STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

20 September 1989

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Doyle Hartman for a non-standard gas proration unit and an unorthodox gas well location, Lea County, New Mexico. CASE 9766

BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division: Robert G. Stovall
Attorney at Law
Legal Counsel to the Division
State Land Office Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico

For Doyle Hartman: Joanne Reuter
Attorney at Law
GALLEGOS LAW FIRM
141 East Palace Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For Marathon Oil Company: W. Thomas Kellahin
Attorney at Law
KELLAHIN, KELLAHIN & AUBREY
P. O. Box 2265
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
and
Lawrence D. Garcia
Attorney at Law
MARATHON OIL COMPANY
P. O. Box 3128
Houston, Texas 77253

I N D E X

E X H I B I T S

MR. CATANACH: At this time we will call Case 9766.

Application of Doyle Hartman for a nonstandard gas proration unit and an unorthodox gas well location in Lea County, New Mexico.

Are there appearances in this case?

MS. REUTER: I am Joanne Reuter from the Gallegos Law Firm and I'm appearing on behalf of Doyle Hartman and I have one witness on his behalf, Mr. Dan Nutter.

MR. CATANACH: Any other appearances?

MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, I'm Tom Kellahin of the Santa Fe law firm of Kellahin, Kellahin & Aubrey, appearing on behalf of Marathon Oil Company.

MR. CATANACH: Any other appearances?

MR. KELLAHIN: I'm sorry, I'm fatigued, I guess. I'm appearing in association with Mr. Larry Garcia, who is an attorney and house counsel for the Marathon Oil Company, and will you please note his appearance.

We have no witnesses to pre-

sent, Mr. Examiner.

MR. CATANACH: Okay. Will the witness please stand to be sworn in?

(Witness sworn.)

MR. CATANACH: You may proceed.

DANIEL S. NUTTER,

being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. REUTER:

Q Could you please state your name and address for the record.

A My name is Dan Nutter. I live in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Q And could you state what your occupation is?

A I'm a consulting petroleum engineer.

Q Have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division as a petroleum engineer?

A Yes, I have.

Q Have you testified on prorationing and petroleum engineering issues?

A Yes, I have?

Q Have you been qualified as an expert before the OCD on prorationing and petroleum engineering issues?

A I have.

Q Have you examined and studied the application of Doyle Hartman in this case and the facts and circumstances surrounding that application?

A I have.

MS. REUTER: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Nutter's testimony as that of an expert petroleum engineer on prorationing and petroleum engineering issues.

MR. CATANACH: He is so qualified.

Q Mr. Nutter, turning your attention to Exhibit One, could you please describe for us what is contained in that exhibit?

A Exhibit One in Case Number 9766 is a packet of correspondence pertaining to the application of Doyle Hartman for the unorthodox location of his A. L. Christmas Well No. 1 and the assignment of a 140-acre non-standard gas proration unit to that well.

The well would be located 990 feet from the north line and 460 feet from the west line of Section 18, Township 22 South, Range 37 East, Lea -- Eumont Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico. The acreage to be dedicated to the well would be the 140-acre -- 48 acre nonstandard proration unit, comprising Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 on the west boundary, the west side of Section 18 of Township 22 South, Range 37 East.

In this packet is the original application for the well which Doyle Hartman requested administrative approval for on July the 27th, 1989. Also attached are the return receipts from all offset operators, acknowledging that they had received a copy of the application through Mr. Hartman.

Upon objection being received from Marathon Oil Company, this matter was set for hearing.

Q Mr. Nutter, you have stated both that Mr. Hartman is seeking a 140-acre and a 148-acre proration unit. Could you clarify for the record which exactly the -- what exactly the acreage of the unit would be?

A I stand corrected. The total acreage contained in Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Section 18, is 148 acres.

Q Turning now to Exhibit Two, could you please tell me what that exhibit shows?

A Exhibit Two is a plat showing the proposed proration unit outlined in yellow. Colored in various colors are the offsetting proration units in the Eumont Gas Pool.

Also attached to the plat is a listing identifying by color and by the tract number which is indicated on the plat, the operator of that particular tract, the name of the well which is dedicated to the tract, whether it is a producing or nonproducing gas well, the location of the plat, a description of it, and the number of acres that are contained in the proration unit.

Also shown is the proposed Eumont Gas infill well, the A. L. Christmas No. 1, as well as the original Eumont Gas producer which is located on the same 148-acre tract being the Gulf A. L. Christmas C Well No. 5, which is located 2310 from the south line and 330 feet from the west line of Section 18. This produced -- this well produced from the Eumont Gas Pool for a number of years and upon declining production was finally plugged and abandoned by Gulf.

Q Mr. Nutter, could you tell us when that well was plugged and abandoned?

A That well was plugged, I believe it was in 1976.

Q And what exactly was the location of

that well?

A 2310 from the south line and 330 feet from the west line.

Q I believe the record in this case also reflects that Marathon had -- did not oppose the application but rather requested that an allowable penalty be imposed upon Mr. Hartman's proposed well and I understand that Marathon has some offsetting wells. Would those be shown on this plat?

A Yes, they are shown.

Q Could you tell me where those are?

A I might also mention that when Gulf applied for the nonstandard proration unit for their Christmas Well No. 5, a copy of the application for administrative approval for that well, being 330 feet from the boundary, was sent to Marathon, or to Ohio Oil Company, the predecessor to Marathon Oil Company. No objection was received from Marathon or Ohio at that time.

Now, Hartman is proposing a well which is 460 feet from the west line of the section and we did get an objection.

I might point out, also, that in Tract 8, which is outlined in blue in Section 13 of Township 22 South, Range 36 East, that Marathon has their McDonald State ACC Well No. 11, located 330 feet from the north line

and 330 feet from the east line. This is also a Eumont well. The plat is in error here. It depicts it as being a Eumont oil well with a casinghead gas allowable; however, that well has been reclassified. It is a Eumont gas well with a gas well allowable, and has 160 acres dedicated.

There is also another well which has a 480-acre plat, tract, dedicated to it, that being Marathon's McDonald No. 26, which is located in Unit J of Section 13, 22, 36, and that is a Eumont Oil Well at the present time.

Q Mr. Nutter, do you know whether Marathon is still objecting or asking for a penalty to be placed on the allowable that would be given to Mr. Hartman's A. L. Christman Well?

A It is my understanding -- it is my understanding that Marathon is withdrawing their objection to the application of Hartman for this 148-acre unit and the nonstandard location, and for that reason we're not presenting our entire case that we had planned on at this time.

Q Can you also tell me whether any of these offsetting proration units are standard?

A There are no standard proration units in this area?

Q Could you tell us for the record what a

standard proration unit --

A A standard --

Q -- in the Eumont is?

A A standard proration in the Eumont Gas Pool is 640 acres. At one time the Well No. 26 of Marathon's in Section 13 did have the entire 640 acres dedicated to it. Then when they completed their Well No. 11, they carved 160 acres and dedicated it to the Well No. 11, and left 480 acres dedicated to the No. 26. No. 26 is now a Eumont oil well, having been reclassified from gas to oil, and theoretically, that 480-acre unit is nonexistent at the present time and there would only be 40 acres dedicated to the No. 26 as an oil well.

Q How many acres receive an acreage factor of 1 in the Eumont?

A A full sized unit of 640 receives an acreage factor of 4. A 160-acre nonstandard unit receives an acreage factor of 1, and we would expect an acreage factor for this well to be in proportion to 148 acres over 160 acres times 1 to be the acreage dedication, or acreage allowable factor.

Q Do you know offhand what that factor would be?

A No, I don't. I think it's .98, I believe; something like that.

Q Do you know whether it's in Mr. Hartman's application?

A I believe it is contained in one of those letters that are in Exhibit Number One.

Q Thank you. Turning to Exhibit Three, could you tell us what that exhibit is?

A That acreage factor would be .93, I stand corrected.

Q Oh, thank you, Mr. Nutter. Now turning to Exhibit Number Three, could you tell us -- describe for us what that exhibit shows?

A Exhibit Three is a plat of the area. Outlined in orange is the proposed nonstandard proration unit and also shown are all of the wells within two locations away of the proposed proration unit and in color code identifying the formations from which those wells are producing.

The light blue is the Eumont Pool wells and you will notice that there are Eumont wells to the north, south, east and west of the proposed location.

Q Mr. Nutter, what does the location of those Eumont wells tell you as a petroleum engineer about any possibility of Mr. Hartman obtaining an unfair geological advantage in drilling his proposed well?

A Well, it shows that the Eumont zone is

present and productive in the entire area. I believe the next exhibit more precisely defines that.

Q Well, turning to the next exhibit, which is Exhibit Number Four, why don't you go ahead and describe what this exhibit demonstrates for us?

A Yes. Exhibit Four is a larger size plat. It identifies the proposed proration unit in yellow. It also shows the location of other wells which are on cross sections which we won't be presenting here today, A-A' and B-B'; however, if you will look at the contour -- this is a structure map on top of the Penrose, which is the pay zone in the Queen formation, you will notice that at the very bottom of the proposed proration unit there's a heavy dark line that's marked plus or minus zero. This would be the C level elevation of a contour which encompasses the entire west half of the west half of Section 18. This is a high in this area except for the little peak down in the southwest southwest of Section 18, and for a high up in Sections 12 and 7 to the north. There's a small peak up there also.

But we consider that anything that's inside this plus or minus zero to be definitely productive and outlined in pink is the approximate oil/gas contact. Anything above that structure should be productive of gas if it's completed properly, and that would be at the -100

foot level.

So we are well above that. We're 100 feet above that within the proration unit.

So I think that this establishes that the likelihood of the entire 148-acre unit would be productive of gas from the Eumont Gas Pool.

Q Where -- which portion of the structure is Mr. Hartman's proposed well? Is it in the high portion or the low portion?

A It's in the high portion of the structure, except for those two little peaks, the one in the southwest southwest of 18, which is a few feet higher than the plus or minus zero line, and then there's another little peak that crosses the section lines between Section 12 and Section 7 to the north there.

Q By locating his proposed well to the west side of the center line of the proposed proration unit, is Mr. Hartman locating his well closer to the high side of the formation or to the lower side of the formation?

A He is moving, probably, slightly to the west of the high there, because it comes up through a saddle, you'll notice, in the northwest northwest quarter section of Section 18. There's a little saddle there where this high narrows down and he's moving slightly to the west

of the center there; however, there are reasons why the well had to be moved to the west and we elaborate on that later.

Q It appears also on this map that other wells or people are trying to move further to the east rather than to the west in the structure, is that correct?

A Yes. You'll notice that almost all of the wells to the west there in Section 12 or in Section 22 or Section 24 to the south, were all moved to 330/330 locations in their respective 40-acre tracts. It's true of the first column of 40-acre tracts in Sections 12, 13 and 24, and then as you move on to the next row of forties, the wells are still located as far east as they could be located. In the third the row of forties the wells are still located to the east. They were oil wells and all drilled 330 to the -- from the eastern boundary of their respective 40-acre tracts. And this is also true in the northwest northwest of Section 13. That No. 14 Well is located 330 feet from the eastern boundary of that 40-acre tract. So there's been a tendency to try to move all of the wells to the east, to get on that high that progresses up through Section 18 and into Sections 12 and 7.

Q So Mr. Hartman's proposed well then in moving westward would really give him somewhat of a geological disadvantage, if anything.

A If anything it would provide a disadvantage, yes.

Q Okay. Where is Marathon's offsetting gas well?

A Marathon's offsetting gas well would be in the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 13, 330 feet from the eastern boundary of Section 13.

Q Compared to Mr. Hartman's well is Marathon's well moving towards the low side of the formation or the high side?

A Well, they moved it as far to the east as they could.

Q Well, compared to his well where does it sit, further towards the low, is that right?

A Well, it has to be because the structure is dipping to the west.

Q Turning to Exhibit Number Five, Mr. Nutter, could you tell us what that exhibit shows? Why don't we start with the first page of it?

A Okay. Exhibit Five is a copy of the original C-102 that was submitted with the C-101 when the application to drill the well was filed. It was also attached to the application for administrative approval, which was sent to all offset operators.

We have taken the plat on Exhibit 102

and elaborated a little bit in the second page of Exhibit Number Five. The red outline on the second page is a map of the 40-acre tract. Now you'll notice that there is a line running almost directly up and down through the middle of that 40-acre tract with some P's interposed in the line. That is a powerline which runs virtually north -- which runs north and south virtually right down the middle of the tract. It would make it impossible to drill a well near the center of the tract because of the danger of a rig standing too close to the powerline, so the well has to be moved at least 120 feet away from the powerline.

Now there's a Shell pipeline that runs southwest/northeast just to the north of the proposed location 100 feet.

There's also a Texaco pipeline running northwest/southeast.

There's also another well which is located -- the Well No. 14, which is visible on the other plats that we had. It's located in the approximate northeast quarter of the red square there. I believe that that well is located 660 feet from the -- well, I really can't say exactly where that well is, but it's located just south of the point where the Shell pipeline and the Texaco pipeline intersect each other. There's another well there so he couldn't move in that direction.

So he had to move in the westerly direction from the center of the section.

Now, it's impossible to get a 660-foot location because the narrowness of the lot, it's only 5,180 rather than 5,280 feet wide. So a 660 location is impossible.

The most orthodox location that would be possible east and west would be 610 feet, but 610 feet is right on the powerline, so we couldn't locate there.

Now we are located 960 feet from the north boundary of the section and that is a standard location insofar as the 160-acre unit or even a 320-acre unit is concerned, standard from the end boundary.

Q Mr. Nutter, you just stated that he is located 960 feet from the north boundary. Isn't it more accurate to say he's 990 feet?

A 990, did I say 960?

Q If you look at the first page of Exhibit Number Five, there is a marking on there that shows 1220 feet. Is that not the width of the proposed proration unit?

A That's right, a normal 40-acre tract would be 1320. Now, as I mentioned before, the section is 5,180 feet wide. A normal section is 5280. So it's 100 feet short. The 100 feet comes off of this row of lots on

the west side, so this particular lot is only 1220 feet wide.

Q And the centerline of that proration unit would be 610 feet.

A 610 feet rather than 660 feet.

Q But the powerline is in the middle at 610 feet.

A That is correct.

Q Why is the proposed well 120 feet off of the powerline?

A To provide the ample -- the ample distance in case the rig would fall over to the east. It wouldn't land on the power line.

Q And why would it be 100 feet south of the Shell pipeline?

A Well, I guess to keep it from falling on the pipeline. We hope it doesn't fall down, period.

Q How much is the variance from the standard location from the east or west line?

A According to the Eumont Pool rules, if he could move that well 200 feet to the east and have a 660 location, he could be 990 feet from the north line, 660 feet from the west line, and be permitted to dedicate the entire west half of the section, if he owned the acreage or communitized it; however, we're only seeking 148 acres and

we're 200 feet closer than we would have to be for a 320-acre proration unit, which would have an acreage factor of 2, whereas we're we're asking for an acreage factor of .93, did I say, I think.

Q Mr. Nutter, just so that the record is clear all in one place, could you explain to us why Mr. Hartman was seeking a nonstandard proration unit?

A The nonstandard proration unit is still in existence. It was approved by the Commission. There never has been any written notice that the nonstandard proration unit was terminated, but I think probably it was terminated by virtue of the fact that the well which was dedicated to that 148-acre unit was plugged and abandoned. The prorated unit is probably dead. If it's not dead, we don't need approval, but just in case it is dead, we want approval for a 148-acre unit, also.

Q Can you tell me when that nonstandard proration unit was initially approved by the Commission?

A It was initially approved by NSP-461 and I believe the date on that was 1957, I believe. I believe it was approved January the 10th of 1957.

Q To your knowledge was there any objection received by Mr. Hartman or any that turned up in your review of the OCD files in this case, of any objection to reinstatement of that nonstandard proration unit?

A No, and I don't know if he specifically asked for reinstatement. Well, I guess he did ask for reinstatement of it. No, there was no objection received from anyone except Marathon in this case.

We had waivers from a number of people and some some operators were just silent but didn't file an objection.

Q Would you like to summarize your testimony for us, Mr. Nutter?

A Yes. I think that the application of Doyle Hartman in this case is a legitimate application. I think that the circumstances here necessitate the drilling of the well where it is being drilled. We've got obstacles that prevent a more standard location from being drilled and it's impossible to drill a standard location because of the narrowness of the 40-acre tract.

There is nowhere in this entire tract you could drill 660 feet from the eastern line and the western line of the tract because it's only 1220 feet.

So I think that his application is a legitimate application. He's not asking for any special considerations, only for a proration unit allocation factor that's in proportion to the acreage that he's dedicated and the standard acreage of a -- for a factor of 1.

So I think that there's every reason for

him to pursue this action, this application.

Q In your opinion as an expert in this area, is approval of this application in the interest of conservation and the protection of correlative rights?

A I think it certainly is in this case, yes.

Q Mr. Nutter, were the exhibits that we entered as Numbers One through Five either prepared by you or at your direction or request?

A Yes, they were.

MS. REUTER: Mr. Examiner, I offer Exhibits One through Five be admitted into evidence.

MR. CATANACH: Exhibits One through Five will be admitted as evidence.

MS. REUTER: And I have nothing further from Mr. Nutter.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CATANACH:

Q Mr. Nutter, on Exhibit Number Three you show three Eumont wells in that -- in that proposed proration unit. Isn't that one too many? That's not correct, is it?

A Yes, it is. The old No. 1 was an oil well which was plugged and abandoned.

The No. 2 was an oil well which was plugged and abandoned.

The No. 3 was -- I don't know if it was ever an oil well or if it was completed as a gas well. It was originally, as the orange indicates, it was originally an Arrowhead well and then it was recompleted as a Eumont Well and it may have been an oil well and then converted to a gas well. I do not know.

But there were three Eumont wells on that proration unit.

Q So all three of them are plugged at this time.

A All three are plugged at this time. All three are plugged at this time, and also in brown up there in the northwest northwest is that No. 14 Well which I told you was located just south of the intersection of those two pipelines.

It's a Drinkard well, still operated by Gulf -- Chevron.

Q So it's Mr. Hartman's opinion that there's still some gas reserves in that northeast or northwest quarter to be produced.

A Well, there's gas reserves in the entire 148-acre tract, we believe.

Q Yeah, but these -- these --

A The No. 5 Well down here in the southeast of the southwest is a good little gas well of Amerada. They originally had that 80-acre unit dedicated to that No. 1 Well, which is the blue well just to the north and it decreased in production so they drilled the No. 5 and it's a good gas well in the Eumont. So we believe that the entire 148-acre unit is productive of gas.

The No. 5 Well was still capable of producing small quantities of gas when Gulf abandoned it.

Q Okay. So that's going to be the only well dedicated to this unit.

A Yes, sir, the proposed well will be the only well.

MR. CATANACH: That's all I have.

MR. KELLAHIN: Let me ask a couple of clarifying questions.

MR. CATANACH: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Kellahin.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q Mr. Nutter, if you'll help me with your Exhibit Number Two, I believe.

A Oh, okay.

Q You've attempted with this exhibit to show certain of the acreage in Section 18 that is currently dedicated to the Eumont gas wells.

A Yes.

Q There is some portion of 18 that is not shown as currently dedicated to Eumont gas wells. Did you simply stop tabulating them or is the balance of Section 18 when you look at the southeast quarter, certain portions of the northeast quarter --

A You mean on my Exhibit Number Three?

Q No, sir, I'm looking at the exhibit -- plat attached to Exhibit Two. Turn past -- there you go.

A No, these are just the offsetting proration units that offset -- directly offset the proposed proration unit.

Q So as we look in the balance of Section 18, there are additional spacing units currently dedicated to Eumont gas wells. You simply haven't outlined them.

A I did not even check to see if they were there. We only looked at the offsetting proration units.

Q When I look at the items you have identified and I see the one shown as No. 2.

A You mean the proration units.

A The proration units, yes, sir. That's shown as Meridian Oil, Inc., is the operator.

A Okay.

Q It's shown within an area that shows Mr. Hartman as having an acreage position in that spacing unit.

A Hartman originally owned that 80-acre tract there and drilled that Crosby No. 2 Well; however, that well has since been sold to Meridian and Meridian is the operator of that well at the present time.

Q So Mr. Hartman doesn't have any interest in the spacing unit outlined in No. 2 that could be added to the spacing unit for the Christmas No. 1 infill well.

A No. This plat is an old plat and shows Hartman. Now on your structure map you'll see that it has been changed to Meridian there for that 80-acre proration unit.

Q So the current -- currently all the available acreage to Mr. Hartman in 18 is the four 40-acre tracts constituting the west half of the west half of 18.

A As far as I know that's all of his acreage, yes.

Q Do you know whether or not he has plans to -- to add additional acreage in Section 18 into this proposed spacing unit?

A Not -- well, he doesn't own any leases at the present time unless he would acquire some additional acreage and you'll also notice up in Section 7 on the old

plat, the north half of the south half is identified as D. Hartman.

Q Yes, sir.

A And if you look at the new map, that also shows that that's another Meridian well or tract that was sold to Meridian.

He disposed of almost all of his stuff in the Eumont.

Q Well, that was part of my question, is to clarify for me what currently is his acreage position because I was confused by looking at the two exhibits.

A Yeah. No, that -- this probably should have been updated, but this was sent in -- it's just a copy of the Midland Mapping Company's plats and they haven't changed their -- they -- maybe they have by now, but they hadn't when this exhibit was prepared. This is a new exhibit we prepared specifically for this hearing, however, and it has been updated.

Q Let me ask you a technical question. What would be the allowable that Mr. Hartman can produce if he uses this approximately 160 acres? What is his maximum daily producing rate for a Eumont gas well?

A I believe in 1988 a 160-acre proration unit in the Eumont averaged around 225 a day. So he would get .93 percent --

Q Times that --

A -- times that, yes, sir.

Q -- number.

A Yes, sir.

Q Have you done any forecast for him on the anticipated reserves to be recovered within the spacing unit?

A No, that's his -- his job.

Q Summarize for us, Mr. Nutter, why, in your opinion, Mr. Hartman does not gain any advantage over Marathon in terms of his unorthodox location in relation to their spacing unit?

A Well, with respect to their proration unit they are 330 feet from the line of a 160-acre unit and getting full allowable for that.

He is a 100 -- he's got a 148-acre unit. He's asking for an allowable in proportion to a 140-acre unit but he's 460 feet, so he's 130 feet further from the common line than Marathon is.

We feel that they have an advantage by virtue of their location being closer to the common line than he is, and they're both getting a proportionate share of the allowable factor for the amount of acreage they have dedicated. So by virtue of closeness to the common line, they have an advantage over Hartman.

Q Do you have any other reasons to demonstrate to the Examiner that Mr. Hartman is not gaining an advantage over the offset with this location?

A Well, I think also that the structure map itself shows he's higher on the structure than the Meridian No. -- or the Marathon No. 11 Well is. And being higher on the structure, he should have more reserves present, more pay thickness, probably, than their well would have.

Q Did you attempt to analyze the actual perforated and producing zones among the wells in the immediate vicinity of Mr. Hartman's proposed location?

A Certain of the wells, yes. Yes. We have more exhibits.

Q No, sir, I mean I don't want to see all the rest of the stuff. I just wanted to have a summary --

A Yeah.

Q -- from you about your expert opinion as to whether or not you thought Mr. Hartman was gaining an advantage notwithstanding the fact there is a Marathon well that is closer to the common line than his well.

A No, I see no advantage. I see him at a disadvantage, as a matter of fact.

MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CATANACH: Any more questions of this witness?

If not he may be excused.

Anything further in this case?

MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, I'd like to state on the record that Mr. Nutter is correct. Marathon, based upon information supplied to us by the applicant, is persuaded that he does not gain an unfair advantage for which the Commission needs to address a penalty on his allowable, and therefor we are withdrawing our opposition to his application.

MR. CATANACH: Thank you, Mr. Kellahin.

MS. REUTER: Mr. Examiner, I also would like to add that Mr. Hartman would love to get his drilling program moving along rapidly in southeast New Mexico. So we would respectfully request that we get an expedited order, as soon as possible.

MR. CATANACH: Case 9766 will be taken under advisement.

(Hearing concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C. S. R. DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil 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. 9766, heard by me on September 20 1978.

David R. Catanach, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division