

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
4 CASE 10118

5

6

7

EXAMINER HEARING

8

9 IN THE MATTER OF:

10

11 Application of Mesa Operating Limited
12 Partnership for Compulsory Pooling,
13 San Juan County, New Mexico

14

15

16

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

17

18 BEFORE: MICHAEL E. STOGNER, EXAMINER

19

20

STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING

21

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

22

October 17, 1990

23

24

25

ORIGINAL

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 FOR THE APPLICANT: J. SCOTT HALL, ESQ.
Miller, Stratvert, Torgerson
3 & Schlenker, P.A.
125 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 303
4 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

5 * * * *

6 I N D E X

7	Page Number
---	-------------

8 EDWARD L. "HANK" WOOD

9	Examination by Mr. Hall	3
	Examination by Hearing Examiner	9

STEWART L. SAMPSON

	Examination by Mr. Hall	11
12	Examination by Hearing Examiner	16

13 TROY A. HOEFER

14 Examination by Mr. Hall 19

15 Certificate of Reporter 25

16 E X H I B I T S

17 APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS:

18	Exhibit	1	4
	Exhibit	2	6
19	Exhibit	3	12
	Exhibit	3-A	12
20	Exhibit	4	13
	Exhibit	5	13
21	Exhibit	6	20
	Exhibit	7	24

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Call next case, No.
2 10118, which is the application of Mesa Operating
3 Limited Partnership for compulsory pooling.

4 Call for appearances.

5 MR. HALL: Mr. Examiner, Scott Hall from
6 the Miller, Stratvert, Torgerson & Schlenker Law Firm
7 of Santa Fe, on behalf of the Applicant this morning,
8 with three witnesses.

9 EXAMINER STOGNER: Were these witnesses
10 previously sworn in Case No. 10117?

11 MR. HALL: Yes, sir.

12 EXAMINER STOGNER: Let the record so show
13 the three witnesses have been sworn.

14 Are there any other appearances in this
15 case? Mr. Hall.

16 EDWARD L. "HANK" WOOD

17 the witness herein, after having been previously duly
18 sworn upon his oath, was examined and testified as
19 follows:

20 EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. HALL:

22 Q. For the record, please state your name?

23 A. Edward L. "Hank" Wood.

24 Q. Mr. Wood, in view of the fact you've been
25 previously sworn, let's proceed direct to your

1 exhibits. If you would explain Exhibit 1, please,
2 sir?

3 A. Exhibit 1 is a land plat showing our
4 proposed proration unit as the east half of Section
5 32, 29 North, 11 West, for the drilling of a Fruitland
6 Coal test to be located 2,085 feet from the north
7 line, 950 feet from the east line of said Section 32.

8 Page 2 of this exhibit shows the working
9 interest owners committed and noncommitted to this
10 well; Mesa Operating Limited Partnership, Jack H.
11 Herd, Jack Markham, and the Estate of John J. Redfern,
12 comprising a total of 45.36867 percent that have
13 agreed to participate in the drilling of this test.

14 Sun Operating Limited Partnership, who is
15 now ORYX, 12.705673 percent; Southland Royalty
16 Company, well, if we want to regress, Sun Operating
17 Limited Partnership has expressed an interest in
18 selling their interest and has told us they will not
19 participate but will not confirm that in writing yet.
20 Southland Royalty has not responded to our proposal.
21 Odessa Knauff, in care of Brooks Exploration in
22 Denver, with 12.705673 percent, has not responded.
23 They were furnished a title opinion in the last 10
24 weeks to verify their interests. They were not aware
25 of any ownership in this proration unit.

1 John J. Christman, with 9.52925 percent has
2 not responded. Rosalind Redfern, with 4.76462 percent
3 has not responded, and Flag-Redfern Oil Company, which
4 is now, as we understand it, Kerr-McGee, although
5 record title shows to be Flag-Redfern, with 3.176418
6 percent, has not responded.

7 I'll point out for the Examiner, if I may,
8 that the interests shown on page 2 of Exhibit 1 do not
9 correspond with Exhibit A to the Operating Agreement,
10 which is another part of our exhibit. That is due to
11 the fact that the Operating Agreement was based on a
12 stand-up check of the records in order to adequately
13 give notice to the parties of our anticipated drilling
14 of the test. The page 2 of this exhibit is based upon
15 title examination.

16 MR. HALL: If I might briefly explain to
17 the Examiner on the Flag-Redfern situation, the record
18 title ownership is shown as being in Flag-Redfern.
19 There is no record of Kerr-McGee's ownership in this
20 tract. I understand through industry knowledge
21 Kerr-McGee succeeded to Flag-Redfern's interest and
22 made no filing in San Juan County for this tract,
23 anyway.

24 Kerr-McGee was contacted by Mesa, by Mr.
25 Wood, and at first responded to Mesa that they owned

1 no interest in this tract. They later communicated
2 again with Mr. Wood and indicated that they might, in
3 fact, have an interest. We sent notice to
4 Flag-Redfern. We subsequently sent notice to
5 Kerr-McGee. The Kerr-McGee notice is not within the
6 22-day notice period; however, we don't believe that
7 they are entitled to notice as they are not a record
8 interest owner and they are unsure of their own
9 ownership.

10 EXAMINER STOGNER: Let me make sure I have
11 this clear. When Flag-Redfern were notified, when
12 they were notified, that was within the proper time
13 constraints?

14 MR. HALL: Yes, sir.

15 EXAMINER STOGNER: And did you contact
16 Kerr-McGee prior to that, trying to work out the
17 problem of who really owned that interest, whether
18 Kerr-McGee did or not?

19 MR. HALL: We did, and we have exhibits we
20 would be glad to submit if the Examiner wishes.

21 EXAMINER STOGNER: I was just trying to get
22 what kind of time frame Kerr-McGee got back ahold of
23 you.

24 THE WITNESS: We received a letter-- As
25 you'll see, our proposal letter which is Exhibit 2,

1 was dated August 27, 1990, proposing the test. By
2 letter dated September 10, 1990, Kerr-McGee responded
3 to us and told us that the interest which Flag-Redfern
4 was credited with should now be into the name of
5 Rosalind Redfern and the Estate of John J. Redfern,
6 who already had been contacted regarding the drilling
7 of this well.

8 On October 4th, or by a memo dated October
9 4th, we received notice from Kerr-McGee that
10 Kerr-McGee, as successor by merger to Flag-Redfern Oil
11 Company, was an owner in this proration unit and they
12 looked forward to hearing from us regarding our plans
13 in this matter.

14 So we have received notice on September 10
15 from Kerr-McGee that they owned no interest in this,
16 and notice on October 10 that they look forward to
17 seeing what we had to do here. So there appears to be
18 a communication problem in their shop regarding their
19 interest.

20 Flag-Redfern was sent a proposal on August
21 27th, which, because of the response of September
22 10th, I can only believe Kerr-McGee received.

23 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Hall, I believe, in
24 my opinion, that notice was adequate. And it's going
25 to right itself anyway because of the problem we had

1 in the advertisement. This case is going to be
2 continued anyway to the 31st, so that will take care
3 of itself at that point.

4 MR. HALL: I think that's right.

5 EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay. So I think we can
6 go ahead and proceed.

7 Q. (BY MR. HALL) Go ahead with Exhibit 2.

8 A. Exhibit 2, as I have already pointed out,
9 is Mesa's proposal letter dated August 27, 1990, which
10 was sent to the record title owners proposing our test
11 as a 1,760-foot Fruitland Coal test, showing the
12 location and the estimated costs. With that letter we
13 forwarded to them Mesa's estimated cost or AFE cost
14 estimate for the drilling of the well, and a proposed
15 Joint Operating Agreement to govern operations.

16 Q. What is the total percentage that's now
17 voluntarily committed to the well?

18 A. 45.36867 percent.

19 Q. What interest are you seeking to pool?

20 A. 54.63133 percent.

21 Q. In your opinion, Mr. Wood, have you made a
22 good faith effort to locate all the individuals to
23 obtain their voluntary joinder?

24 A. Yes, we have.

25 Q. Were Exhibits 1 and 2 prepared by you or at

1 your direction?

2 A. They were.

3 MR. HALL: We would move the admission of
4 Exhibits 1 and 2, and that concludes our direct of
5 this witness.

6 EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 1 and 2 will be
7 admitted into evidence.

8 EXAMINATION

9 BY EXAMINER STOGNER:

10 Q. Let's see if we're talking about the right
11 well here. I have it FC State Com No. 33?

12 A. Yes, sir. It was later revealed that we
13 had federal acreage in there and not state; the name
14 was changed to FC Fed Com 43.

15 Q. And that is the way it appears on the
16 advertisement?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. So all your correspondence and your two
19 exhibits should be changed to reflect Well No. 43, is
20 that correct?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 MR. HALL: That's correct. There's a
23 mixture of state, federal and fee acreage in the unit.

24 EXAMINER STOGNER: The names of the wells
25 really have no bearing on the docket. I usually use

1 those whenever I have a massive amount of applications
2 that come in at one time, to keep them straightened
3 out. I usually refer to it as a well drilled either
4 at a standard or unorthodox.

5 Q. (BY EXAMINER STOGNER) In looking at your
6 Exhibit No. 2, on your percentages, there again they
7 do not correspond, as you stated, to your Exhibit No.
8 1, is that correct?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. But your Exhibit No. 1 is correct,
11 according to title search?

12 A. Based on record title, yes, sir.

13 Q. And that sounds like to me it would also
14 correspond, this being a section, which is not
15 standard that contains 314.84 acres? It sounds like
16 it corresponds, and I would assume it does?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. The August 27th letter, that was the first
19 written correspondence to the parties in which you're
20 force pooling?

21 A. Yes, sir, it was.

22 Q. Did you have any telephone conversations
23 with other parties besides Kerr-McGee & Son or ORYX?

24 A. Yes, sir. We've had a number of
25 conversations with Brooks Exploration. We've made a

1 couple of phone calls to John J. Christman and have
2 received no response yet, and, of course, I've talked
3 to the parties who have consented to join.

4 Q. And Southland, I'm assuming you've probably
5 had conversations with them?

6 A. Multiple, yes, sir. They are in the same
7 shape, as we mentioned before in the other testimony,
8 in that their reservoir engineer has left and they're
9 shorthanded now.

10 EXAMINER STOGNER: I will refer to the
11 record that has been made for Case No. 10117.

12 I have no further questions of this
13 witness. You may be excused.

14 Anybody else have any questions before I
15 excuse him? No? Okay. Mr. Hall.

16 STEWART L. SAMPSON

17 the witness herein, after having been previously duly
18 sworn upon his oath, was examined and testified as
19 follows:

20 EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. HALL:

22 Q. For the record, state your name.

23 A. Stewart Sampson.

24 Q. Mr. Sampson, you've been previously sworn.
25 Let's go directly to the exhibits you've prepared for

1 this case. And let me ask you first, what risk
2 penalty are you seeking for this well?

3 A. On this particular well we are seeking the
4 200 percent plus cost penalty which, I think, will be
5 clear from the exhibits to follow.

6 Exhibit 3, just as in the previous case, is
7 an isopach map for the entire San Juan Basin for the
8 Fruitland Coal thickness. As you can see, the
9 location of our proposed well by the red dot, is
10 located in an extremely thin area of coal deposition,
11 right there by the "O" and the "N" in the word
12 "Farmington." We have a 10-foot contour, and you can
13 see that our well falls just outside that contour
14 interval. We think that is an extremely risky
15 situation in that we have very little coal expected to
16 be present in this well.

17 And as in further evidence of that fact,
18 Exhibit 3-A is the only well which is located in the
19 quarter section where we intend to drill this well.
20 This is a Dakota well, which was drilled by Redfern
21 and Herd, the #1 Nye, and of course penetrated the
22 Fruitland formation. This is a resistivity log. The
23 coals show up as high resistive streaks. You can see
24 that in this well, which is just a few hundred feet
25 from our proposed well, we have a few very thin seams

1 which are designated by the black bars in the depth
2 track of the log. Right above 1,500 feet is the
3 thickness seam in the well at probably six feet, and
4 going on up the hole there's about three more seams at
5 two feet each. So consequently we anticipate a
6 thickness of less than 15 feet in this well.

7 The gas in place number would be very small
8 due to the thin total coal in the area. Consequently,
9 once again, we would have to achieve a very high
10 recovery factor to make an economic venture in this
11 well.

12 Another critical aspect, of course, is the
13 pressure and permeability characteristics, and that's
14 reflected in Exhibit 4 which shows the bottom-hole
15 pressures which have been demonstrated in this area,
16 and we would anticipate a pressure somewhere in the
17 500- to 600-pound range, which is way underpressured
18 and, consequently, we would not expect this to be a
19 very high permeability area.

20 And finally, Exhibit 5 demonstrates the
21 location of our well in the northeast of Section 32,
22 and any Fruitland Coal completions would have been
23 shown on this map with solid red dots; however, there
24 have been no completions within this 25-square-mile
25 area, so we have basically no data to rely on out here

1 which would decrease our risk factor. Consequently,
2 the fact that we know we'll have thin coal and don't
3 have any other data to rely on, leads us to believe
4 that this is worthy of a total 300 percent penalty.

5 We are aware that 300 percent penalties
6 have been granted in the basin. Previously we have
7 seen Hixon, which I believe is now Giant, was granted
8 a maximum penalty down in the Bisti area, which we
9 feel has certainly no worse geologic characteristics
10 than this particular area, so we feel it's justified.

11 Q. In spite of the fact that this well is
12 within the parameters of the Basin Fruitland Coal
13 Pool, would you otherwise consider this a wildcat
14 well?

15 A. Yes, I certainly would.

16 Q. You're assured of encountering the coal, as
17 thick as it may be or as thin as it may be?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Does the thickness or thinness of the coal
20 itself affect your economics?

21 A. Yes, it certainly does. We have a much
22 smaller target when the coal is very thin like this
23 and, once again, we have to have all other aspects be
24 in our favor so that we get a very high recovery
25 factor in order to make an economic well.

1 Q. Do you know how this well will be
2 completed?

3 A. This will be a cased and fractured
4 completion.

5 Q. Must you necessarily case and fracture the
6 well and produce the well for a while in order to
7 determine its productive capacity?

8 A. Yes, that's correct, and that's a very
9 important point here because typically you will hear
10 people say that there are not many dry holes in the
11 basin. That's simply because it's really very
12 difficult to determine whether you're going to have an
13 economic well before you incur your completion costs.

14 So this well we would take all the way
15 through to completion and our fracture stimulation at
16 this depth is as expensive as the actual drilling of
17 the well, so we will have incurred even more risk than
18 would have been incurred in a dry hole, you know, per
19 say.

20 Q. Were Exhibits 3, 4 and 5 and 3-A prepared
21 by you or at your direction?

22 A. Yes, they were.

23 MR. HALL: We would move the admission of
24 those exhibits, and that concludes our direct of this
25 witness.

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 3, 4 and 5 will
2 be admitted into evidence.

3 EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. STOGNER:

5 Q. Mr. Sampson, what are the nearest
6 coal-producing wells to this proposed well?

7 A. I believe there may be some wells which
8 would lie off of Exhibit 5 within another mile, so
9 probably you're talking about a minimum of three to
10 four miles distant from this particular proposed well.

11 Q. To the north?

12 A. Generally there would be more of a tendency
13 for them to be to the north and west, yes, because
14 that's moving toward more favorable geologic
15 conditions.

16 Q. All of these wells that show on Exhibit 5,
17 none of them were tested in the coal, is that correct?

18 A. No. That's absolutely correct. There are
19 other Fruitland producers in the area producing from
20 Fruitland sands, but no coal completions.

21 Q. How many Fruitland sand wells would you
22 estimate are in this area, and where would they be
23 located on this map?

24 A. There are probably six or eight wells, and
25 they would generally be located to the north and west

1 of this proposed well. I might point out that the pay
2 zones in the Fruitland sand are very obvious. They
3 are channelized sequences deposited in a fluvial
4 environment, and the well in this quarter section,
5 which we have shown here as Exhibit 3-A, does not have
6 any Fruitland sands present in it.

7 Q. Where, generally, in the Fruitland
8 formation, when we look at the overall formation, does
9 the coal seams or the coal beds lie within the
10 Fruitland formation? Kind of give me a detailed--

11 A. Okay. Generally, if you just look at an
12 average throughout the basin, there's typically a
13 fairly thick coal seam right at the base of the
14 Fruitland which is not present in this area at all.

15 Then normally you have another couple of
16 zones in the range of 1- to 200 feet uphole from that
17 point where you can develop a cumulative total of 20
18 feet in a group of seams. So it is normally spread
19 throughout about a 300-foot interval; typically
20 weighted more to the base of the Fruitland is where
21 you have a higher cumulative total of coal.

22 EXAMINER STOGNER: I'll ask your next
23 witness, Mr. Hall--I assume you're going to bring up
24 Mr. Hoefer?

25 MR. HALL: Yes, sir.

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Maybe he will be a
2 little more detailed on corresponding water production
3 in these Fruitland formations than Mr. Sampson
4 described? That's more the norm, as opposed to where
5 you're at.

6 Q. Now, the Fruitland sand wells in this area,
7 do you know what pool that is? Is that the
8 Bloomfield-Farmington? There is a Fruitland sand pool
9 out there, is that correct?

10 A. That's what I would guess, just based on
11 the proximity to the Bloomfield area, but I do not
12 know that to be the case. I'm not sure what the field
13 name is.

14 Q. Do you know if any of the completion
15 technician utilized, when those Farmington sand wells
16 were put in, if any of the perforations or open-hole
17 intervals extend into the coal?

18 A. Everything that I've seen out in this area
19 was a cased and perforated completion, so the
20 completions should have been well localized to the
21 sand interval and should not have drained any coal
22 appreciably.

23 Typically these sands out in this area are
24 in the order of 20-feet thick, one channelized sand,
25 so it's well localized within the Fruitland.

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: I have no other
2 questions of Mr. Sampson. You may be excused.

3 Mr. Hall.

4 TROY A. HOEFER

5 the witness herein, after having been previously duly
6 sworn upon his oath, was examined and testified as
7 follows:

8 EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. HALL:

10 Q. For the record, please state your name?

11 A. Troy A. Hoefer.

12 Q. Mr. Hoefer, you've previously been sworn.

13 Let's go to Exhibit 2 and the AFE in there. If you
14 would please review the well costs in that exhibit?

15 A. Okay. Exhibit No. 2 is a detailed cost
16 estimate for the drilling, equipping and completing of
17 the FC Federal Com No. 43. This will be a 1,760-foot
18 Fruitland Coal test, and you'll note the completion
19 costs are for a cased and fractured well.

20 Q. Are those costs in line with what is being
21 charged in the area?

22 A. Yes, they are.

23 Q. Have you made an estimate of the overhead
24 and administrative costs while drilling and producing
25 the well?

1 A. Yes, I have.

2 Q. And what are those costs?

3 A. \$3,831 per month while drilling; \$382 per
4 month while producing the well.

5 Q. Do you know those costs to be in line with
6 what is being charged?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Are you recommending those charges be
9 incorporated into any Order that results from this
10 hearing?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And Mesa seeks to be designated operator of
13 this well, is that correct?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Let's go to Exhibit 6 now.

16 A. Exhibit 6, as you can see, is an exhibit of
17 offset Fruitland Coal production within an approximate
18 two-mile radius of the proposed FC Federal Com No.
19 43. As you can see, there has been no Fruitland Coal
20 completions in this area.

21 Q. So you have no control over whatsoever of
22 the immediate area?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. Do you concur in the request for the 200
25 percent risk penalty in this case?

1 A. Yes, I do.

2 Q. What is the basis for your concurrence?

3 A. The basis is the fact that we have no
4 offset production. Due to the nature of coal, it can
5 be vary variable in the rates of production, and as I
6 stated in Case No. 10117, we would put a very large
7 fracture treatment on this to enhance the natural
8 fracturing and permeability of the reservoir. This
9 large tract would have high rates, high pump volumes
10 and high pressures.

11 Q. Does the fact that you're dealing with a
12 relatively thin seam of coal pose any particular
13 problems to your frac job?

14 A. Yes, it does. In fact, it makes the frac
15 much more risky. A thin coal has a much higher
16 possibility of screening out than a thicker coal seam.

17 Q. Risk penalties are typically based on
18 development drilling projects, are they not? Let me
19 ask it this way.

20 In view of the fact that you have very
21 little control or next to no control for this
22 particular well, would you consider this well a
23 wildcat, respective of the fact that it's within the
24 Fruitland Basin Coal Pool?

25 A. Yes, I would.

1 Q. Would you care to discuss for the Examiner
2 the significance of water production from typical
3 Fruitland Coal wells, and how that plays in with this
4 particular well?

5 A. Water production is typically, in a coal
6 reservoir, the water is in the natural fracturing of
7 the coal. Typically, rates of gas are affected by the
8 water production. As the water is produced, the rate
9 of gas production will increase if there is a large
10 volume of water present in the area. If there's no
11 water, we expect the rates to be flat for a period of
12 time or possibly even decline.

13 Q. In this case, since you have a thin coal
14 seam, does that affect your recoverability rate?

15 A. Yes, it does.

16 Q. Does that have any bearing on the risk, in
17 determining whether or not this is a commercial well?

18 A. Yes, it does. Recovery factors for the
19 coal, due to the fact that it is a thin coal seam, we
20 would need a much higher recovery factor to make this
21 an economic well.

22 Q. I understand this will be a cased-in,
23 frac'd well, is that correct?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. You will necessarily have to case and frac

1 the well and produce it for a while before you can
2 determine whether or not it is going to be a
3 commercially successful well?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. If such is the case, your dry-hole costs
6 are really not a consideration in this matter, is that
7 not correct?

8 A. That's correct. We do expect to encounter
9 some coal, and therefore the risk is more associated
10 with whether or not we will get a commercially
11 economic completion rather than whether or not we find
12 coal in the area.

13 Q. So you're economics must necessarily take
14 in together full-blown completion costs?

15 A. That is correct.

16 Q. Did you prepare Exhibit 6?

17 A. Yes, I did.

18 MR. HALL: We would move the admission of
19 Exhibit 6.

20 Q. Let me ask you one additional question.
21 Mr. Hoefer, in your opinion, is the granting of this
22 application in the interests of conservation, the
23 prevention of waste and the protection of correlative
24 rights?

25 A. Yes.

1 MR. HALL: That concludes our direct of
2 this witness.

3 EXAMINER STOGNER: I have no questions of
4 Mr. Hoefer.

5 There again, Mr. Hall, I'll take
6 administrative notice of the case in which Order No.
7 R-8768 was produced from.

8 MR. HALL: We would also tender Exhibit 7,
9 which is our 12-07 Affidavit.

10 EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 6 and 7 will be
11 admitted into evidence.

12 Anything further in this case?

13 MR. HALL: No, sir.

14 EXAMINER STOGNER: Due to, again, the
15 advertisement error, this case will be continued to
16 October 31st, at which time it will be taken under
17 advisement.

18 (Thereupon, the proceedings concluded.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2

3 STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
 4) ss.
 5 COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

6

7 I, Carla Diane Rodriguez, Certified
 8 Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY
 9 that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before
 10 the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that
 11 I caused my notes to be transcribed under my personal
 12 supervision; and that the foregoing is a true and
 13 accurate record of the proceedings.

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

18 WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL October 20, 1990.

19

Carla Diane Rodriguez
 CARLA DIANE RODRIGUEZ
 CSR No. 91

20

21 My commission expires: May 25, 1991

22

23

24

25

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
 a complete record of the proceedings in
 the Examiner hearing of Case No. 10118,
 heard by me on 17 October 1990.
Michael B. Stinson, Examiner
 Oil Conservation Division