

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Northwest Case 9843
Pipeline Corporation for an
unorthodox coal gas well location
and a nonstandard gas proration
unit, San Juan County, New Mexico

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: DAVID R. CATANACH, EXAMINER

STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

December 13, 1989

ORIGINAL

CUMBRE COURT REPORTING
(505) 984-2244

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE DIVISION:

ROBERT G. STOVALL

Attorney at Law

Legal Counsel to the Divison

State Land Office Building

Santa Fe, New Mexico

FOR THE APPLICANT:

RODEY, DICKASON, SLOAN, AKIN

& ROBB

Attorneys at Law

123 East Marcy Street

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

BY: PAUL A. COOTER, ESQ.

I N D E X

	Page Number
Appearances	2
DARRELL GILLEN	
Direct Examination by Mr. Cooter	5
Cross-Examination by Hearing Examiner	16
JEFF VAUGHN	
Direct Examination by Mr. Cooter	18
Cross-Examination by Hearing Examiner	24
Statement by Mr. Broome	25
Certificate of Reporter	27
E X H I B I T S	
Exhibit A	7
Exhibit B	7
Exhibit C	10
Exhibit D	12
Exhibit E	13
Exhibit F	19
Exhibit G	20
Exhibit H	21
Exhibit I	22
Exhibit J	22
Exhibit K	22
Exhibit L	23

1 HEARING EXAMINER: At this time we'll call
2 Case 9843.

3 MR. STOVALL: Application of Northwest
4 Pipeline Corporation for an unorthodox coal gas well
5 location and a nonstandard gas proration unit, San
6 Juan County, New Mexico.

7 HEARING EXAMINER: Are there appearances in
8 this case?

9 MR. COOTER: Paul Cooter with the Rodey law
10 firm in Santa Fe, appearing on behalf of the
11 applicant, Northwest Pipeline. At counsel table with
12 me will be Mark Moench, in-house counsel for the
13 applicant. We have two witnesses, and then Mr. George
14 Broome with McElvain Oil and Gas will make a statement
15 in support of the application at the conclusion of our
16 case.

17 HEARING EXAMINER: Will the witnesses
18 please stand and be sworn in?

19 (Witnesses sworn.)

20 MR. COOTER: If it may be permitted, I
21 would like to make a brief opening statement which I
22 think might clarify what is sought by the case and the
23 reasons for it.

24 I would ask the Division to take
25 administrative notice of Order No. R-1066, which is

1 dated October 9, 1957, a copy of which is attached to
2 the book of exhibits. It's part of Exhibit B. By
3 that order, the Commission established a series of
4 nonstandard proration units, lettered Tract A through
5 Tract O, along the west and north side of Township 31
6 North, Range 7 West, San Juan County. The necessity
7 was strictly by reason of the corrections being made
8 in the surveys at that point. Those lands were
9 included in the Pacific Northwest Pipeline
10 Corporation, San Juan 32-7 Unit, and Block B
11 established by that order is the same proration unit
12 covered in the application.

13 After the entry of Order No. R-1066 in
14 1957, this Commission entered its Order No. R-6938 on
15 April 16, 1982. A copy of that is also included in
16 the volume of exhibits.

17 Tract B was divided into two nonstandard
18 Pictured Cliffs proration units which overlap that
19 Mesa Verde unit. B-1 and B-2 are the same as, again,
20 Tract B, the same lands included in this application.

21 With that very brief background, I'll
22 commence my examination of Mr. Gillen.

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

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. COOTER:

3 Q. Would you please state your name for the
4 record, sir.

5 A. Darrell Gillen.

6 Q. And by whom are you employed, Mr. Gillen?

7 A. Northwest Pipeline Corporation, one of the
8 Williams companies.

9 Q. What's your position with that company?

10 A. Land manager.

11 Q. Is this the first time you've testified
12 before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. Would you relate briefly your education and
15 your professional experience?16 A. I have a B.S. in business administration.
17 I've worked with Northwest Pipeline 15 years, ten
18 years in the joint operation department, five years in
19 the land department, the last year as land manager.20 Q. Are you a member of any professional
21 associations?22 A. Yes. I'm a member of AAPL and also the
23 Utah Petroleum Association of Mining Landmen, which
24 now I'm serving as the president of that association.

25 Q. What does Northwest Pipeline seek by this

1 application?

2 A. We'd like approval for a Basin-Fruitland
3 Coal Gas coal nonstandard proration unit for the San
4 Juan 32-7 unit No. 201 well, which includes part of
5 Section 7 and part of Section 18 in Township 31 North,
6 Range 7 West.

7 Q. Was administrative approval first sought
8 for that nonstandard proration unit?

9 A. Yes. On November 8, 1989, we sought
10 administrative approval. It was denied due to the
11 fact that there are no provisions that allow
12 administrative approval for a nonstandard proration
13 unit that crosses section lines.

14 Q. Copies of that request for administrative
15 approval and the subsequent rejection of it by
16 Mr. Stogner, together with a copy of this application,
17 constitute Exhibit A to the volume of exhibits, do
18 they not?

19 A. Yes, they do.

20 Q. Let me then direct your attention, if you
21 would, to Exhibit B, the first page of that exhibit,
22 and have you identify and explain it.

23 A. Possibly before I explain Exhibit B, going
24 along with what we're seeking, I could also include
25 just for the Commission, Northwest Pipeline is the

1 operator of the federal unit San Juan 32-7, and as
2 such, we have the responsibility of polling all the
3 working interest owners' desires of that unit for
4 drilling requests for each year. Last year, as we did
5 that, T. H. McElvain Oil and Gas Properties, who are a
6 mineral owner in the boundaries of the San Juan 32-7
7 unit, requested that we drill a well in Section 18, 31
8 North, 7 West. Along with the lands that they were
9 proposing to be included in that spacing unit, they
10 owned that property, 120 acres, with Kindermac
11 Partners.

12 Due to the fact that the north and west
13 boundaries of 31-7 are nonstandard sections, we were
14 required to develop nonstandard proration units in
15 order to go along with the 320-acre spacing under
16 Order R-8768 that was developed for Fruitland Coal in
17 1988.

18 As we researched, we found that proration
19 units had already been established, and this is what
20 Exhibit B indicates for the Blanco-Mesa Verde
21 formation.

22 There's 15 nonstandard proration units that
23 have been developed, starting with A through O.
24 Outlined in red are those proration units that have
25 been approved by the Commission.

1 The green markings in the middle of those
2 proration units indicate 14 proration units in the
3 Pictured Cliffs formation that were applied for and
4 approved by the Commission in 1982 under Order
5 R-6938. These Pictured Cliffs formations just overlay
6 the existing Mesa Verde formations' nonstandard
7 proration units.

8 The highlighted yellow area is the area
9 that we are now asking for approval of a nonstandard
10 proration unit. The blue dot is a proposed well
11 location in that proration unit, approximately.

12 Q. The block numbers given on that page you've
13 just talked about are the same block numbers that were
14 set forth by this Commission in its Order No. R-1066
15 back in 1957?

16 A. Yes, they correspond with the Order lot
17 numbers.

18 Q. Turn to the second page of Exhibit B, if
19 you would, which appears to be another plat.

20 A. In 1977, Palmer Oil made application for
21 four Mesa Verde nonstandard proration units and five
22 Pictured Cliffs nonstandard proration units. They
23 have been highlighted again, the Mesa Verde and Dakota
24 proration units in red, the Pictured Cliffs in green,
25 splitting up the Mesa Verde proration unit. These

1 were applied for and approved. There is a conflict on
2 the Mesa Verde and Pictured Cliffs proration unit as
3 approved in the 1957 order, being B, C, and D
4 proration units have been established here.

5 What they've done is taken the original
6 Order 1957, I and H proration units, and made three
7 proration units out of those two, going down into
8 Section 10, which would give them the additional
9 acreage needed for the three proration units.

10 Q. Those blocks A through G, however, as
11 established by the Commission in 1957, particularly
12 including tract B, which is the subject matter of this
13 application, remain unchanged?

14 A. That's correct. Also J remains unchanged
15 in Section 2.

16 Q. Behind those two plats, there appear copies
17 of the Commission orders to which reference has been
18 made in your testimony; is that correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. Let's turn then to Exhibit C and ask you to
21 explain that to us?

22 A. Exhibit C outlines the existing Mesa Verde
23 wells that have been drilled on the nonstandard
24 proration units that have already been approved. In
25 Section 7 you'll see a proration unit that was

1 established in 1957, which well No. 79 has
2 incorporated as its spacing unit. That's unchanged
3 from the 1957 order.

4 Q. That's block C?

5 A. That would be block C. Block F in Section
6 5 and part of Section -- well, in Section 5, has well
7 No. 18 on it. That is also unchanged.

8 Block G in Section 4 with Well No. 19 is
9 also unchanged from the 1957 order.

10 Q. Let me ask you at that point, even though
11 other tracts, such as tract A, B, D, and E were
12 designated by the 1957 order, no Mesa Verde wells were
13 drilled on those?

14 A. No Mesa Verde well was drilled; that's
15 correct.

16 Q. Then turn to the next page of Exhibit C, if
17 you would?

18 A. Exhibit C would indicate the existing
19 Pictured Cliffs wells that have been drilled. They
20 have all been drilled under the order that was
21 approved in 1977, Order No. R-5364.

22 Q. The Pictured Cliffs is on 160 acres. The
23 Mesa Verde is on a 320-acre spacing unit?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. All right. Turn to Exhibit D, if you

1 would, and explain that.

2 A. The first page of Exhibit D is an
3 application for a permit to drill. The second page of
4 that shows the Commission's approval in Aztec, New
5 Mexico, the district office there, of the C-102.

6 The plat, again, outlines the nonstandard
7 proration unit that we're asking approval for. It
8 indicates that the well is drilled 880 feet from the
9 east line, 500 feet from the south line in Section 7.

10 Q. If I may interrupt your testimony at this
11 point.

12 MR. COOTER: Mr. Catanach, it's our
13 position that -- we notice that the advertisement
14 included drilling of a well at an unorthodox
15 location. It's our position that if the nonstandard
16 proration unit be approved, that then this well would
17 be drilled at an orthodox location within that
18 nonstandard proration unit, being further than 790
19 feet from the exterior boundaries of the unit, and in
20 the northwest portion -- pardon me -- northeast
21 portion of the unit, even though it's not the
22 northeast quarter of the government subdivision.
23 That's why it was treated that way in the application.

24 HEARING EXAMINER: Okay.

25 Q. (BY MR. COOTER) Did you discuss this

1 proposed application with Mr. Bush?

2 A. I did not, but Paul Thompson, our
3 production manager out of our Farmington office, did.
4 Ernie Bush recommended -- originally, we had this well
5 slated for the northeast quarter of Section 18. He
6 recommended that we move that up to the southeast
7 quarter of 7, which it's now outlined, so that if the
8 time comes where there needs to be an infill well
9 drilled, that we can drill that infill well in the
10 south part of this proration unit.

11 Q. Then turn to Exhibit E. I'd ask you to
12 turn to it, and explain what is shown there.

13 A. The first page of Exhibit E is the
14 offsetting operator and owner's plat. That would
15 indicate on the west of our proration unit, Meridian
16 Oil owns Section 12 and Section 13 in 31-8. Northwest
17 Pipeline has been indicated as numerical No. 1. They
18 are the unit operator of the San Juan 32-7 unit.
19 Numeric No. 6 is owned by Amoco Production Company.
20 Numeric No. 4 is owned by Kindermac Partners and T. H.
21 McElvain Oil and Gas Properties.

22 Q. Let me ask you to correlate that exhibit
23 back with the first page of Exhibit B. The land which
24 you show owned by Amoco is that little strung-out
25 section that is part of block C?

1 A. Yes. That would be the west half of the
2 west half of Section 7 there.

3 Q. And then the little tracts in the center of
4 tract B are owned by --

5 A. They are owned undividedly by McElvain and
6 Kindermac Properties.

7 Q. And down in the southwest corner of tract
8 B, which would be, I guess, the southeast of the --
9 pardon me -- southwest of the northeast of Section 18?

10 A. That is also owned by McElvain and
11 Kindermac. And then the southeast of the southeast of
12 18 is owned by Hixon Development Company.

13 Q. Are there any other offsetting owners or
14 operators other than those that you've enumerated?

15 A. And then on the west side in 31-8, Sections
16 12 and 13 are owned by Meridian.

17 Q. Did you request from those various
18 companies waivers of protest for your application?

19 A. Yes, we have.

20 Q. And those are attached as part of Exhibit
21 E?

22 A. Those are part of Exhibit E. Each company
23 has given waiver to this application.

24 Q. That is, waivers from Meridian Oil, Inc.,
25 Hixon Development Company, Kindermac Partners, T. H.

1 McElvain Oil and Gas Properties, and Amoco?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Are those true and correct copies of those
4 actual waivers?

5 A. These are copies of a faxed copy that I
6 received, and they are true and correct.

7 Q. Mr. Gillen, were the maps which appear as
8 pages 1 and 2 of Exhibit B, pages 1 and 2 of Exhibit
9 C, and page 1 of Exhibit E prepared by you or under
10 your direction and supervision?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Do those accurately and correctly reflect
13 the information that's shown thereon and about which
14 you've testified?

15 A. Yes, they do.

16 Q. Are the other exhibits about which you
17 testified true and correct copies of those identified
18 copies?

19 A. Yes.

20 MR. COOTER: At this time, Mr. Catanach, we
21 offer Exhibits A through E.

22 HEARING EXAMINER: Exhibits A through E
23 will be admitted as evidence.

24 Q. (BY MR. COOTER) Mr. Gillen, in your
25 opinion, would the granting of this application by the

1 Oil Conservation Division afford Northwest Pipeline
2 the opportunity to produce its just and equitable
3 share of gas in the Basin-Fruitland Coal Gas Pool
4 covered by the proposal?

5 A. Yes, it would.

6 Q. Would it prevent economic loss caused by
7 the drilling of unnecessary wells?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Prevent other physical or economic waste
10 and protect correlative rights?

11 A. Yes.

12 MR. COOTER: That concludes my direct
13 examination of Mr. Gillen.

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY HEARING EXAMINER:

16 Q. Mr. Gillen, let me see if I understand all
17 of this. R-1066 created the 320-acre proration units
18 or the ones you have labeled on Exhibit B?

19 A. Yes, they do.

20 Q. The ones outlined in red?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. The nonstandard proration unit you're
23 proposing is tract B; is that correct?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. And that corresponds to the one that was

1 approved by R-1066?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. By R-5364, is it my understanding that some
4 of those proration units were altered?

5 A. Yes, they were. On the second page of
6 Exhibit B, tracts B, C, and D have been altered, which
7 were originally tracts H and I on the 1066 order.
8 Now, I could not come across any documentation that
9 altered it or rejected it; however, there are wells
10 that are under the 5364 proration spacing order.

11 Q. This really doesn't have an effect on your
12 application at this time?

13 A. No, it does not, other than we felt that we
14 should indicate what is existing out there on
15 nonstandard proration units.

16 Q. Does Northwest Pipeline anticipate coming
17 in and creating some additional Fruitland Coal
18 proration units?

19 A. If this well proves to be a good well, yes,
20 we'll be in to apply for additional proration units
21 for the Fruitland Coal.

22 Q. It may be a factor later on then?

23 A. It could be a factor later on.

24 Q. I see. Am I correct in understanding you
25 have received waivers from all offset operators?

1 A. Yes, we have, and they're part of Exhibit
2 E.

3 Q. Am I also correct that in your proposed
4 proration unit, a Mesa Verde well was never drilled;
5 is that correct?

6 A. That's correct.

7 HEARING EXAMINER: That's all the questions
8 I have of this witness. He may be excused.

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

10 MR. COOTER: Next call Jeff Vaughn.

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

14 DIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. COOTER:

16 Q. Would you state your name for the record,
17 please, sir.

18 A. My name is Jeff Vaughn.

19 Q. By whom are you employed, Mr. Vaughn?

20 A. Northwest Pipeline.

21 Q. In what position?

22 A. I'm a production and drilling engineer in
23 Farmington, New Mexico.

24 Q. Is this the first time that you've
25 testified before the Oil Conservation Division in the

1 State of New Mexico?

2 A. Yes, sir, it is.

3 Q. Would you briefly relate your education and
4 professional experience for Mr. Catanach.

5 A. Yes, sir. I graduated from the Colorado
6 School of Mines with a Bachelor of Science in
7 petroleum engineering in 1982. I worked for
8 Kerr-McGee and Northwest Exploration while in
9 college. After graduation, I worked for Northwest
10 Pipeline as a reservoir engineer in Salt Lake City for
11 two years, and the last five years I've worked as a
12 production and drilling engineer in Farmington, New
13 Mexico.

14 I'm a Registered Professional Engineer in
15 the State of New Mexico, president of the Four Corners
16 chapter of API, and membership chairman of the Society
17 of Petroleum Engineers.

18 Q. For the record, have you been present and
19 heard the testimony of Mr. Gillen?

20 A. Yes, I have.

21 Q. For your testimony here today, have you
22 prepared certain exhibits?

23 A. Yes, I have.

24 Q. We direct your attention to what has been
25 marked as Exhibit F in the compilation. Would you

1 identify and explain that?

2 A. Exhibit F basically shows the topography
3 within the proposed nonstandard proration unit, the
4 location of the proposed well. And the main purpose
5 here is to show the river running through the
6 proration unit and that the well was staked in the
7 northeast corner of the proration unit as suggested by
8 Ernie Bush.

9 Q. Turn next if you would to Exhibit G.

10 A. Exhibit G shows the offset wells. The star
11 inside the boundary of the proposed location unit is
12 our proposed well. To the northwest is the San Juan
13 32-7, No. 79 Mesa Verde, which is the closest offset,
14 and to the southeast is the 32-7 No. 6 Fruitland well,
15 which I will concentrate reservoir engineering
16 position on those two wells as related to the proposed
17 well.

18 There are other wells shown on here which
19 are Fruitland sand wells which don't really relate to
20 our proposed coal well.

21 There is another well, the 422 in Section
22 20 in the southwest quarter section recently completed
23 by Blackwood Nichols which was gauged at 2 to 3
24 million a day.

25 Q. Are you ready to go on to Exhibit H?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Identify Exhibit H, please.

3 A. As I stated previously, our focus will be
4 on the two offset wells. The well which provides us
5 the most insight into what type of well we'll have in
6 the proposed location is the San Juan 32-7 No. 6.

7 What I have here is a data sheet that shows
8 the history of the well. This well has been
9 documented by Brent Hale and Carolyn Firth. Brent
10 Hale is the manager of reservoir engineering,
11 Northwest Pipeline. Documented in the geology and
12 coal bed resources of San Juan Basin, published by
13 Rocky Mountain Association of Geologists in 1988, and
14 what I've done is recap some of the history here.

15 It's the oldest, continuously producing
16 coal well in New Mexico, to my knowledge. It is
17 completed open hole in the coals. There are some
18 sands in there as well, but we believe all indications
19 are it's producing mainly from the coals.

20 I show a 10-day buildup of 1,540 pounds in
21 1953. A buildup conducted within the last two years
22 shows the reservoir pressure is still 1,500 pounds.
23 It's produced 1.4 Bcf to date. In 1988, the average
24 production was 140 Mcf per day.

25 Our recoverable reserves are estimated at

1 2.7 Bcf with 1.3 remaining.

2 At the bottom I show the percent of CO2 and
3 BTU data to confirm coal methane production.

4 And that's the summary of this exhibit.

5 Q. Turn next to Exhibit I, if you would.

6 A. Exhibit I is an isopach map of current
7 production, coal gas production, and the star
8 indicates the location of the proposed well.
9 Basically what this map indicates is we can expect a
10 rate of approximately 250 to 350 a day from the
11 proposed well.

12 Q. Go next to Exhibit J.

13 A. Exhibit J is a structural contour map of
14 the area around the San Juan 32-7 No. 6 well. The
15 32-7 No. 79 well is in the upper left-hand corner of
16 the cross-section, and, of course, our well would be
17 directly south of that.

18 This basically shows that the 79 and the 6
19 and our proposed well are structurally equivalent and
20 refers to the next exhibit.

21 Q. Turn to that exhibit, if you would, sir.

22 A. The next exhibit is a cross-section showing
23 the 79 and the 6. In the black is outlined the coal
24 sections. And as you can see from this exhibit, the
25 wells are structurally equivalent, and we see the

1 coals are somewhat continuous through there. We do
2 see all the coal beds in various thicknesses.

3 The No. 6 well is not drilled into the
4 lower coals. We anticipate encountering the lower
5 coals in our proposed well. And this all goes back to
6 showing that the data from the No. 6 well is a good
7 indication or should be a good indication of what we
8 expect from our well.

9 Q. One final Exhibit, Exhibit L. Would you
10 identify that and explain it to us?

11 A. Exhibit L is a blow-up of the actual log
12 from the 79, which is the Mesa Verde well directly
13 north of the proposed well. And in the margin there,
14 in the middle of the log, the coal zones, the net
15 coal, which is a conservative estimate of what will
16 actually be our producing horizons, are highlighted.
17 There's 25 feet of net coal that we expect to
18 encounter in the proposed well.

19 Q. Mr. Vaughn, you've testified about exhibits
20 F through L. Were each of those exhibits prepared by
21 you or under your direction and supervision?

22 A. Yes, they were.

23 Q. Do those exhibits accurately and correctly
24 reflect the information which is shown thereon and
25 about which you've testified?

1 A. Yes, they do.

2 MR. COOTER: Mr. Catanach, we offer
3 exhibits F through L at this time.

4 HEARING EXAMINER: Exhibits F through L
5 will be admitted as evidence.

6 Q. (BY MR. COOTER) Mr. Vaughn, in your
7 opinion, would the granting of this application by the
8 Oil Conservation Division afford Northwest Pipeline
9 the opportunity to produce its just and equitable
10 share of gas in the Basin-Fruitland Coal Gas Pool?

11 A. Yes, I believe it would.

12 Q. Would it also prevent economic loss caused
13 by the drilling of unnecessary wells?

14 A. Yes, I believe it would.

15 Q. Would it prevent possible other waste and
16 protect correlative rights as well?

17 A. Yes.

18 MR. COOTER: That concludes my direct
19 examination of Mr. Vaughn.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY HEARING EXAMINER:

22 Q. Mr. Vaughn, have you satisfied yourself
23 that the entire nonstandard proration unit will be
24 productive in the Fruitland coal?

25 A. Yes, I believe it will.

1 Q. Do you believe that the proposed 201 well
2 will effectively drain the proposed proration unit?

3 A. Yes, I believe it will. At this time we do
4 not know exactly the total acreage that will be
5 drained by the proposed well, and that's under study
6 by the Oil Conservation Division, whether it be 160
7 acres or 320 acres, but I believe it will be the best
8 location at this time.

9 HEARING EXAMINER: That's all the questions
10 I have.

11 The witness may be excused.

12 MR. COOTER: Mr. Catanach, at this time I
13 would like to introduce Mr. George Broome with T. H.
14 McElvain Oil and Gas Properties. We're not presenting
15 him as our witness, but in discussing this case with
16 us while we waited this morning, it was my
17 understanding that Mr. Broome would like to make a
18 statement to you, sir.

19 HEARING EXAMINER: Yes, sir. You may
20 proceed, Mr. Broome.

21 MR. BROOME: As Mr. Gillen said, we
22 proposed this well about a year ago, and we've been
23 trying to encourage Northwest to drill it, and they
24 had some problems with their leases that delayed them
25 somewhat this year, but now they're in a position to

1 where they can go ahead with it, and we are giving
2 them all the encouragement and support we can because
3 we have budgeted this well to be drilled in this year,
4 and we would like to see it drilled as soon as
5 possible.

6 HEARING EXAMINER: Okay.

7 MR. COOTER: That concludes our case.

8 HEARING EXAMINER: There being nothing
9 further in this case, Case 9843 will be taken under
10 advisement.

11 MR. COOTER: Thank you, sir.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

I, Freda Simmons, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I caused my notes to be transcribed under my personal supervision; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

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

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL February 18, 1989.

Freda Simmons
FREDA SIMMONS

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct and true transcript of the proceedings in the case of 9843, heard by me on December 13 19 88.

David R. Catamb, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division