the contract had takes or pays in it.
6 Did those takes or pays apply only to Yates' gas? We
7 didn't know if the contract settlement between Transwestern
8 and Yates gave Yates a preferential right into the Trans-
9 western line and when Yates -- when Transwestern was ready
10 to cut other people off, that they could cut off other
11 people's gas without cutting off Yates.

12 Those were questions that were unknown
13 to us and we asked to see either the settlement or for
14 Yates to put something in writing to the effect so that we
15 could make a rational business decision upon -- about oper-
16 ations for the east half of Section 36.

17 Q Were either of those forthcoming?

18 A No. On March the 8th we received by
19 certified mail Yates' two proposals, two working interest
20 proposals covering the east half of Section 36.

21 Q Those are marked, are they, Mr. Davis,
22 as --

23 A Yes, they are, they're --

24 Q -- Exhibit Two-A --

25 A A through C, and Exhibit Three-A

1 Q -- through C?

2 A -- through C, and they're highlighted in
3 blue on the cover letter to tell you which exhibit applies
4 to which well.

5 Q Go ahead.

6 A Again, this was the first notice that we
7 had had of an operating agreement or an AFE from the Yates
8 group.

9 Q All right, what was the next thing that
10 transpired, then, Mr. Davis?

11 A Okay. After we received the Yates AFE's
12 and operating agreements, of course we made an analysis of
13 the operating agreements, the differences between the two
14 operating agreements, and we made a quick analysis of the
15 AFE's; at least we did through the Land Department, and not
16 being an expert on AFE's we at least had sources that we
17 could refer to on AFE cost in the particular area.

18 We had been invited a year before to
19 join Yates in the Sunnyside Unit in the acreage north of us
20 and they had sent us an operating agreement and an AFE.
21 The only thin that they never told us initially was where
22 the initial well was going to be drilled. We had asked
23 them to tell us where the well would be drilled, we could
24 make a decision. They went to the hearing and then carved
25 our acreage out of the State working interest unit, but we

1 at least did have the benefit of the operating agreement
2 and the AFE that were utilized for the Sunnyside Unit.

3 We went back to some current operations
4 in the surrounding are and I visited with some represent-
5 atives of Terra Resources and tried to determine what their
6 AFE costs were for a well that had been drilled up in Sec-
7 tion 35, Township 9 South, 26 East, and their AFE costs
8 were actually a little bit -- they were higher than ours
9 and Yates was a participant in that particular well, and I
10 really don't know the well name but it is in Section 35, 9
11 South, 26 East, but their -- their AFE cost, and I don't
12 know what the actual well costs were, but their AFE costs
13 were \$244,000 dry and \$419,000 completed well cost.

14 Q What is represented by the package of
15 exhibits marked Exhibit Three-A through C?

16 A Three-A through C?

17 Q Yes, sir.

18 A Three-A through C, that is the letter
19 and the AFE and the operating agreement from Yates Petro-
20 leum to BHP at the standard location of 1980 from the north
21 and 1980 from the east.

22 Again the operating agreements and the
23 AFE's and the letters are essentially the same except the
24 locations are different. One is the standard location, one
25 is the unorthodox location.

1 Q All right. Where do you stand with the
2 other interest owners apart from the Yates entities with
3 regards to their participation in the well in the east half
4 of 36 with BHP as the operator, including their approvals,
5 if any, of the AFE you submitted and the overhead charges
6 you have recommended?

7 A Okay, I would submit, then, Exhibit
8 Four, which is three pages, which is a letter from Samedan
9 to Yates, a signed AFE from Samedan from BHP's operatorship
10 perspective on the nonstandard location of 1650 from the
11 north and 2310 from the east, and Samedan does advise Yates
12 that their are going to join the BHP proposal because we
13 had proposed the working interest unit first, and we had a
14 joint area of operations with Samedan in this particular
15 area.

16 Q What is your understanding, then, of the
17 status of the remaining 50 percent interest in the spacing
18 unit in the east half of 36?

19 A Well, I presume that the remaining 50
20 percent is tied up with Yates, but on the operating agree-
21 ment that we received, only Yates Petroleum signed the
22 operating agreement and none of the other Yates corpora-
23 tions signed the operating agreement, as well as I don't
24 have the signatures for the Yates companies, I don't
25 believe, on the AFE's; only Yates Petroleum signed the AFE

1 that we have and, again, I presume that being Yates cor-
2 porations, that was a matter of business and they have
3 probably signed the operating agreements and AFE's long
4 before this date.

5 Q Let me ask you whether or not you
6 undertook any type of investigation to determine what
7 overhead rates to recommend and to apply for among the in-
8 terest owners in the operating agreement and before the
9 Examiner this afternoon?

10 A Yes, we did. As a matter of fact, we
11 did also utilize the Ernst and Whinney book that you re-
12 ferred to earlier for the rates, and the rates that we're
13 using at 4100 and 410 are actually directly out of the
14 Ernst and Whinney book, just rounded to the -- to the near-
15 est \$10.00 figure.

16 Q We further did your investigation again
17 based upon what we knew about the area. We had access to
18 the operating agreement for the Sunnyside State explora-
19 tory unit, which the rates in there were different.

20 We had access --

21 Q What -- what Yates -- what rates are
22 Yates using for the Sunnyside Unit up to the northwest of
23 this well?

24 A I believe if you'll bear with me one
25 second, I believe it was \$5400 and \$540. Yes, that was --

1 that was the --

2 Q Go to the documents on the Sunnyside
3 Unit, Mr. Davis, and refresh your recollection.

4 A And again the only thing that I can say
5 about this, this is the information that we have in house.
6 This perhaps could have been changed after the unit was
7 approved. I do not know that information.

8 Additionally, we utilized the same rates
9 of the 4100 and the 410 for the operating agreement cover-
10 ing the west half, of which all the parties in the room
11 have signed.

12 We farmed out, gave Yates and option
13 farmout offsetting their Dragonfly State No. 2 Well, of
14 which our farmout agreement had language that when the
15 operating agreement would be entered into the drilling and
16 producing well rates would be 4100 and 410.

17 So we used what we had available in the
18 area.

19 Q Have you continued your discussions with
20 Yates personnel to determine whether or not you're going to
21 be able to reach a voluntary agreement with regards to the
22 drilling of this well without the assistance of a compul-
23 sory pooling order?

24 A Yes, sir, we have had numerous telephone
25 conversations with representatives of Yates. I personally

1 have had several telephone conversations with representa-
2 tives of Yates where again the primary reason that Yates
3 has proposed the operatorship for the Yates Petroleum Cor-
4 poration is the premium. Our contention is that we cannot
5 make that business decision without knowing the facts and
6 we cannot be expected to do anything less than that.

7 Q Do you have an opinion as a petroleum
8 landman as to why the Examiner ought to award operations of
9 this well in the east half of 36 to your company?

10 A Yes, I do. For one thing, number one,
11 BHP initiated the prospect. It was a prospect that our
12 geological group and land group put together. It was a
13 situation where we went and asked Yates from the onset be-
14 fore drilling the initial well, before drilling the initial
15 discovery well in the prospect, we asked them to join us in
16 the operations here, but Yates chose to farm out their in-
17 terest to us.

18 We drilled and we completed the discov-
19 ery well. We drilled and completed the confirmation well
20 on State Lease LG-6319, which was actually going to expire
21 on February the 1st, 1989.

22 It was a situation where we have pro-
23 posed the working interest unit. I know there's some con-
24 sideration about, well, who proposed the well location. It
25 is not unusual for an operator, once an operator has addi-

1 tional information, to change the well location based upon
2 the best information that they have on hand, and we cer-
3 tainly seek out the best information that we have on hand
4 and if somebody can provide us with some additional infor-
5 mation and we as a group confirm that by shooting the
6 additional seismic line.

7 BHP, from our position is developing a
8 field. We're not developing a one well situation. We're
9 looking to get that product to market for the field that
10 will not only make BHP money, it will make our partner Sam-
11 edan, it will make Yates, as well as the royalty interest
12 owners, who are the State of New Mexico and the Federal
13 government. We cannot take a -- make a business decision
14 based upon hearsay from Yates about a premium that they can
15 get for themselves and for all the parties. There are many
16 marketing details that we must know before we could ever
17 make a decision that would have -- that could ultimately
18 have some effect on the field development as well as -- as
19 opposed to a single well development.

20 Q What is the position with regards to
21 your company and the Valley farmout agreement and what im-
22 pact will the forced pooling operations have on that farm-
23 out agreement?

24 A We have gone to Valley five times to ask
25 for an extension of time because of the hearing that we're

1 having today. The hearing, of course, was set two weeks
2 ago and we continued it.

3 We have now approached them five differ-
4 ent times for an extension of the May 20th deadline date.
5 They have told us that it is too far away for them to think
6 about an extension, that we could come to them ten to fif-
7 teen days before our farmout agreement is going to expire
8 but they gave me no guarantee that they would grant us that
9 extension.

10 We have spent a lot of time, a lot of
11 money, and a lot of manpower in this effort to -- to dev-
12 elop this field and to drill this Yates Valley State No. 1
13 Well.

14 Q In the event the Division does not award
15 operations to BHP Petroleum Company for this well, do you
16 have currently in place contractual arrangements with
17 Valley that will allow you to preserve an interest in the
18 northeast quarter of the section in compliance with the
19 farmout agreement?

20 A Only if Valley consents to the assign-
21 ment to Yates Petroleum. Short of that we have no guar-
22 antee.

23 Q At this point, then, in order to earn
24 the interest under the farmout agreement BHP Petroleum must
25 be the operator?

1 A We must drill the well.

2 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes
3 my examination of Mr. Davis, Mr. Catanach.

4 We move the introduction of
5 his Exhibits One through Five.

6 MR. DICKERSON: No. objection.

7 MR. CATANACH: Exhibits One
8 through Five will be admitted into evidence.

9 Mr. Dickerson?

10

11

CROSS EXAMINATION

12

BY MR. DICKERSON:

13

14

15

16

Q Mr. Davis, do I understand the terms of
the Valley farmout to be that you think restrict BHP's
rights to participate in this well as a non-operator with
Yates operating?

17

18

19

20

21

A They could. There is a consent to as-
sign provision in the operating agreement. Yates has it in
their agreements, we have it in our agreements. It be-
comes, the farmout (unclear) choice, again it's a business
decision that they must make.

22

23

24

Q But you're not -- you haven't heard any-
thing from Yates, have you, that they expect to earn any
interest under your farmout from Valley?

25

A No, they will not earn anything under

1 our interest, that's correct. We are proposing the working
2 interest unit through our farmout from Valley.

3 Q But the usual and customary restriction
4 on assignments of rights under that, if Yates were merely
5 the operator and carrying its 50 percent collective inter-
6 est in the well, would not require an assignment of
7 Valley's interest to Yates, would it?

8 A The well would actually be being drilled
9 on Valley's lands, so, yes, Valley would have to -- Valley
10 would have to consent to that.

11 Q Have you sought their consent or raised
12 the question --

13 A We have not at this particular point but
14 the point that we have been seeking with Valley is to try
15 to get the extension of time.

16 Q Do you know, Mr. Davis, how much, approx-
17 imately, gas BHP delivers through wells operated or the
18 working interest is owned by BHP in Chaves County?

19 A I do not.

20 Q Do you have any idea how many wells BHP
21 operates in Chaves County?

22 A I do not.

23 Q Are there any wells in addition to the
24 existing two wells that we've talked about today?

25 A I don't know if we still have any of the

1 wells that we operated in the, I believe, in the Peterson
2 Field, and I just -- I really don't know. We have sold
3 quite a bit of our producing properties in Chaves County in
4 the last few years and so I -- I just do not know that.

5 Q You do know, don't you, that Yates is
6 the biggest operator delivering gas in --

7 A Yes, sir.

8 Q -- Chaves County?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Would it follow from that that by
11 reasons of the scale of the gas delivered by Yates that an
12 advantage in marketing may exist there?

13 A No, sir, big does not make you good.

14 Q Are you saying that it does not give you
15 any advantage at all?

16 A I am saying that this is a situation for
17 a development of a new field and I don't believe that
18 whether or not we have ten wells or 400 wells, as far as
19 the purpose of operations here, and this is my opinion, and
20 I believe that we're dealing on some principles here of the
21 development of the field and the prudent operation and de-
22 velopment of that particular field.

23 We are looking at the sale of the gas on
24 a field-wide basis. We're not looking at the sale of the
25 gas because Yates operates 350 wells in the New Mexico and

1 sells gas to Transwestern.

2 We may be able to sell gas under one
3 well, the Yates well, if Yates operates it, but what are we
4 going to do with the rest of the field if Yates has a pre-
5 ferential right to a pipeline and we do not. We must --
6 there are two -- there are options as opposed to Transwes-
7 tern in the field. So I can only answer from my particular
8 point of view. Because Yates has this tremendous volume of
9 wells, that's wonderful between Yates and Transwestern and
10 we recognize that they -- or we understand that they have a
11 preferential right into the Transwestern line. That does
12 not guarantee BHP's interest, BHP's royalty, Valley, or any
13 of the offset wells that preferential right into that
14 Transwestern line.

15 Q Let's assume that BHP is designated the
16 operator of this proposed third well so that in this pool
17 that's the subject of these hearings there will be three
18 BHP operated wells. Would BHP propose to, if requested by
19 Yates and if the situation were reversed so that BHP had
20 the opportunity to sell its gas and that of non-working
21 interest owners, would BHP offer to Yates the opportunity
22 to participate in any arrangement that you might make with
23 any of the gas purchasers?

24 A We are in the process right now through
25 the development of this particular field of exploring all

1 of the avenues of how to get our product to market. We are
2 looking at independents building lines to this particular
3 area to connect with either Transwestern or El Paso. We
4 are looking to find the most economical way to do that.

5 It is a situation where you must look at
6 all of the variables. If it means looking at the possibil-
7 ity of a partnership between BHP, Samedan, Yates, or who-
8 ever the developers of the field, the working interest par-
9 ties of the field are, that, I'm sure, would be a consider-
10 ation. That is out of my line of expertise. That actual-
11 ly falls into the marketing department of our corporation,
12 but I would presume that we as a prudent operator, as a
13 party that wants to get that product to market as quickly
14 as possible so that we can all realize revenue from it,
15 that we will do what a prudent operator would do in that
16 situation.

17 Q With due regard, not only for its own
18 interest, but with those interests of its other owners in
19 the well?

20 A We must protect the interest of all the
21 interest -- of all the parties that have an interest in our
22 well. We can't make side agreements for ourselves at the
23 expense of our royalty owners or we can't make side agree-
24 ments at the expense of our working interest partners, but
25 I can't tell you how we'll market the gas. We're not going

1 to -- we're not in the business to dupe people. We're in
2 the business to sell a product and to make money for us, as
3 well as for our partners, our partnerships.

4 Q How would BHP make the decision among
5 the three existing wells, assuming a successful completion
6 on the east half of Section 36? What -- what rates of de-
7 livery of gas from those wells, how would that be deter-
8 mined?

9 A I do not know. That again would be out
10 of my line of expertise. Again, I think you have to refer
11 to probably four wells because we are actually in the pro-
12 cess of drilling today the well in the northeast quarter of
13 Section 8 of which we operate with 50 percent interest.

14 Q In the course of the conversations that
15 you've detailed, Mr. Davis, do you recall an offer by Yates
16 to commit in the event that it is designated operator of
17 this proposed well in the east half of Section 36 to -- to
18 not hook up that well and sell gas from it with the possi-
19 bility of draining gas from this common reservoir until BHP
20 was successful in obtaining the pipeline for its well?

21 A Yes, on March the 22nd in a
22 conversation that I had with one of the Yates representa-
23 tives through his chain of command and management, yes, I
24 was told that Yates would agree in writing if they were the
25 operator to hook up all three wells at the same time to

1 prevent drainage. I don't know if that is -- again, I
2 can't response to that because I don't know if that falls
3 outside of the rules and regulations of the State of New
4 Mexico, because if you're under an oil and gas lease with a
5 shut-in provision, and you have a market, say, in this
6 particular case three of the companies had a market and two
7 of them didn't, the three companies that had the market are
8 saying that they won't send their gas to market until the
9 other two do, and I think that, that violates the State of
10 New Mexico Oil and Gas Lease.

11 Q Well, the offer was made in an attempt
12 to be conciliatory -- I mean to represent that Yates would
13 not sell its gas, if able, to the detriment of BHP, who at
14 that time might not be able to --

15 A Well --

16 Q -- sell it.

17 A Yes, and I understand that, yes, on
18 March the 22nd I was informed on that.

19 Q Okay.

20 MR. DICKERSON: I have no fur-
21 ther questions.

22 MR. CATANACH: Anything fur-
23 ther?

24 MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.

25

CROSS EXAMINATION

1
2 BY MR. CATANACH:

3 Q Mr. Davis, I just want to verify a
4 question that Mr. Kellahin asked you.

5 If Yates is appointed operator of this
6 unit, Valley has to consent to this before you gain an in-
7 terest?

8 A We have a farmout agreement that covers
9 the northeast quarter of Section 36 of which we're sharing
10 50/50 with Samedan. Under the farmout agreement there is a
11 consent to assign provision. The way I would understand
12 it, because somebody else is coming in and operating on
13 this particular lease that they have no interest in, and,
14 yes, we would need to get Valley's approval for Yates to
15 come in and operate on the farmout that we have. Now,
16 again, technically that may not be correct but that would
17 be my understanding and it would be my understanding that
18 certainly we, as the farmouttee (sic) in this particular in-
19 stance would certainly advise Valley of that particular
20 situation and give Valley the opportunity to respond to
21 that based upon the language of consent to assign. Again,
22 it's an interpreted matter.

23 Q That's all I have.

24 MR. KELLAHIN: Let me follow
25 up on that question, Mr. Examiner.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

1
2
3 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

4 Q Let me make sure I understand what your
5 opinion on that subject is, Mr. Davis, if you have an
6 opinion.

7 Is it possible under this farmout ar-
8 rangement to have a situation where Yates has force pooled
9 the interest owners in the east half and if they are the
10 operator, then, you have not fulfilled the terms and the
11 conditions of the farmout agreement and therefore BHP would
12 not earn an interest in the east half but that the
13 interest, then, is one where Valley has 50 percent of the
14 well and Yates has the other 50 percent. You know, that
15 was a statement but I intended it for a question for you to
16 answer, if you can, based upon your knowledge of that
17 agreement and your expertise as a landman.

18 A Based upon my knowledge of the agreement
19 and based upon my lack of information on the situation like
20 this particular situation that we're involved in today, I
21 do not know what the implications of the forced pooling
22 would have upon us.

23 Q Thank you.

24 MR. KELLAHIN: I have nothing
25 further.

1 MR. DICKERSON: One question,
2 Mr. Catanach.

3
4 RE CROSS EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. DICKERSON:

6 Q Mr. Davis, you have given your inter-
7 pretation. Is there any objection to anything BHP would
8 object to simply submitting the farmout agreement in
9 question?

10 A To submitting the farmout agreement in
11 question?

12 Q Sure.

13 A For what?

14 Q Well, so that we can all see the langu-
15 age if we're arguing over whether it does or does not and
16 you asked Mr. Catanach to follow your interpretation of it
17 and we certainly don't have a copy of it.

18 A If Valley has no objection to that, I
19 will, I will send you a copy of that agreement, but I would
20 like at least to check with Valley to get their consent.

21 MR. KELLAHIN: I like Mr.
22 Dickerson's notion that we need to further examine the
23 legal aspects of that language. It pales me to think that
24 we could get force pooled out of the well entirely and if
25 you will check with Valley and get their concurrence, I'd

1 like to submit that document to Mr. Dickerson and to the
2 Commission and let us all look at it and see if based upon
3 our own particular expertise we see any kind of glitch that
4 creates that unfortunate situation where you're out of the
5 wells.

6 A We certainly would not want that to
7 happen with what we have gone through up to the point.

8 MR. CATANACH: Can you also
9 submit an interpretation of that?

10 MR. KELLAHIN: Can certainly
11 look at it; be happy to.

12 A I'll defer that to my attorney.

13 MR. DICKERSON: Which side do
14 you want?

15 MR. KELLAHIN: I don't care.

16

17

18 WILLIAM J. MORRIS,
19 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
20 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

21

22

DIRECT EXAMINATION

23

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

24

Q Mr. Morris, for the record would you
25 please state your name and occupation?

26

A My name is William J. Morris. I'm a

1 petroleum geologist for BHP Petroleum Company in Midland,

2 Q Mr. Morris, you have on prior occasion
3 testified before the Division as a petroleum geologist?

4 A Yes, I have.

5 Q Would you refresh our recollection and
6 tell us generally on what occasions that you testified be-
7 fore the Division as a geologist?

8 A Okay. The most recent case was on the
9 unorthodox location on the Ervin Ranch Well in Section 5
10 that's in this pool.

11 I've also testified on a case in the
12 Indian Basin Field in Eddy County. That was an unorthodox
13 location that was contested by Amoco.

14 Q Have you been the geologist that has
15 been involved from the inception of the exploration for
16 production out of this formation in the Ervin Ranch area?

17 A Yes, I've been working on this prospect
18 for -- or I've been responsible for it for the last five
19 years, approximately.

20 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr.
21 Morris as an expert petroleum geologist.

22 MR. CATANACH: He is so qual-
23 ified.

24 Q Mr. Morris, let me have you identify and
25 describe the display that you've marked as Exhibit Number

1 Six.

2 A Okay. Exhibit Six is a base of the Penn
3 structure map. We have two well values on here for the two
4 wells that we've discussed that we drilled at -2338, the
5 base of the Pennsylvanian section top and our well in
6 Section 5 at -2368, the Yates State Well in Section 36.

7 The other values that are on the map are
8 interpretational based upon seismic data that we have shot
9 or have obtained in this area.

10 Q Before we describe all the details and
11 conclusions about Six, let me have you go ahead and de-
12 scribe for us the Exhibit Seven.

13 A Okay. Exhibit Seven is our structure map
14 on top of the Montoya formation, which is the dolomite pay
15 section in the two wells.

16 Q All right, then, finally I'll ask you to
17 find a copy of Ms. Bentz' Exhibit Number Five, which is her
18 structure map on top of the PrePenn. Do you have a copy of
19 that?

20 A Yes, I do.

21 Q Okay. On each of your two displays
22 you've located a well spot by the red arrow?

23 A Right, that is the proposed unorthodox
24 location.

25 Q And that's the current location that

1 both you and Ms. Bentz concur on at this point?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q Describe for us in a general way, Mr.
4 Morris, what information is important for us to understand
5 in looking at Exhibits Six and Seven.

6 A Well, the Exhibit Six generally shows
7 the structural attitude of the reservoir in this vicinity.

8 Exhibit Seven is more precisely on the
9 producing reservoir zone and --

10 Q Where does Ms. Bentz' structure map
11 integrate itself with these other two structures?

12 A It is the same as our Exhibit Six. Her
13 -- yes, her map and our Exhibit Six are on the same -- same
14 zone.

15 Q Let's look at the more specific struc-
16 ture map on the top of the Montoya, which is Exhibit Number
17 Seven.

18 A Okay.

19 Q All right, what is your opinion with
20 regards to the preference of accepting the unorthodox
21 location as opposed to the closest standard location?

22 A It is -- the unorthodox location is
23 structurally much better.

24 Q Describe for us or quantify for us in
25 what particular way it's much better.

1 A We should be anywhere from, oh, you
2 know, 20 to 50 feet in a higher structural position than
3 what an orthodox location would give us, and that's the ad-
4 vantage to going to the unorthodox location.

5 Q Ms. Bentz commented on the occurrence of
6 a gas/water contact generally lying in the eastern portion
7 of the east half of 36 and she approximated for us where on
8 her contour line on her structure map she thought it might
9 be located.

10 Can -- can you undertake a similar dis-
11 cussion with me and locate for me, first of all, whether or
12 not you concur that there is a gas/water contact in the
13 vicinity of the east half of 36?

14 A I'm in -- generally in excellent agree-
15 ment with Ms. Bentz' estimation of where the contact is. I
16 personally would put it a little bit further to the west,
17 which would be a little bit more pessimistic interpreta-
18 tion, but, you know, that's just the differences between
19 one geologist and another.

20 Q Do you see any other standard location
21 in the east half of 36 that provides an equal opportunity
22 for the production of hydrocarbons from this formation that
23 the unorthodox location demonstrates?

24 A No, I do not.

25 Q In looking at the general geology for

1 this specific formation in the entire Section 36, do you
2 have an opinion as to whether the approval of this location
3 without a penalty will give the owners in the east half of
4 36 an unfair advantage over the owners in the west half of
5 36?

6 A You're moving closer to the lease line
7 but I think that location will give them the opportunity to
8 produce the gas that is on their lease and not, you know,
9 overly drain the up dip acreage too much. I mean it will
10 drain some.

11 Q Is there a -- is there a structural re-
12 lationship between the existing Yates State "36" Well in
13 the west half of 36 to the proposed location in the east
14 half?

15 A Based on the seismic interpretation, we
16 should be, you know, 20 to 25 feet higher in our -- in the
17 well that we've drilled to the unorthodox location.

18 Q Are you comfortable, Mr. Morris, with
19 the concept that the well in the southwest quarter of 36 is
20 going to have the opportunity to produce its share of the
21 hydrocarbons in the west half of 36 without undue inter-
22 ference from the well in the east half of 36?

23 A Yeah, there shouldn't be any problem. I
24 don't see any major drainage problem. That well is a
25 decent distance away.

1 Q Ultimately, then, do you have an opin-
2 ion as to whether or not this location ought to be penal-
3 ized?

4 A I don't object to it being penalized, I
5 guess, but I'm not, you know, there's no need for it to be.

6 Q Well, my question is not the objection
7 but the need in order to balance the correlative rights
8 between the owners in each portion, whether there is a
9 compelling need that you see as a geologist for the penalty
10 on the well.

11 A No, I don't see a definite need.

12 Q Let's look at Exhibit Number Eight, Mr.
13 Morris, and have you identify and describe that for us.

14 A Okay, that's a schematic diagram of
15 three wells in the area. The two wells on the left are the
16 wells that we have drilled and the well further to the
17 right falls just off the right edge of the map here in
18 Section 31. That would be due -- well, it's approximately
19 9000 feet east/northeast of our Yates State Well.

20 I've drawn the unorthodox location on
21 there to show that it should be down dip from the two wells
22 that we've drilled. There's a good chance that the Missis-
23 sippian section is going to get thicker there and that's
24 going to move the Montoya pay zone a little bit lower and
25 those are some of the reasons why we need the unorthodox

1 location approved.

2 Q Am I correct in understanding, then,
3 that you and Ms. Bentz come to the same ultimate geologic
4 conclusion about the location?

5 A Absolutely.

6 Q There is no material difference in your
7 conclusions having examined the new seismic information
8 that's been made available?

9 A I think the new seismic data has con-
10 firmed that we need to go to the unorthodox location.

11 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes
12 my examination of Mr. Morris.

13 We move the introduction of
14 his Exhibits Six, Seven and Eight.

15 MR. DICKERSON: No objection.

16 MR. CATANACH: Exhibits Six,
17 Seven and Eight will be admitted into evidence.

18 MR. DICKERSON: I have no
19 questions of Mr. Morris.

20

21 CROSS EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. CATANACH:

23 Q Mr. Morris, one question.

24 A Sure.

25 Q Was it just Yates and BHP that were

1 involved in choosing this location or was Samedan also
2 involved?

3 A Samedan was involved, yes.

4 Q And do they concur?

5 A They concur, yes, absolutely. They were
6 the ones who recommended shooting this seismic line and we
7 have talked to them since that and they are in full agree-
8 ment with us to join at that location.

9 Q Thank you.

10 MR. CATANACH: That's all I
11 have.

12 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,
13 at this time we'll call Mr. Hal Crabb. He's a petroleum
14 engineer with BHP Petroleum Corporation.

15
16 HAL CRABB,
17 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
18 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

19
20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

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

24 A My name is Hal Crabb and I'm a petroleum
25 engineer for BHP Petroleum.

1 Q Have you on prior occasions testified
2 before the Division as a petroleum engineer?

3 A Yes, I have.

4 Q Pursuant to your employment did you
5 prepare and have circulated the AFE that was attached to
6 the Yates Petroleum Corporation Exhibit Number Seven?

7 A Yes, I did.

8 Q And you also prepared the original AFE
9 that was dated in January of the same year for the subject
10 well?

11 A Yes.

12 Q In addition, pursuant to your employ-
13 ment, have you studied in general the engineering aspects
14 of this particular Ervin Ranch Field and the three produc-
15 ing wells in the field?

16 A Yes, I have.

17 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr.
18 Crabb as an expert petroleum engineer.

19 MR. CATANACH: He is so qual-
20 ified.

21 Q Mr. Crabb, let me commence my discussion
22 with you by going directly to the topic of the AFE's that
23 each of the companies have proposed.

24 Did you receive and have an opportunity
25 to examine the AFE that Mr. Springer prepared for his com-

1 pany for the well?

2 A Yes, I did.

3 Q Will you take us through a discussion
4 and show us what in your opinion as an engineer are the
5 material differences that occur in the two AFE's?

6 A Yes. First I would like to direct your
7 attention to Exhibit Number Eight, which was submitted by
8 Yates.

9 Q That's the four well comparison of
10 costs?

11 A Yes, it is.

12 Q All right.

13 A I think this is very revealing and we
14 can explain the differences between the two well costs to
15 show that the dry hole cost for all of these wells is es-
16 sentially the same, and the first thing that I'd like to do
17 is direct your attention to the dry hole cost here on BHP
18 Petroleum Ervin Ranch State No. 1 of \$263,883, which I will
19 accept as a reasonable estimate, and we compare that with
20 Yates Petroleum, the Energy "AFY" State No. 1, where we had
21 the cost of \$239,220.

22 Now I'm not familiar with the well that
23 Yates drilled here, but I will comment on the difference.

24 That gives us a difference, or a delta
25 between the two well costs of \$24,663.

1 Now, first of all, we DST'd this parti-
2 cular well, the Ervin Ranch, our discovery well in the
3 field, on two separate occasions. There were two DST's and
4 two separate zones were tested and potentialed and these
5 two DST's, plus the day work involved, would in my quick
6 estimation, which I believe is reasonably correct, account
7 for \$18,000 of that difference. That would leave a differ-
8 ence of \$6,663, which could easily be accounted for with
9 differences in the open hole log suite chosen, location,
10 building location differences. There are going to be
11 reasonable differences or discrepancies between any AFE and
12 there are reasonable differences, or choices, that prudent
13 operators can make as to what they decide to do with re-
14 spect to logging or other -- or other things along this
15 line.

16 Now let's go to the next well, the
17 Yates "36" State No. 1, which you've estimated as costing
18 \$268,374 through casing point. Compared with your Energy
19 "AFY" State No. 2, which you've estimated as costing
20 \$239,892, and you have stated that this was a confirmation
21 well, or development well. Once again I'm not familiar
22 with your particular well here; however, the differences
23 between the two wells amount of \$28,482.

24 Now, on the Yates "36" State No. 1, we
25 cored this particular well and the coring plus the day work

1 also would rough out to about \$18,000, which would take the
2 difference down to, let's say about \$10,000, and we DST'd
3 this well, also. Now the DST and the day work involved
4 would account for \$9000 of this remaining \$10,000 differ-
5 ence. So that leave us with a remaining difference of ap-
6 proximately \$1000, which once again is a very minor differ-
7 ence, can be accounted for in differences in logging pro-
8 gram, location costs, and things such as this.

9 And once again we're talking about dry
10 hole costs and the completed well costs haven't been ad-
11 dressed here.

12 As far as our drilling in the field, we
13 have not had any real problems as far as slushing shale or
14 sticking our drill pipe or not being able to get down with
15 our DST. I believe our mud costs, our mud programs, are
16 approximately the same cost as Yates and like I said, we've
17 -- we've been successful. As I recall we didn't have any
18 problems with our Ervin Ranch, which was down to TD in 18
19 days, including the two DST's.

20 Now, --

21 Q Do you have some actual costs on the
22 Ervin Ranch Well?

23 A The Ervin Ranch? Yes, I do. We have
24 completed well costs of, I believe, \$422,000, which, like I
25 said, includes extensive testing and completion, completion

1 work, because we were dealing and treating two separate
2 producing intervals within the Montoya formation.

3 Q When you compare the estimated dry hole
4 cost to the actual costs up to the last item on the dry
5 hole entires, what is the total cost there? Have you
6 separated that out?

7 A Would you run that by me again?

8 Q Yes, sir. When we look at the Ervin
9 Ranch Well --

10 A On the AFE?

11 Q -- on the AFE, we've got \$263,000 plus?

12 A Yes.

13 Q What is the comparable actual cost,
14 then, for those items that compose that portion of the ex-
15 hibit?

16 A Are you talking about on the AFE or --

17 Q Yes, sir, on the AFE, now.

18 A Okay, I'm not sure I followed the ques-
19 tion. I'm sorry.

20 Q All right, the actual cost on the Ervin
21 Ranch Well --

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q -- when you back out the completion
24 costs --

25 A Oh, okay.

1 Q -- and the stimulation costs, those
2 items that are attributable to dry hole were estimated.
3 Now what were the actual numbers?

4 A The actual numbers were, let me guess, I
5 don't have it at my fingertips here.

6 Q Well, at the break you gave them to me.

7 A Okay, well, let me see that.

8 Q See if that refreshes your recollection.

9 A Oh, these are -- these are just mud
10 costs.

11 Q Oh, all right, I misunderstood what
12 you're doing.

13 A You threw me there.

14 Q Well, you and I are not talking the same
15 thing.

16 A Yeah, these are just mud costs --

17 Q Okay.

18 A -- that I gave you.

19 Q All right.

20 A So I would -- I would -- I feel comfor-
21 table with the numbers that we've used here on Exhibit
22 Eight as far as showing the differences in the costs and
23 how they were accounted for.

24 Q All right. Do you see any material
25 difference, then, between the two AFE's that should be used

1 as a significant factor by this Examiner in deciding who
2 operates the well?

3 A No, I don't. I think that the Exhibit
4 Eight here really shows that we can operate or we can drill
5 and we can complete the well just as cheaply as Yates.
6 We've shown that on the two wells that we've drilled with
7 the lack of problems that we've had while drilling and I've
8 shown here by accounting for the differences that we can
9 drill the wells competitive with Yates.

10 Q Let's talk about BHP's experience as an
11 operator in the immediate area. How successful have you
12 been with your other wells?

13 A Well, we've been very successful. We
14 drilled the, of course, the discovery well, Ervin Ranch
15 State No. 1, which was a significant discovery of a new
16 reservoir and we confirmed it shortly thereafter with the
17 Yates "36" State No. 1, which was drilled without incident
18 and made a successful confirmation well in Section -- the
19 west half of Section 36.

20 Q What's the current status of the well in
21 the northeast quarter of 8 down to the south?

22 A It is currently being drilled. We're
23 drilling the Conoco 8 Federal No. 1.

24 Q And what is its current status as of
25 now, do you recall?

1 A Well, it's in the process of being
2 drilled. That's all I can say.

3 Q You're not at the point where you're
4 ready to complete the well?

5 A No, not at this time.

6 Q Mr. Crabb, let me ask you, sir, do you
7 have an opinion as an engineer as to why you believe your
8 company ought to be the operator for the well in the east
9 half of 36?

10 A Well, yes, I do.

11 Q And what is the reason? What is that
12 opinion?

13 A My opinion is that BHP should be the
14 operator on this well for a number of reasons, many of
15 which were enunciated by Mr. Davis: The fact that we have
16 developed the field; we have the expertise in the immediate
17 area; we drilled two successful wells; we're in the process
18 of drilling a third one; and also, going back to what we
19 thought was the primary reason for this -- Yates wanting to
20 have operations here, was this premium that they were to
21 get for their gas price. We feel that this is not going to
22 necessarily be, or it will not be, for the good of the en-
23 tire field. It will just possibly benefit Yates and maybe
24 the other operators if what they say is true, but it could
25 even be detrimental to the other two wells that we current-

1 ly have shut in that are waiting on a pipeline.

2 Q Let me ask you to identify and describe
3 for us what is marked as Exhibit Number Nine, Mr. Crabb.
4 Let me ask you, sir, am I correct in understanding that
5 Section 36 that's the subject of this hearing is located at
6 this point on the display where I've placed the numbers
7 "36"?

8 A Yes, that is correct. Right.

9 Q Let me do that on all the copies so that
10 --

11 A Now these are townships here but --

12 Q Excuse me, let me borrow that back from
13 you so we won't have to search for Section 36.

14 What is Exhibit Number Nine, Mr. Crabb?

15 A Exhibit Number Nine is a schematic of
16 the pipelines in the area and the gas well there which
17 you've highlighted is the approximate location of the field
18 at this point.

19 Q Has -- has BHP undertaken the task to
20 study the physical arrangement as well as the economic cost
21 of installing a gathering line system to take field produc-
22 tion --

23 A Yes, we have.

24 Q -- to the transmission line?

25 A Yes.

1 Q What are the two choices of available
2 potential markets in the area?

3 A Well, the line to the north, which is
4 running from the northwest to the southeast there, is
5 Transwestern's line and the line to the south below it,
6 which takes a sharper drop to the south, is the El Paso
7 line, and as you can see, the field sits pretty much equi-
8 distant from the two lines.

9 Q Has BHP undertaken an analysis of the
10 costs that are going to be required to install a gathering
11 system to take the production in the field to either one of
12 these pipelines?

13 A Yes, we have.

14 Q And what does that study show?

15 A Well, it shows us that it's going to
16 require a substantial investment in order to be able to put
17 in this pipeline to -- to install the treating facilities,
18 the tie-in, and the other miscellaneous expenses. Our
19 study told us that -- well, the briefly summarize the
20 results of this study, it was concluded that an initial
21 investment of \$1.75-million would be required for the pipe-
22 line construction, the tie-in, the amine (sic) plant, et
23 cetera, and that we ran some preliminary economics based on
24 this capital outlay and the scenario that we used was based
25 on ultimate recovery of 7 to 7-1/2 BCF and an initial rate,

1 deliverability, of 10-million cubic feet per day, and based
2 on these parameters, the economics of the installation of
3 such a facility are very marginal unless you charge a
4 transportation fee of around 50 cents per MCF, and of
5 course that's a very high transportation fee, unreasonable,
6 and in order to get a more reasonable fee, along the order
7 of 25 cents per MCF transportation, an initial rate of
8 15-million to 20 a day would really be desirable to make
9 this economic for someone to do, and of course more the
10 more deliverability you have, the more favorable the
11 economics are going to look.

12 Now, the pipeline is not going to put in
13 a line like this, either one of them, at this time, and in
14 the existing economic climate. So it will either be up to
15 one operator, such as BHP, or a joint effort to share the
16 cost and to put in a line and a processing plant. Until
17 that happens all the wells are going to remain shut-in in
18 that field.

19 Now where I'm going with all this and
20 the reason that it's important is that due to the high cost
21 involved, a pipeline is not going to be constructed in this
22 area and all this large capital outlay is not going to come
23 about or be installed based on the reserves or the deliver-
24 ability of one well, such as the Valley State No. 1, or the
25 well in the east half of Section -- Section 36. In fact a

1 large number of wells, an entire field, will have to be
2 included before we can make it -- make the economics at-
3 tractive enough to -- to engage in such a venture.

4 So whether or not Yates plans to have a
5 good deal with Transwestern for selling this gas at a pre-
6 mium will by itself not move one MCF of gas and we have to
7 think about the benefit to the -- to the whole field in
8 general.

9 Q What is the current deliverability of
10 the two wells that currently are completed and shut-in now
11 in the field?

12 A Well, let me give you a little informa-
13 tion about these -- these wells to really show why they
14 need to be given a major consideration as far as the pur-
15 chaser, which we eventually choose in this field.

16 Of course as we've already stated, the
17 discovery well, Ervin Ranch State No. 1, was potentialled in
18 December of '88 for a little over 4-million cubic feet per
19 day CAOF in the lower zone, which I alluded to previously,
20 and over 10-million cubic feet per day in the upper zone,
21 both in the Montoya formation, and the pressure transient
22 testing and reservoir limits analysis that we did indicated
23 substantial reserves for this particular well, along the
24 order of 6-to-7 BCF, and we estimate that the combined de-
25 liverability of both zones in the Ervin Ranch State No. 1

1 to be on the order of 3-to-4-million cubic feet per day.

2 Now the confirmation well in Section 36
3 was potentialed for over 37-million cubic feet per day CAOF
4 in January of 1989 and this was from the single zone in the
5 Upper Montoya and reservoir limits testing on this well, as
6 well as volumetrics, indicate reserves on the order of 3
7 BCF, or better, and this particular well could have a de-
8 liverability of anywhere from 2 to 5-million cubic feet per
9 day, we estimate. Now it's reasonable we're a little un-
10 certain on this one as it's down structure, it's closer to
11 the water table, we're going to be more careful about how
12 we produce this particular well.

13 So for the field, as it stands, to date
14 we have reserves from these two wells of 9 to 10 BCF, we
15 estimate, with a combined deliverability of around 5-mil-
16 lion cubic feet per day, so we're talking about substantial
17 reserves here and any decisions we may make as to the pipe-
18 line that we choose would have to consider the benefit to
19 these wells. This would have to weigh in there very great-
20 ly.

21 Q Do you currently have sufficient daily
22 deliverability into a pipeline to make the cost of bringing
23 that gathering system to the field economic at this point?

24 A No, we don't. We will continue to deve-
25 lop the field and hopefully soon we'll be at the point

1 where we can justify the installation of this facility.

2 Q In your opinion as a petroleum engineer,
3 is it a significant matter to you to have the operations
4 for the subject well decided based upon the contention that
5 Yates has a 50 percent interest collectively in the well?

6 A No, we do not.

7 Q Do you believe as a reservoir engineer
8 that the operation of the well ought to be decided based
9 upon overhead costs or the difference between the existing
10 AFE's?

11 A No, we do not, because we have shown
12 that those are insignificant.

13 Q What to you are the significant factors
14 that ought to be decided in determining who the operator is
15 for the well?

16 A Well, the significant factors would be
17 the individual that discovered the field, which is us; the
18 fact that we have the expertise in the immediate area; our
19 success in drilling of these wells; and looking at the mar-
20 keting of the primary product on a fieldwide basis and not
21 on an individual well basis.

22 Q Is there anything else that you'd like
23 to comment on, Mr. Crabb?

24 A No.

25 Q All right, sir.

1 will be admitted as evidence.

2 Would you like to go first, Mr
3 Kellahin? Do you have a statement?

4 MR. KELLAHIN: Just briefly,
5 Mr. Examiner, we've spent a good part of the day talking
6 about this particular case and I think you've found that
7 there is an overwhelming number of items upon which both
8 sides agree and that's why it makes a decision of this case
9 as to the operations even more difficult.

10 We do not have the more common
11 situation of a great disparity in the ownership between the
12 parties desiring to operate the well. I appreciate Mr.
13 Dickerson's landman's position with regard to dividing the
14 Yates interests among the various Yates entities and then
15 collectively adding them up to say 50 percent, but the
16 actual truth of the matter is that my client controls 50
17 percent of the property and Mr. Dickerson has the other 50
18 percent. So if you're trying to decide how to balance the
19 scales, tipping the scale based upon who controls what per-
20 centage is not a meaningful way to decide this case.

21 Sometimes you're able to de-
22 cide a forced pooling case based upon the fact that there
23 is a material and significant difference in the operating
24 agreement and the overhead charges that the company pro-
25 posed to charge. In this case we have utilized the Ernst

1 and Whinney overhead rates. We have used the same over-
2 head rates that Yates has agreed to in the west half of
3 this section and the overhead rates, notwithstanding the
4 contention of Ms. Colbert this morning, I don't think is a
5 material basis upon which to decide the case.

6 Another way in which the Com-
7 mission on occasion decides pooling cases is to say that
8 there is a significant and material difference in the cost
9 of the wells. I think you can see from Mr. Crabb's testi-
10 mony that if you adjust some of the numbers based upon
11 whether or not you run a particular type of log or a drill
12 stem test, make some reasonable judgments as operator,
13 you're going to come in with either AFE. There is not an
14 appropriate way to make a material difference in the two
15 AFE's by which to decide the case.

16 One way we sometimes decide
17 these cases is decide which operator is the operator with
18 the greatest experience. It's conceded that Yates is a
19 good operator, a prudent operator, and certainly knowledge-
20 able.

21 We contend, however, that the
22 fact that BHP undertook the risk of exploring for and de-
23 veloping this prospect and this field with the discovery
24 well and the confirmation well, ought to be awarded. They
25 ought to be awarded in having the operations for the well

1 in the east half of 36 granted to them as a continuing
2 benefit for their ability to gather sufficient daily pro-
3 duction to take the gas to market. We think it is import-
4 ant that you remember that it was Yates who was given the
5 opportunity to share that risk with BHP and they elected
6 not to do that. They elected to farmout their interest in
7 the west half of 36 and it was BHP that took that risk for
8 the benefit, then, ultimately of themselves when they were
9 successful and certainly of Yates. Had they not been suc-
10 cessful then the adverse economic consequences of that
11 decision would have been on BHP alone.

12 We think that ought to be re-
13 warded, particularly in view of the fact that the only con-
14 tentions that Yates asserts for being awarded operations of
15 the well is they mistakenly believe that they have a signi-
16 ficant controlling interest in the well and that there is a
17 material difference in the overhead cost in the AFE.

18 Those are not material differ-
19 ences by which you should seize operations from the company
20 that proposed the well first. This is third, fourth well
21 in the immediate area and we are the company that went to
22 Yates and asked them if they would like to participate with
23 us. We proposed the well first and when all things other-
24 wise are equal, the Commission historically, and I think
25 fairly, has awarded operations to the party that proposes

1 the well initially and we, it is uncontested that we pro-
2 posed a well in the east half of this section prior to
3 Yates.

4 What does Yates do? They take
5 the AFE that we have provided them, the operating agreement
6 that we have provided with them, and they send us back an
7 operating agreement in which they attach our own exhibit to
8 their operating agreement. You know, they're trying to
9 take away the operations from us and we don't understand
10 and believe that there is a material justification to allow
11 it to occur.

12 We would like to operate this
13 property. We think it's important for us to continue the
14 operations of the field. We think it's of material import-
15 ance to us that we preserve our farmout rights under the
16 Valley farmout. We will obtain that document for you and
17 brief our legal opinions on the consequences of a decision
18 to allow Yates to operate over BHP with regards to the ef-
19 fects of that Valley farmout.

20 But setting aside that issue
21 for a moment, we think that the parties have no dispute on
22 the location. We don't believe that either party desires
23 or seeks that the well be penalized. You can't resolve the
24 case based upon the location of the well because through
25 joint study further development of data, all parties agree

1 on the well location. Sometimes we can decide these cases
2 based upon that. This does not present you that choice.

3 Therefor we conclude and hope
4 that you will also conclude that operations belong to the
5 party first proposing the well and that is beyond dispute
6 BHP Petroleum Company.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. CATANACH: Thank you. Mr.
9 Dickerson?

10 MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Catanach,
11 the testimony again uncontroverted as much of the testimony
12 was today, was that Yates has drilled approximately 12 Or-
13 dovician wells, 10 of which are producers in the general
14 area with similar geologic and drilling considerations in-
15 volved in the drilling of those wells.

16 BHP, on the other hand, has
17 drilled 2.

18 As did Mr. Kellahin, we con-
19 cede that BHP is a prudent operator. It's certainly qual-
20 ified to operate oil and gas wells, but -- and it's true
21 that BHP first proposed a well in the east half of Section
22 36. But think about the testimony as to what happened. At
23 that point all parties were in possession of roughly equal
24 data in that they had shared among themselves the existing
25 seismic data. If anything, BHP had some advantage to the

1 extent that it had all the actual results, at least by that
2 point had actually drilled its well in the northeast quart-
3 er of Section 5 and the Yates "36" 1 Well in the west half
4 of Section 36, and yet the location that BHP proposed was
5 at a standard location. Now, upon consideration by the
6 parties and Yates' objection to that standard, the parties
7 got together, and reasonable people are supposed to get to-
8 gether, but we would submit that that is an indication that
9 Yates experience in the area counts for something. It
10 counted for enough to convince BHP that, yes, the location
11 proposed by Yates is superior to the one initially pro-
12 posed by BHP, and changed its mind; a reasonable and pru-
13 dent thing to; that's what we should all do when confronted
14 with differing opinions which upon review appear to be sub-
15 stantiated. It's what happened here.

16 I also agree with Mr. Kellahin
17 and I offer a case that you might find instructive, Mr.
18 Catanach, in Order No. R-119 -- 8119, which Mr. Kellahin
19 and I are both familiar with, several findings, beginning
20 on about the Findings 8 or 9, were made concerning the rel-
21 ative merits of the positions of the parties. Now in that
22 case the parties were diametrically opposed on each and
23 every point in contention, the location of the well, not
24 only who should be operator. But the substance of the or-
25 der entered was that absent any compelling reason to do it,

1 in a situation such we have here our geologists are in
2 total agreement.

3 The well costs, while we con-
4 tend that Yates can drill for something less and complete
5 these wells than can BHP, I wouldn't quarrel with -- it's
6 opinion at this point and history will tell, but that or-
7 der goes further and points out that there is another sig-
8 nificant factor and notwithstanding the fact that it's
9 denegated by BHP, the fact remains that Yates Pet controls
10 50 percent of the acreage. Yeah, the other 50 percent is
11 owned by other parties, but Samedan controls its own inter-
12 est half the size of the Yates interest. BHP controls the
13 remaining 25 percent interest and in the absence of other
14 compelling reasons to decide a case based on any other
15 factors, that would be a perfectly reasonable case in which
16 to provide this one.

17 We've also pointed out, Mr.
18 Catanach, that here we have a new pool, discovery, through
19 the efforts not along of BHP, but through its drilling,
20 which has resulted in two producers that did not exist be-
21 fore, and yet because of the realities of the situation and
22 the economics of the oil business these days, there is an
23 advantage to a party to have control over the operations.
24 We submit that for whatever advantage that would be, it
25 would be equitable and fair in these circumstances to allow

1 Yates Pet, a prudent and well qualified operator, to oper-
2 ate wells and develop its reserves in the east half. It's
3 committed to complying, not because of any engineering or
4 geologic reason that Yates has to drill that well current-
5 ly, but conceding to the time problems that BHP has, Yates
6 has agreed to comply with those problems, get that well
7 drilled within the time frame of their existing agreements
8 without requiring them to get an extension from Valley,
9 which they say may or many not be possible.

10 Given these factors we think
11 the reasonable conclusion here and equitable to all parties
12 would be to allow Yates to operate this third well for the
13 benefit of all the interest owners (unclear).

14 MR. CATANACH: Thank you.

15 Is there anything further in
16 this case, any of these cases?

17 If not, they will be taken
18 under advisement.

19
20 (Hearing concluded.)
21
22
23
24
25

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

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 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 hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 9629, 9630, 9631 heard by me on March 21, 19 88.
David R. Cotland, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
4 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
5 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6 15 March 1989

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 In the matter of cases called on this
10 date and continued or dismissed with-
11 out testimony presented.

CASES
9610
9619
9624
9626
9627
9628
9629
9630
9631

12 BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner
13

14 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
15

16 A P P E A R A N C E S
17

18 For the Division:

19 Robert G. Stovall
20 Attorney at Law
21 Legal Counsel to the Division
22 State Land Office Bldg.
23 Santa Fe, New Mexico
24
25

I N D E X

- 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

CASE 9610
CASE 9619
CASE 9624
CASE 9626
CASE 9627
CASE 9628
CASE 9629
CASE 9630
CASE 9631

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

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

MR. STOGNER: This hearing will come to order for Docket No. 9-89. I'm Michael E. Stogner and it's March 15th, 1989, and we'll go through the continuances and dismissals first.

We'll call Case Number 9610.

MR. STOVALL In the matter of the hearing called by the Oil Conservation Division on its own motion to permit Knights Bridge Petroleum Corporation and James Marchbanks and all other interested parties to appear and show cause why the Triple Crown Well No. 1, Quay County, New Mexico, should not be plugged and abandoned in accordance with a Division approved plugging program.

The Division requests this case be continued to the April 12th, 1989 hearing.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9610 will be continued to the examiner's hearing scheduled for April 12th, 1989.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
9619.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
Santa Fe Exploration Company for compulsory pooling and an
unorthodox gas well location, Eddy County, New Mexico.

This case is going to be con-
tinued and readvertised for March 29th.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9619
will be continued and readvertised for the examiner's
hearing scheduled for March 29th, 1989.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9624.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
W. A. Moncrief, Jr., for compulsory pooling, Lea County,
New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be dismissed.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9624
will be dismissed.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9626.

MR. STOVALL: The application
of Mobil Producing Texas and New Mexico, Inc., for compul-
sory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be dismissed.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9626
will be dismissed.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9627.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
Yates Petroleum Corporation for an unorthodox gas well
location, Chaves County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be continued to March 29th, 1989.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9627
will be so continued.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9628.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
Yates Petroleum Corporation for an unorthodox gas well
location, Eddy County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be continued to March 29th.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9628
will be so continued.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9629.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
Yates Petroleum Corporation for compulsory pooling, Chaves
County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be continued to March 29th.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9629
will be so continued.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9630.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
Yates Petroleum Corporation for an unorthodox gas well
location, Chaves County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be continued to March 29th.

MR. STOGNER: Case 9630 will
be so continued.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
9631.

MR. STOVALL: Application of
BHP Petroleum, Inc. for compulsory pooling and unorthodox
gas well location, Chaves County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case
be continued to March 29th.

MR. STOGNER: Case Number 9631
will be so continued.

(Hearing concluded.)

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

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 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 hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case Nos. 9610, 9619, 9624, 9662, 9627 heard by me on 15 March 1989. 2028, 9629, 9630, 9631
Michael J. [Signature], Examiner
Oil Conservation Division