

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

6
7
8 9 May 1984

9 EXAMINER HEARING

10
11
12
13 IN THE MATTER OF:

14 Application of Robert N. Enfield CASE
15 for an unorthodox gas well loca- 8177
16 tion, Eddy County, New Mexico.

17
18
19
20 BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets, Examiner

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

20 For the Oil Conservation Division: W. Perry Pearce
21 Attorney at Law
22 Legal Counsel to the Division
23 State Land Office Bldg.
24 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

25 For the Applicant: Conrad E. Coffield
Attorney at Law
HINKLE LAW FIRM
P. O. Box 3580
Midland, Texas 79701

A P P E A R A N C E S

For Marathon Oil Co.: William F. Carr
 Attorney at Law
 CAMPBELL, BYRD & BLACK P.A.
 Post Office Box 2208
 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

I N D E X

ROBERT N. ENFIELD

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield	5
Cross Examination by Mr. Carr	12
Redirect Examination by Mr. Coffield	17
Recross Examination by Mr. Carr	17

EDSEL NEFF

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield	18
Cross Examination by Mr. Carr	23
Redirect Examination by Mr. Coffield	29

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

I N D E X

JAMES F. O'BRIANT

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield	31
Cross Examination by Mr. Carr	37
Cross Examination by Mr. Stamets	39

RUSSELL M. HOLMBERG

Direct Examination by Mr. Carr	40
Cross Examination by Mr. Coffield	49
Cross Examination by Mr. Stamets	51

STATEMENT BY MR. CARR 53

STATEMENT BY MR. COFFIELD 56

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

4

E X H I B I T S

Enfield Exhibit One, Structure Map	10
Enfield Exhibit Two, Land Plat	7
Enfield Exhibit Three, Cement Log	32
Enfield Exhibit Four, Daily Drilling Report	34
Enfield Exhibit Five, C-125 Forms	34
Enfield Exhibit Six, Reserve Estimate	35

Marathon Exhibit One, Contour Map	42
-----------------------------------	----

1
2
3 MR. STAMETS: We'll call next
4 Case 8177.

5 MR. PEARCE: That case is on
6 the application of Robert N. Enfield for an unorthodox gas
7 well location, Eddy County, New Mexico.

8 MR. COFFIELD: My name is Con-
9 rad Coffield and I'm with the Hinkle Law Firm in Midland,
10 Texas, appearing on behalf of the applicant.

11 I have three witnesses to be
12 sworn.

13 MR. PEARCE: Are there other
14 appearances in this matter?

15 MR. CARR: May it please the
16 Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with Campbell, Byrd and
17 Black, P. A., of Santa Fe, appearing on behalf of Marathon
18 Oil Company.

19 I have one witness.

20 MR. PEARCE: Other takers?

21 (Witnesses sworn.)

22 ROBERT N. ENFIELD,
23 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
24 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:
25

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Q Mr. Enfield, for the record would you please state your name and address?

A My name is Robert N. Enfield, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Q Are you the applicant in this case?

A Yes, I am.

Q And are you the proposed operator of the well which is the subject of this application?

A Yes, I am.

Q Are you familiar with operational matters in this area generally and in Section 18, Township 21 South, Range 23 East, specifically?

A Yes, sir, I operate wells in Sections 18, 17 and I have drilled dry holes in others around the field.

Q Have you previously testified before the Division?

A Yes, I have.

Q And were your qualifications made a matter of record and accepted by the Division?

A Yes, they have.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Enfield to testify on his own behalf.

MR. STAMETS: He is considered qualified.

Q Mr. Enfield, for the record would you

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

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

please state briefly what it is you seek in connection with the application in this case?

A I seek to drill an unorthodox location in Section 18, 21 South, Range 23 East, to the Indian Basin Upper Penn Reservoir.

The location will be 660 from the south and 330 from the east line of said Section 18.

Q Do you propose to dedicate the entire section to this well?

A Yes. It's presently dedicated to the No. 1 Bunnel.

Q Mr. Enfield, how many acres are there in Section 18?

A 574.04.

Q Would you please refer to what we've marked previously as Exhibit Two and describe the features of that exhibit to the Examiner?

A This is a land plat showing the location of the No. 1 Bunnel 1650 from the south and east of Section 18.

Shown in red is the proposed location for the No. 2 Bunnel.

The acreage colored in yellow offsetting is acreage under which I own interests and all -- and other parties own interest.

Q Can you tell the Examiner, please, Mr. Enfield, what is the ownership of offsetting acreage, speci-

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

fically, of course, with reference to the acreage toward which you are moving in this unorthodox location?

A I am the operator and owner of the acreage in Section 17 and in the north half of 20.

The south half of 20 is owned by Marathon and Southern Petroleum.

The ownership is common in 18, 17, and 20, the part that's marked in yellow. The percentage differ but the ownership is the same parties, with the exception of Superior, who does not own in 17 and 20 but does own in Section 18.

Q And the ownership is Section 19, did you cover that?

A In Section 19 the operator's El Paso, which also owns in 17 and 20 and 18, and L. R. Prince, who also owns in 17, 18, and 20.

Q What about the royalty ownership in the sections involved here?

A The royalty is common. It is all Federal royalty.

Q As the operator of the No. 1 Bunnel Well located in Section 18, Mr. Enfield, would you please review the history of that well and give your experience with it?

A The well was drilled approximately nineteen years ago. As you'll see by later exhibits, there is a dolomite lime facies change. This well was located in the lime.

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

2. The second part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

3. The third part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

4. The fourth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

5. The fifth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

6. The sixth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

7. The seventh part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

8. The eighth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

9. The ninth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

10. The tenth part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

1
2 Recently we've been experiencing a de-
3 cline in production. Commencing in December our production
4 was a million four, approximately, cubic feet for the whole
5 month. January, approximately 350 Mcf. February, zero.
6 March, a little more than two million, which we feel was a
7 marginal situation and indicates we need to do something.

8 Q Have you attempted any remedial work re-
9 cently on this particular well?

10 A We have looked at the remedial work in
11 there and as the -- as my engineers will testify, we do not
12 think it is economically feasible and probably would not be
13 totally successful.

14 Q Is it your opinion, then, the remedial
15 work is not a viable alternative to attempting to secure ad-
16 ditional production from this particular section?

17 A Yes, that's true.

18 Q Is the well for which you're seeking ap-
19 proval in this case, then, Mr. Enfield, in effect a substi-
20 tute well for your No. 1 Bunnel?

21 A Yes, it would be. Ultimately we would
22 plug the No. 1.

23 MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, in
24 connection with some upcoming testimony, I would respectful-
25 ly request administrative notice be taken of prior Case Num-
ber 6845 and Order No. R-6310, which case involved an appli-
cation by Marathon Oil Company for an unorthodox well loca-
tion and which was heard by the Examiner March 26th, 1980.

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 10/10/1988. The letter discusses the author's interest in the journal and the possibility of publishing a paper.

2. The second part of the document is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 10/15/1988. The editor responds to the author's letter and discusses the journal's policies and the author's proposed paper.

3. The third part of the document is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 10/20/1988. The author responds to the editor's letter and discusses the paper's content and the author's expectations.

4. The fourth part of the document is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 10/25/1988. The editor discusses the paper's acceptance and the author's next steps.

5. The fifth part of the document is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 10/30/1988. The author discusses the paper's revision and the author's commitment to the journal.

6. The sixth part of the document is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 11/5/1988. The editor discusses the paper's final acceptance and the author's next steps.

7. The seventh part of the document is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 11/10/1988. The author discusses the paper's publication and the author's gratitude to the editor.

1
2 MR. STAMETS: We will so take
3 administrative notice.

4 Q Mr. Enfield, in connection with the case
5 I just mentioned, would you refer now to what we've marked
6 as Exhibit One in this case and explain that exhibit as far
7 as your concerns are?

8 A This is a structural map identical as
9 submitted by Marathon in the Case Number 6845. We essen-
10 tially agree with the structural map. We have no difficulty
11 with it.

12 One additional thing, two additional
13 things have been added. We put a limited line in red show-
14 ing the porosity limit, which was not part of the original
15 case. We have carried the limestone dolomite contact point
16 through my well, which in the original map I think it was
17 stopped up in 18. I don't remember. I mean up in Section
18 8, rather.

19 Other than that the map is identical
20 other than the scale, instead of being 1-to-4 is 1-to-3.

21 Q On this map where is the Marathon Well
22 located which was the subject of the order I just mentioned?

23 A It was located in Section 30, 800 feet
24 from the north line and 200 feet from the west -- east line,
25 rather, of Section 30, 21, 23.

MR. STAMETS: What was the
north line?

A 800.

1963

1964

1965

1966

1967

1968

1969

1970

1971

1972

1973

1974

1975

1976

1977

1978

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986

1987

1988

1989

1990

1991

1992

1
2 MR. STAMETS: Thank you.

3 A That's the best of my recollection. I'm
4 sure that's right.

5 Q Did you have any other comments with
6 respect to the features on this particular matter, Mr.
7 Enfield?

8 A Other than the structure map in the Upper
9 Cisco Canyon and showing the fault line through there, which
10 we agreed to at that time and agree to now.

11 Q In your opinion is the granting of your
12 application in the interest of conservation, prevention of
13 waste and protection of correlative rights?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Was Exhibit, what we've marked Exhibit
16 Number Two, Mr. Enfield, prepared by you or under your
17 supervision?

18 A Yes, it was.

19 MR. COFFIELD: I'd move the
20 admission now of Exhibit Number Two, Mr. Examiner.

21 MR. STAMETS: Exhibit Two will
22 be admitted.

23 MR. COFFIELD: I have no other
24 questions of Mr. Enfield on direct Examination.

25 MR. STAMETS: Are there
questions of Mr. Enfield?

Mr. Carr.

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 10/10/1954.

2. The second part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 10/15/1954.

3. The third part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 10/20/1954.

4. The fourth part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 10/25/1954.

5. The fifth part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 10/30/1954.

6. The sixth part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 11/5/1954.

7. The seventh part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 11/10/1954.

8. The eighth part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 11/15/1954.

9. The ninth part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 11/20/1954.

10. The tenth part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 11/25/1954.

11. The eleventh part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 11/30/1954.

12. The twelfth part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 12/5/1954.

13. The thirteenth part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 12/10/1954.

14. The fourteenth part is a letter from the editor to the author, dated 12/15/1954.

15. The fifteenth part is a letter from the author to the editor, dated 12/20/1954.

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

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q Mr. Enfield, you stated that the present well in Section 18 was drilled in 1964, I believe?

A '65, I believe it was.

Q What has it produced to date?

A Just a moment, I can give it to you.

4.75 Bcf. That is to 1-1 -- through December '83.

Q And is it at a standard location?

A Yes, it is.

Q And what is that footage location?

A 1650 from the south and east of Section 18.

Q Is all of Section 18 dedicated --

A Yes, it is.

Q -- to that well?

A The Upper Penn is dedicated --

Q Right.

A -- under a communitization agreement.

Q And so your proposed location is to be between that standard location and the offsetting owners to the south and the east.

A My -- yes, in between my wells to the south and east.

Q Now, you have indicated on your Exhibit Number One a 2 percent porosity limit. Did you place that

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

DATE: 10/15/54

TO: SAC, NEW YORK (100-100000)

FROM: SAC, NEW YORK (100-100000) (P)

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]

RE: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6

[REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIAL - SECURITY INFORMATION

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

there or did another witness?

A No, my geologist.

Q And as to -- there's a dashed line on this that shows the dolomite and limestone. Why is that a significant limit?

A Normally the wells in the limestone have not produced this well.

Q And do they produce better on the south side of the line or on the north side of this line?

A On the south side of the line.

Q And that's where the dolomite would be encountered?

A Hopefully.

Q And that is the -- and you are actually locating the --

A To the east side, southeast, actually.

Q To the southeast. You're actually locating to the southeast and not to the north and west of a line, hoping to encounter the dolomite, is that correct?

A Yes. I am attempting to have a facies change with a better production capacity.

Q Does Marathon own any interest in Section 18?

A None that I know of.

Q Do they own, to your knowledge, any interest in Section 19?

A I believe, I think they own the southeast

REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

REVENUES

Contributions from individuals, \$1,234,567

Contributions from corporations, \$345,678

Contributions from foundations, \$123,456

Income from investments, \$56,789

Income from other sources, \$23,456

Total revenues, \$2,000,000

Operating expenses, \$1,500,000

Administrative expenses, \$200,000

Capital expenditures, \$100,000

Total expenditures, \$1,800,000

Surplus, \$200,000

Reserve fund, \$1,000,000

Operating reserve, \$500,000

Administrative reserve, \$200,000

Capital reserve, \$100,000

Total reserves, \$1,800,000

Operating reserve, \$500,000

Administrative reserve, \$200,000

Capital reserve, \$100,000

Total reserves, \$1,800,000

Operating reserve, \$500,000

Administrative reserve, \$200,000

Capital reserve, \$100,000

Total reserves, \$1,800,000

Operating reserve, \$500,000

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

quarter.

Q Do you operate the well in Section 20?

A Yes, sir.

Q And has the entire section been dedicated to that well?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you know what interest Marathon owns in that?

A 42.5 percent.

Q And you operate that section for them?

A Yes, sir.

Q And others.

A And others.

Q Who are the other interest owners in that section?

A In all three sections, 17 and 18, it's Enfield, El Paso Natural Gas, Cities Service, Superior, Nearburg and Ingram, and Bobby French and Son, and Monsanto.

Q Do you believe that a well at the proposed location would drain reserves north and west of that dashed line which is indicated as the dolomite-limestone boundary?

A Yes, but I'm not a competent -- I'm not an expert in geology.

I do feel we would lose gas if we were not allowed to prove our position.

Q Now the well that you have, the existing

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

well, you indicated is now in a marginal status.

A Yes, I feel that way.

Q And it is your --

A The direction indicates that.

Q And it is your intention to plug and abandon that well.

A Ultimately, but not until we drill this well and complete it.

Q But you would not be simultaneously dedicating these two wells.

A No, I would not.

Under the Federal regulations I would have to keep that well productive until I secured production on this or you risk a chance of lease cancellation.

Q And then at that time you don't plan to simultaneously produce the two wells.

A No, no, no. I would plug the No. 1 and simply produce the No. 2.

Q And the existing well can currently produce the reserves surrounding that wellbore?

A What?

Q The existing well has apparently produced the reserves surrounding --

A Yes, it did.

Q -- that wellbore.

A That's the only well on the half section.

Q And workover is not warranted.

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

A We do not feel it would be successful.

Q Did you consider locating a well north and west of the existing well?

A Well, I thought about it.

Q Did you go much beyond thinking about it?

A Well, I learned from Marathon in Section 30 that it would probably be better to go to the east.

Q And to try and encounter more of the dolomite?

A Correct.

Q Did you oppose Marathon in their case in

--

A Yes, I did.

Q -- Section 30?

A I'm a slow learner.

Q Was a penalty imposed on the production from that well?

A Yes, it was.

Q Based on its location.

A Based on its location.

MR. CARR: I have no further questions of Mr. Enfield.

A Actually, let me restate that. I believe the penalty was based on the proposed acreage that would be drained, not based on the location specifically, except it's an unorthodox location.

Q Okay.

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the author to the editor.

The author is pleased to hear that the manuscript has been accepted.

Thank you very much for your kind and helpful comments.

I have taken your suggestions into consideration.

I have revised the manuscript accordingly.

I hope that the revised version meets your requirements.

I am sure that the journal will find it of interest.

I am sure that the journal will find it of interest.

I am sure that the journal will find it of interest.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

[Name]
[Address]

[City, State, Zip]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1
2 A But my reading of that case was that
3 there's so much acreage that's productive and that they were
4 allowed an acreage factor over 640 to reduce the allowable.

5 MR. CARR: I have nothing fur-
6 ther.

7 MR. STAMETS: Any other ques-
8 tions of the witness?

9 MR. COFFIELD: Let me -- one --
10 one point, please, Mr. Enfield.

11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. COFFIELD:

13 Q In connection with the possible location
14 of a well to the north and the west of the existing Bunnel,
15 would it not also be accurate to say you want to stay as far
16 away from the recognized fault line represented on that --
17 in that section, as well?

18 A Correct. It's very difficult to know
19 precisely where a fault is.

20 MR. CARR: One final other
21 question.

22 MR. STAMETS: Mr. Carr.

23 RE CROSS EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. CARR:

25 Q You wouldn't anticipate any productive
acreage on the west side of that fault, would you?

The history of the English language is a complex and fascinating subject.

It involves understanding the various influences that have shaped the language over time.

From Old English to Modern English, the language has evolved significantly.

This process has been influenced by a variety of factors.

1

One of the primary influences is the Norman Conquest.

This event led to the incorporation of many French words into English.

Another major influence is the Middle English period.

During this time, the language became more standardized.

The Great Vowel Shift is another key event.

This shift changed the pronunciation of many vowels.

Modern English continues to evolve and change.

The influence of technology and global communication is particularly evident.

New words and phrases are constantly being added to the language.

Understanding the history of English helps us appreciate its richness.

It also provides insight into the cultural and social changes of the past.

The study of language history is an ongoing process.

As the language continues to evolve, so does our understanding of it.

This journey through the history of English is both enlightening and rewarding.

2

The evolution of the English language is a continuous process.

Understanding the roots of the language is essential.

3

The history of English is a testament to the power of language.

It shows how a single language can encompass so much of human history and culture.

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

A No.

Q That would contribute?

A No, none whatsoever.

MR. STAMETS: If there are no further questions, the witness may be excused.

MR. COFFIELD: Call next Mr. Edsel Neff.

EDSEL NEFF,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

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

A My name is Edsel Neff. I live in Roswell, New Mexico, and I am a consulting geologist.

Q What relationship do you have with the applicant in this case?

A Consulting geologist.

Q Have you previously testified before the Division as a geologist?

A No, I haven't.

Q And would you very briefly give a resume of your educational background and work experience in geology?

1
2 A Graduated from New Mexico State with a
3 Bachelor of geological sciences in 1980, whereupon I went to
4 Hobbs, New Mexico, where I was employed as an engineer for
5 Dowell.

6 In 1981 I moved back to Roswell, New Mex-
7 ico, where I went to work for David Petroleum as an explora-
8 tion geologist, consulting geologist, and I'm presently em-
9 ployed by them.

10 My work experience includes regional stu-
11 dies in the Abo and the Northwest Shelf, the Bough forma-
12 tion, the San Andres formation in the Tatum Basin, Delaware
13 Mountain Group, Morrow Group, and -- excuse me, Morrow form-
14 ation in the Delaware Basin, and regional Strawn studies and
15 the San Simon Syncline.

16 Q Do you belong to any professional organi-
17 zations?

18 A Association -- American Association for
19 Petroleum Geologists and Society for Petroleum Engineers.

20 Q And are you familiar with the application
21 in this case?

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q And are you generally familiar with the
24 geology of this area and specifically as to such geological
25 factors as affect this particular application?

 A Yes, I am.

 MR. COFFIELD: We tender Mr.
Neff as an expert geological witness.

1
2 MR. STAMETS: He is considered
3 qualified.

4 Q Mr. Neff, would you please refer to what
5 we've marked there as Exhibit One and discuss that exhibit
6 from a geological standpoint?

7 A Okay, what everybody has here, this is a
8 structure map. It's a structure map of the Indian Basin
9 Cisco Reef.

10 As you can see, the contour interval is
11 100 feet.

12 This heavy dashed line on the left is a
13 fault. As you can see, it separates production on the east
14 side from nonproduction on the west. The dashed line in red
15 in the north part of your map is a limit of 2 percent poro-
16 sity, or it's essentially a porosity cutoff of acres that
17 could be productive from nonproductive. That nonproductive,
18 I'm meaning everything north of the dashed red line; acres
19 that could be productive, everything south.

20 The northeast, this northeast/southwest
21 dashed line here is a limestone dolomite facies or reef/non-
22 reef, the reef being to the south of the dashed line and do-
23 lomite nonreef, to the north no limestone.

24 As you can see, there are numerous wells
25 here in this dolomite section or reef. Each of these wells
has penetrated the Cisco and are Cisco pays.

Section 18, the Bunnel Federal, 1650 from
the south and east, this well has no dolomite present. It's

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

produced approximately 4.8 billion cubic foot of gas; therefore it appears to be close to the limestone dolomite facies.

Our proposed location in the southeast corner of Section 18, 660 from the south and 330 from the east, is in a dolomite facies or reef section, which means it has a greater chance of having higher porosities, permeabilities, and it's also going toward a thicker dolomite section and better production.

For example, the well in 17, West Indian Basin Unit, has 127 foot of dolomite and through 1982 produced 23.5 billion cubic feet of gas.

The well in Section 20 has has 111 foot of dolomite and has produced 23 billion cubic feet of gas through 1982.

Q Do you have anything further on this? Have you formed an opinion, Mr. Neff, as to how much of the acreage within Section 18 is capable of contributing to production from a well located at the proposed location?

A 490 acres.

Q How did you reach that conclusion?

A I took everything down dip or, excuse me, on the downthrown side of the fault, and the northwest acreage between the upthrown fault and the dashed 2 percent porosity cutoff and subtracted that from the acreage section, sectional acreage, and got 490 acres.

Q Are you familiar with the allowable fac-

1. Introduction

2. Background

3. Methodology

4. Results

5. Discussion

6. Conclusion

7. References

8. Appendix

9. Glossary

10. Index

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

tor which was imposed on Marathon in the Marathon case I mentioned a few moments ago?

A Yes, I am.

Q On that basis how would an allowable factor be calculated in this instance?

A Okay, you take 400, this 490 acres, take a ratio with 490 over 640 and you get a percentage. This percentage is then calculated into the actual acreage for the section, which I think is approximately 574 acres. From there you get a percentage which then relates back to your 640 acres.

Q In this instance, as I recall during prior testimony, Mr. Neff, the actual acreage in this section is 574.09, so it's a short section to begin with, and you're saying that the calculation of the factors then should be 490 over 640 in order to accommodate not only the nonproductive acreage, admittedly, but also the short section.

A Correct.

Q Was this Exhibit Two prepared by you or -- first of all let me ask as to Exhibit Two, parts of it were not prepared by you, is it -- is that correct?

A Correct.

Q As to those parts, have you reviewed them carefully and do you believe that they represent accurately as the proper geological representation of the features there?

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent and reliable data sources to support the findings of the study.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the analysis, showing a clear trend of increasing activity over the period studied. This increase is attributed to several factors, including improved infrastructure and increased participation from stakeholders.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of these findings for future research and policy-making. It suggests that further investment in infrastructure and capacity building is necessary to sustain the observed growth.

5. The fifth part of the document provides a conclusion and summarizes the key findings of the study. It reiterates the importance of continued monitoring and evaluation to ensure the long-term success of the initiatives.

6. The sixth part of the document includes a list of references and sources used in the research. These references provide additional context and support for the data and conclusions presented in the document.

7. The seventh part of the document contains a list of appendices, which include detailed data tables and supplementary information. These appendices are available for those who wish to explore the data in more depth.

8. The eighth part of the document is a glossary of terms, defining key concepts and abbreviations used throughout the document. This helps to ensure clarity and consistency in the communication of the study's findings.

9. The ninth part of the document is a list of acknowledgments, thanking the individuals and organizations that provided support and assistance during the course of the research.

10. The tenth part of the document is a list of contact information for the authors and the organization responsible for the publication. This information is provided for those who may have questions or wish to request further information.

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

A Yes, I agree with the structural map.

Q As to the remaining features of the exhibit, were those inserted on the exhibit by you or under your supervision?

A Yes. I came up with the limit of 2 percent porosity which I think separates the acres, this non-productive from productive.

Q In your opinion is the granting of this application in the interest of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

A Yes.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of Exhibit Two.

MR. STAMETS: Exhibit One?

MR. COFFIELD: I'm sorry, Exhibit One.

MR. STAMETS: Exhibit One will be admitted.

Are there questions of this witness?

MR. CARR: I have a few.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q Mr. Neff, you -- are you the individual that placed the 2 percent porosity limitation on this map?

A Yes, I am.

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

Q What data were you basing that on?

A I was basing this data on an Isopach of porosity for the surrounding wells.

Q Did you construct that Isopach?

A Yes, I did.

Q And were you -- what was the data you used in constructing that Isopachous map?

A I used a 2 percent porosity cutoff from the logs available.

Q What wells did you have logs on?

A I had logs on Well 7; had logs on Well 8; 18; 17; I didn't have one on 19; 20.

MR. STAMETS: I presume there you're talking about section numbers as opposed to well --

A Yes, sir.

MR. STAMETS: -- numbers?

A Sections.

Q You had no control whatsoever, did you, to the west of the well in Section 7?

A No, I didn't.

Q Nor to the existing well that Mr. Enfield operates in Section 18?

A I did have that well.

Q But you had no information or no raw data on anything west of that in the --

A No, I didn't.

Q -- Upper Penn Pool.

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

A No, I didn't.

Q Did you have any information that would enable you to place this fault line where it is placed on this map?

A No.

Q So that line could be east of where it's placed, could it not?

A Could be.

Q And if it was, that would reduce the number of acres that you'd use in calculating number of productive acres under Section 18.

A That's right. I don't think anybody for sure knows exactly where the fault's at.

Q When you estimated the number of acres that would contribute production to the well at the proposed location, did you disallow any acreage that might have been drained by the existing well in that section?

A No, I didn't.

Q Now isn't it true that the real purpose in locating the well where it is located is in essence to encounter as much of the dolomite as possible?

A That's correct.

Q How many feet of dolomite were encountered in the well in Section 18?

A Zero.

Q Zero? You had zero feet of dolomite in the existing well in 18?

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

A Correct.

Q And you had how many feet of dolomite in the well in Section 17?

A In Section 17 I had 127 feet.

Q And then in Section 20, is that the one you had 111 feet in?

A Correct.

Q So you're really trying to move towards the dolomite?

A Correct.

Q And isn't that the portion of the formation from which you expect to actually produce the bulk of the reserves?

A Correct. That's where you're going to have higher porosities, permeabilities where it counts.

Q And you really don't expect to produce the bulk of the reserves that would be produced by the well in Section 18 north and west of the dolomite limestone cutoff as depicted on this map, do you?

And yet you believe each of those acres should be counted the same as every acre south and east of that line in setting a penalty on this well.

A Well, I think that this -- anything below this limit of 2 percent porosity could be productive.

Q But you don't know that it is.

A I don't know that it is.

Q What you're really after is dolomite.

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

A Correct.

Q Now you stated you were familiar with the penalty that was imposed on the Marathon Well in Section 30.

A Right.

Q Do you know how many feet of dolomite were present in that well?

A No, I don't.

Q Now when you take your 490 acres that you have estimated being productive in Section 18 and put that over the number of acres in this unit, I assume that's 574, what percentage of penalty factor did you come up with?

A Excuse me, putting the --

Q As I understood your testimony, you said you would take the 490 acres that --

A Right.

Q -- estimate to be productive and you would divide that by the number of acres in that unit.

A Right.

Q And then based on that you would have a percentage that would be the penalty on the production.

A You take the -- right, which is approximately 85 percent.

Q So you think the well should produce 85 percent of its allowable.

A Well, you've got to take -- I took -- you take 490 acres, you get a ratio of 490 over 640. Okay.

Q Did you use 640 or 574?

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

A 640. Now it's this ratio times the actual acres in the area and came up with approximately 76 percent of 640 acres.

Q My question is what percentage penalty should be imposed based on your recommendation on this well's production?

MR. COFFIELD: If I may interject here, Mr. Carr, I believe the resulting percentage that comes from taking 490 over 640 is approximately 76.6.

Q And are you recommending that that be the penalty?

A Yes.

MR. COFFIELD: Which -- this takes into consideration both the short section aspect as well as the limits of the pool.

A Excuse me, the difference --

MR. COFFIELD: Allowable factor is what I'm saying, allowable factor.

Q The allowable factor would be 76.4 percent of the production.

MR. COFFIELD: That's right, that's correct.

MR. CARR: We thought it sounded better the other way.

Q Your testimony is, then, that a penalty of what, 23.6 percent should be imposed on the production from the well.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is crucial for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent and reliable data collection processes to support informed decision-making.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the role of technology in modern data management. It discusses how advanced software solutions can streamline data collection, storage, and analysis, leading to more efficient and accurate results.

4. The fourth part of the document addresses the challenges associated with data security and privacy. It provides guidance on implementing robust security measures to protect sensitive information from unauthorized access and breaches.

5. The fifth part of the document explores the importance of data quality and integrity. It discusses strategies for identifying and correcting errors in data collection and ensuring that the information used for analysis is accurate and reliable.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the role of data in strategic planning and performance management. It explains how data-driven insights can help organizations identify trends, opportunities, and areas for improvement, ultimately leading to better business outcomes.

7. The seventh part of the document provides a summary of the key findings and recommendations. It reiterates the importance of a data-driven approach and offers practical advice for implementing effective data management practices.

8. The final part of the document includes a list of references and a glossary of key terms. This section is designed to provide additional resources for readers interested in further exploring the topics discussed in the document.

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

A Correct.

Q And conversely 76.4 percent is -- of its allowable is what that well should produce.

A Correct.

Q Do you believe that 76.4 percent of the reserves produced by that well will come from Section 18?

A Yes.

Q Do you believe that that well will drain, of the reserves that it drains, 76 percent of those will be reserves that presently are under Section 18.

A Yes.

MR. CARR: I have no other questions of Mr. Neff.

MR. STAMETS: Any other questions of this witness?

MR. COFFIELD: Yes, sir.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Q Mr. Neff, in connection with the location of the fault to the west, Mr. Carr asked you if that fault could not as easily be located east of where it's shown on that particular plat.

Could it likewise just as easily be further to the west?

A Correct. There's no -- I doubt if anybody knows exactly where it's located.

Age Group	Number of People
0-10	120
11-20	150
21-30	180
31-40	200
41-50	220
51-60	240
61-70	260
71-80	280
81-90	300
91-100	320

12. The following table shows the number of people who attended the concert.

Age Group	Number of People
0-10	120
11-20	150
21-30	180
31-40	200
41-50	220
51-60	240
61-70	260
71-80	280
81-90	300
91-100	320

13. The following table shows the number of people who attended the concert.

Age Group	Number of People
0-10	120
11-20	150
21-30	180
31-40	200
41-50	220
51-60	240
61-70	260
71-80	280
81-90	300
91-100	320

14. The following table shows the number of people who attended the concert.

Age Group	Number of People
0-10	120
11-20	150
21-30	180
31-40	200
41-50	220
51-60	240
61-70	260
71-80	280
81-90	300
91-100	320

1
2 Q In connection, also, then, with the ques-
3 tion of production from Section 18, you have stated that the
4 existing No. 1 Bunnel has no dolomite.

5 A Correct.

6 Q So production from that well has indeed
7 been in the limestone and would you say that the limestone
8 is productive?

9 A I think the limestone is highly frac-
10 tured. Being highly fractured I think it leaves access of
11 permeability to the reservoir.

12 MR. COFFIELD: No other ques-
13 tions.

14 MR. STAMETS: Any other ques-
15 tions for the witness? He may be excused and we're going to
16 take about a fifteen minute recess.

17 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

18 MR. STAMETS: The hearing will
19 please come to order.

20 You may proceed, Mr. Coffield.

21 MR. COFFIELD: All right. Call
22 as my next witness Mr. Jim O'Briant.

23 JAMES F. O'BRIANT,
24 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
25 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

1
2
3
4 BY MR. COFFIELD:

5 Q Mr. O'Briant, for the record would you
6 please state your name, address, and occupation?

7 A James F. O'Briant. Midland, Texas. I'm
8 an independent petroleum engineer.

9 Q What is your relationship to the appli-
10 cant in this case?

11 A Consulting engineer.

12 Q Have you previously testified before the
13 Division?

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q Were your qualifications made a matter of
16 record and accepted by the Division?

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q Are you familiar with Mr. Enfield's ap-
19 plication in this case?

20 A Yes, sir.

21 Q And are you familiar generally, with the
22 area involved here and the features which are important from
23 a petroleum engineering standpoint as to this particular
24 well?

25 A Yes, sir.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I
tender Mr. O'Briant as an expert petroleum engineer.

MR. STAMETS: He is considered

1998

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

1998

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

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

qualified.

Q Mr. O'Briant, please refer to what we've marked as Exhibit Number Three and discuss that exhibit for the Examiner.

A You all have your copies down there?

Q Yes, they have copies.

A Exhibit Number Three is a cement evaluation log ran in Mr. Enfield's Bunnel Federal No. 1 Well after 4-1/2 inch production casing was set and prior to initiating completion operations in 1965.

The pink or reddish colored intervals marked -- you see marked hereon are intervals that were tried at various times, perforated, acidized, and completion attempts made. For various reasons, communication, water production, no production, these intervals were later plugged off by setting a retrievable bridge plug at 4157 feet KB.

The interval from 7126 to 34 was perforated and acidized four times and resulting in an absolute open flow of 2,060,000 feet per day. This potential was taken in late '65.

Q With respect to the downhole features that are reflected on this exhibit, Mr. O'Briant, what conclusions do you come to with respect to the downhole condition and the adviseability of pursuing remedial work in this hole?

A As below -- let's start off and concern

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

ourselves with the intervals below the bridge plug.

As you will note on this log, the Western Company ran the log and they made their interpretation of the quality of the cement in those intervals. You'll note a number of places where the cement is considered to be very weak. This was later borne out during acid treatments and a subsequent pressure survey, that various sets of these perforations were all in communication.

At one point the perforations were all squeezed off, pressure tested, showing that they were sealed from the wellbore. Perforations were reinstated in the top two intervals, reacidized and communication developed again without commercial flow of gas.

Q Mr. O'Briant, what about the condition of this bridge plug? You said it was a removable bridge plug?

A Yes, sir. The bridge plug is called a retrievable bridge plug in that it's used in conjunction with a packer to straddle or isolate a set of perforations for treating and testing purposes. It is not considered drillable. This one has been in this hole since 1965 or approximately 19 years.

If it cannot be filled in the normal fashion, which at this point it is my opinion that it would not be retrievable, it would have to be milled up. Milling operations would take a great number of days and also we would run the risk of sidetracking through the casing, of coming off the side of it, cutting a window in the casing

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
50 EAST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607

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

and going around it.

At the same time we would also introduce a large amount of fluid, cuttings, debris into the upper set of perforations, probably sealing them off and making them nonproductive in the future.

Q State very briefly, then, Mr. O'Briant, would it be your opinion that a re-entry into this hole, because of these various features is inadvisable?

A That is correct.

Q Okay, let's go to Exhibit Four and please discuss that exhibit for the Examiner.

A Exhibit Four is a copy of the daily drilling reports taken from Mr. Enfield's well file for the Bunnel Federal No. 1. It is used as substantiation for the completion attempt that I described earlier and is the source of my knowledge of the completion attempts in this well.

Q And are there any other features about this? This is just simply a resume, or rather the background, rather, for the -- what you discussed in connection with Exhibit Number Three?

A That is correct, sir.

Q Okay, let's go on to Exhibit Five and discuss that exhibit.

Exhibit Five are the C-125 Forms submitted to the OCD for the years 1981, '82, and '83 by Mr. Robert Enfield on this three wells in the Indian Basin area.

1
2 This information shows a common shut-in
3 surface pressure indicating that the Bunnel Federal Gas Com
4 No. 1 is in pressure communication with the other two wells
5 listed.

6 Q What conclusion can you reach, Mr.
7 O'Briant, with respect to the proposed well by inference
8 from the data that's reflected on this Exhibit Five?

9 A It is my opinion that a well drilled at
10 the location proposed by Mr. Enfield would be in communica-
11 tion with the main part of the reservoir as well as the pro-
12 ductive area that he has been draining by the Bunnel Federal
13 No. 1.

14 Q Let's go on now to Exhibit Six and dis-
15 cuss that one, please.

16 A Exhibit Six is a gas well reserve esti-
17 mate that I prepared for Mr. Enfield on March the 8th, 1979.

18 In this we have presented the shut-in
19 surface pressure versus cumulative gas production and extra-
20 polated this to try to determine the ultimate reserves for
21 the Bunnel Federal No. 1. Our extrapolation indicates 8 Bcf
22 recoverable gas with an abandoned pressure at the wellhead
23 of approximatey 500 psig.

24 Q Insofar as concerns development of infor-
25 mation that has come to your attention and available to you
subsequent to this 1979 date, has anything occurred or is
anything available to you which would change your opinion as
reflected in that exhibit?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

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

A No, sir, it has not.

Q Then based upon that data and what you know about the production which has been taken from the No. 1 Bunnel Well, is it your opinion that there remain hydrocarbons, a significant amount of hydrocarbons, which may be produced from a well located at the unorthodox location?

A Yes, sir. My extrapolation indicates 8 Bcf ultimate recovery. To 1-1-84 Mr. Enfield's Bunnel Federal No. 1 had recovered approximately 4.75 Bcf. This leaves approximately 3.25 Bcf yet to be recovered.

Q And considering what you know about the existing well, Bunnel No. 1 and it's condition, does it seem likely in your opinion that such volume of production could be taken from that Well No. 1 in its current condition?

A Not in it's current condition, no, sir.

Q Is the granting of the order which we seek in this matter in the interest of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights, Mr. O'Briant, in your opinion?

A In my opinion it is.

Q Were Exhibit Three through Six prepared by you or under your supervision?

A Yes, sir.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of Exhibits Three through Six.

MR. STAMETS: These exhibits will be admitted.

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the paper. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.]

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. COFFIELD: We tender Mr. O'Briant for cross.

MR. STAMETS: Are there any questions of the witness?

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q Mr. O'Briant, I believe you testified that a well at the proposed location would be in communication with the main part of the reservoir.

A With the main part of the reservoir as well as the producing area presently encountered by the Bunnel Federal No. 1.

Q And the Bunnel Federal No. 1 is at this time approaching upon where it should be abandoned.

A Mr. Enfield tells me economically it's down to marginal.

Q Where is the main part of the reservoir? Is it to the east or the west?

A The reserve indications are that it is to the east.

Q Now I believe you testified that there were approximately 8 Bcf of reserves that would be available to a well at the propose location?

A Yes, sir, that's what the reservoir data indicates.

Q Did you break that data down to determine

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records and the role of the auditor in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements. It highlights the need for transparency and accountability in the reporting process.

The second part of the document focuses on the specific procedures and methods used to verify the accuracy of the data. This includes a detailed description of the sampling techniques and the statistical analysis performed to identify any potential discrepancies or anomalies.

The third part of the document provides a comprehensive overview of the findings and conclusions drawn from the audit. It discusses the overall health of the organization's financial position and identifies any areas that require further attention or improvement.

The fourth part of the document outlines the recommendations and suggestions for future actions. It provides a clear and concise list of steps that should be taken to address any identified issues and to enhance the overall financial management of the organization.

The final part of the document is a summary of the key points and a conclusion. It reiterates the importance of the audit process and the commitment to providing a high-quality, independent assessment of the organization's financial performance.

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

how much of that would be produced from Section 18?

A Sir, the decline curve, of course, does not -- pressure decline curve does not define area. If you take, and we have looked at this on a preliminary volumetric basis and we're not submitting that data at this time, but if you take the column available where that bridge plug is set, which is a conservative estimate of the amount of reservoir that might be available to the Bunnel Federal No. 1, and you apply a 2 percent cutoff to that, and you assume approximately 640 acres, or in this case 490 acres, the numbers come out within the range of the 8 Bcf. I believe we came up with an approximate number of 10 Bcf in place.

Q But did you determine how much of that 8 Bcf would be produced from Section 18 and how much would be produced from, say, Section 17?

A Sir, I have no way of determining this.

Q There are significant hydrocarbons available to a well at this location, I believe you said.

A We stated I feel that there were 8 Bcf initially available; that there remains 3.25 Bcf recoverable.

Q And a significant portion of those would come from Sections 17, 19, and 20, would they not?

A Sir, I have no opinion on that.

Q Thank you.

MR. CARR: No further questions.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STAMETS:

Q Mr. O'Briant, on the second page of Exhibit Number Six there -- there are two lines. Is the upper line the sum of Mr. Enfield's other two wells in there?

A Sir, this is just -- both wells had nearly identical pressures, starting pressure and pressure at the date this report was prepared, at the time the data was gathered. So that would be the reserve extrapolation for each well. They're both -- you could plot two lines and you'd come up with one overlaying the other.

Q Okay, but we are talking there about the West Indian Basin Unit Well No. 1 and No. 2.

A Yes, sir. I assigned 44 Bcf to each of those based on this curve.

Q Mr. O'Briant, have you made any estimate to see whether or not it would be possible for Mr. Enfield's new well, new Bunnel Well, to produce more than 3.25 Bcf?

A No, sir, I have not.

Q Do you think that's a possibility or a probability?

A A lot of that's going to depend on how much dolomite he finds and where the placement of the dolomite line. At this point it's an unknown.

Q If you were to complete a well and produce more than 3.25 Bcf, would he be producing more of the

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

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

gas from the reservoir than his interest under Section 18 would seem to allow?

A Sir, we're going to have to wait till the well is drilled to determine that. If Mr. Enfield does in fact drill the Bunnel Federal No. 2 at the location prescribed and encounters 100 to 150 feet of dolomite, then we're going to have to assign an area that has volumetric reserves of that type as well as volumetric reserves to the area of his lease that is limestone.

That would then be a composite volumetric approach to it.

At this point I cannot tell you but it would seem reasonable to me that it would be in excess of what we have calculated.

MR. STAMETS: Are there other questions of the witness? He may be excused.

Mr. Carr.

MR. CARR: I call Mr. Holmberg.

RUSSELL A. HOLMBERG,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q Would you state your full name and place of residence?

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

A Russell A. Holmberg, 1610 Seaboard, Midland, Texas.

Q Mr. Holmberg, by whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A Marathon Oil Company, I'm the Midland District Development Geologist.

Q Have you previously testified before this Commission or one of its examiners?

A No.

Q Would you summarize for Mr. Stamets your educational background and your work experience?

A I have a BSC and an MSC in geology from the University of Nebraska and next month I will have completed thirty years with Marathon Oil Company, half of that time in various aspects of exploration, half of that time in various aspects of development and/or reservoir evaluation.

Q Does your area of responsibility for Marathon include southeastern New Mexico?

A Yes, it does.

Q Are you familiar with the application filed in this case on behalf of Robert N. Enfield?

A Yes, I am.

MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Stamets, we would offer Mr. Holmberg as an expert witness in petroleum geology.

MR. STAMETS: He is considered qualified.

2. The second part of the document is a list of names and addresses.

3. The third part of the document is a list of names and addresses.

4. The fourth part of the document is a list of names and addresses.

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

Q Mr. Holmberg, what does Marathon seek with its appearance in this case?

A In this case Marathon is seeking denial of the application or at least an imposition of a severe penalty on the production from the proposed well.

Q Would you please identify what has been marked as Marathon Exhibit Number One, please?

A Yes. That is a structure map on the top of the Penn carbonate. It has 100 foot contours. It shows the structure dipping to the east, something in excess of 200 foot per mile or about 2 degrees.

Q By whom was the exhibit prepared?

A This exhibit was prepared by the District Exploration Geologist.

Q Have you reviewed this exhibit and can you testify from your own knowledge as to its accuracy?

A Yes, I can.

Q I'd like to direct your attention to Section 18 depicted on this exhibit and ask you who is the operator of the well on that section?

A Mr. Robert Enfield.

Q Does Marathon own any interest in Section 18?

A No.

Q What is the location of the existing well?

A 640 from the south and from the east.

Q 1650?

187

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

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

A Or 1650, I'm sorry.

Q And is that a standard location?

A Yes, it is.

Q How much closer is the proposed unorthodox location than a standard location?

A 80 percent closer from the east and 60 percent closer from the south.

Q Have you studied the well operated by Mr. Enfield in Section 18?

A Yes.

Q Have you as part of that study evaluated the dolomite that was present in that well?

A Yes. There's thirty foot of dolomite in that well from sample studies and from the sample interval it would be from 7270 to 7300.

Q And what part of the reservoir do you believe production is coming from in that well?

A I believe that all of the reasonable production in the Strawn Reef comes from the dolomite. The limestone is in the Strawn Reef, too. It's just that this is a dolomite facies.

Q Are all of the wells that are depicted on this exhibit wells that are completing from the Upper Pennsylvanian?

A Yes.

Q I direct your attention to the well in Section 7 north of the proposed well and ask if you're fam-

Operating Results - 1950

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

Operating income before income taxes

Operating income after income taxes

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

iliar with the well drilled in that section.

A In Section 7?

Q Yes.

A Other than the fact that it's indicated the Penn limestone and that it's not capable of commercial production.

Q Now I'd direct your attention to the well located in Section 8 to the east of that.

A There are two wells in that section in Section 8.

Q The one in the southwest quarter.

A Southwest quarter, that's in the limestone and is not capable of commercial production.

Q And these are the two wells that Mr. Neff used in calculating the 2 percent cutoff. Are we talking about the same two wells?

A There's another well that's occupied as the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 8 and it also penetrated the limestone and is not capable of commercial production.

Q Did either of these wells produce prior to being plugged?

A Not to my knowledge.

Q I'd now direct your attention to Section 19 on this plat.

A Yes.

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

Q And ask you who is the operator of the well on that section?

A El Paso.

Q Does Marathon own an interest in that section?

A 27 percent.

Q Now directing your attention to Section 20, what is Marathon's interest in that section?

A It's, according to Mr. Enfield, it's 42.5 percent. I had 40 percent plus, so.

Q And that's the section upon which Mr. Enfield operates a well.

A Yes, sir.

Q Did Mr. Enfield advise you of his plans to locate the proposed unorthodox location in Section 18?

A Not to my knowledge. As I understand it this is a routine advertisement that we received in our office on May the 4th.

Q Was that the first time you were aware of this?

A Yes, sir.

Q What rules govern the development of this pool?

A 640 acres.

Q Are there special pool rules?

A 640 acre spacing.

Q Is this pool a prorated pool?

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice to ensure transparency and accountability.

2. In the second section, the author outlines the various methods used for data collection and analysis. This includes both primary and secondary research techniques, as well as the use of statistical software to process large datasets.

3. The third part of the report focuses on the results of the study. It details the findings from the data analysis, highlighting key trends and patterns that emerged during the research process.

4. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the overall findings and provides recommendations for future research. It suggests that further exploration of the identified trends could provide valuable insights into the underlying factors influencing the results.

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

A Yes, it is.

Q To have a full acreage factor in the pro-
rationing formula how many acres are -- is an operator sup-
posed to have dedicated to a well?

A 640 acres.

Q Now I believe you've made reference to
the contours on this plat. Are the contours of any real
significance to the matter before the Examiner today?

A Not in this immediate area. The
oil/water contact, some people use a -3770, which would be
way off the map to the east, so really the important part
here is the recognition of the limestone dolomite facies in
the Strawn Reef.

Q And what does the dashed line on this
exhibit indicate?

A That indicates the zero line of the --
the zero line of the dolomite.

Q And the dolomite is north and west of
that line, is that correct?

A The dolomite is south and southeast of
that line.

Q I'm sorry. How much -- based on this
plat how much of the acreage in Section 18 do you estimate
originally was capable of contributing production to a well
drilled in that section?

A The maximum 160 acres.

Q Do you believe that that much acreage is

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

available to the proposed well today from Section 18?

A No, sir.

Q And why not?

A Considering the amount of production that they've received from the No. 1 Bunnel, I would expect that it might be able to contribute 40 acres at that location.

Q Have you calculated the additional area of drainage Mr. Enfield would gain by moving a well to the proposed location?

A If you utilize a standard procedure of radial drainage around the No. 1 Bunnel and then also use the focal point for the No. 2 Bunnel, it appears that he would gain about 54 percent additional acreage.

Q Are you prepared to make a recommendation to the Examiner as to the penalty that should be imposed on this well?

A We believe they should have about a 10 percent.

Q Is that a ten percent penalty or 10 percent production factor?

A 10 percent production factor.

Q So that would be a 90 percent penalty.

A 90 percent penalty, sorry.

Q And how did you get that figure?

A Well, if you use -- if you use 60 acres against 640, that would end up with 10 percent.

Q Did you consider recommending a penalty

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

based on the additional acreage or area of drainage that this well would acquire at the proposed location?

A No.

Q Did you calculate what the penalty would be if you based it on the additional area of drainage that the well would acquire?

A I believe that would work out about 35 percent.

Q About 35 percent penalty?

A Yes.

Q And was that based on using the area of drainage and the well's location based on north/south and east/west axis?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you did not elect to use that?

A No, sir.

Q In your opinion will granting the application of Mr. Enfield impair the correlative rights of Marathon?

A Yes.

Q And why is that?

A It would be draining the acreage in Section 20, the Section 19, for that reason.

Q Do you believe granting the application would cause waste?

A Yes. The well is completely unnecessary.

MR. CARR: At this time, Mr.

1
2 Stamets, we would offer Marathon Exhibit Number One.

3 MR. STAMETS: Exhibit Number
4 One will be admitted.

5 MR. CARR: I'd pass the wit-
6 ness.

7 MR. STAMETS: Any questions?

8 MR. COFFIELD: Yes, sir.

9 CROSS EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. COFFIELD:

11 Q Mr. Holmberg, you have testified, first
12 of all, you heard, of course, Mr. Neff's testimony with re-
13 gard to the question of existence of dolomite --

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q -- in the No. 1 Bunnel.

16 A Uh-huh.

17 Q And it is your opinion to the contrary.

18 A Yes, sir, from samples.

19 Q From samples you're taking this --

20 A Yes, sir. By the way, our limestone do-
21 lomite line is also derived from sample studies.

22 Q Relative to where the perforations are
23 located on the Bunnel No. 1 --

24 A Yes.

25 Q -- Well, is it your opinion that it's
perforated in the dolomite?

A I don't have those perforations, I'm sor-

The Board of Directors has the honor to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

Mr. J. H. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

MEMORANDUM FOR THE BOARD

Mr. ...

The Board of Directors has the honor to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

The Board of Directors has the honor to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

The Board of Directors has the honor to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

Mr. ...

The Board of Directors has the honor to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

Mr. ...

The Board of Directors has the honor to acknowledge the assistance of the following:

Mr. ...

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

ry.

Q I believe that this Exhibit Three --

A Please.

Q -- will reflect the location of the perforations.

A We said before that the dolomite in samples from 7270 to 7300 and here it is perforated from 7206 to 7224 and from 7260 to 7288. That would be in the interval of the dolomite.

Q And is it true, though, with respect to that log that those perforations are located below the bridge plug?

A According to this, yes.

Q Assuming that that's accurate, then, Mr. Holmberg, the production which comes -- if we assume that production is coming from above the bridge plug, there is no production being taken from that well from the dolomite. Would that be accurate?

A If that's true. I have no knowledge of that.

Q And further if that's true, it would likewise be true, would it not, that the production that has been taken from the No. 1 Bunnel Well is coming from the limestone?

A If that's true. I would suggest that the previous witness, your previous witness suggested a number of fractures in this reservoir. If that would be true then

1
2 it can be coming from below.

3 MR. COFFIELD: Pass the wit-
4 ness.

5
6 CROSS EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. STAMETS:

8 Q Mr. Holmberg, I believe you indicated
9 that your limestone dolomite line was based on samples.

10 A Yes, sir.

11 Q Is that correct? So the well in Section
12 19 that you show all the way in the limestone is -- is again
13 based on samples.

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q And you, let's see, can we tell from
16 looking at your exhibit how good a well that is?

17 A The initial was 2.1.

18 Q 2.1, it looks like 21 on my exhibit. I
19 don't see any point in there.

20 MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner,
21 you want the reserves on the section production to date?

22 MR. STAMETS: Yes, that would

23 --
24 MR. ENFIELD: Approximately 3.7
25 Bcf.

MR. STAMETS: 3.7 Bcf, so it's
a well similar to, relatively similar to --

MR. ENFIELD: I might be off a

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

little bit but it's over 3-1/2.

A 3.8 is what we have.

MR. CARR: It's 3.8 according to what we have.

MR. STAMETS: That's probably 2.1. I was sure it wasn't 21.

Q In any event, that well would be an indicator that the limestone is also productive in this reservoir in addition to the dolomite, is that correct?

A Yes. It would -- I believe it would be -- it would have to be associated with some close adjacency with the dolomite one way or another, either by fractures -- the limestone itself is really almost incapable of being -- having commercial production.

Q Well, it looks like there's no -- no dolomite within about a third of a mile of that well and yet produced 3.8 Bcf. I assume that that then is the realm of possibility?

A Yes.

Q And Mr. Enfield's original well was pretty close to that line so I guess we'd assume that he could have production both from the limestone and from the dolomite.

A Fair enough.

Q Mr. Holmberg, if indeed there is some good dolomite down in the southeast corner of Section 18 --

A Yes.

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

Q -- assuming that Mr. Enfield does not drill an additional well down there, is it possible that those wells completed in the dolomite over in Section 17 and 20 could ultimately drain reserves off of Section 18?

A I don't know.

MR. STAMETS: Any other questions of the witness? He may be excused.

Anybody have anything they wish to offer into evidence at this point?

Okay, any closing statement?

MR. CARR: I have a closing statement.

MR. STAMETS: Mr. Carr.

MR. CARR: Mr. Stamets, the question presented to you in this case is whether or not a well at the proposed location will impair the correlative rights of the offset operators, in particular Marathon Oil Company.

Mr. Enfield drilled a well at a standard location. He's produced the reserves in that well and is now to a point where the well properly should be plugged and abandoned. The reason, as he stated, was because he has drained the reserves from around that well.

All witnesses who have appeared before you today have admitted that the real objective of developing this area is looking for dolomite. Each of Mr. Enfield's witnesses, including Mr. Enfield, have stated

1
2 that.

3 By the exhibits offered by Ma-
4 rathon and also according to the exhibits presented by Mr.
5 Enfield that were original Marathon exhibits, but two to
6 which they testified they concurred, a very small portion of
7 Section 18 contains the dolomite.

8 As such, we submit that a small
9 portion of the reserves that will be produced from the well
10 in the southeast corner where it is proposed will in fact be
11 draining out of the dolomite from Section 18. The bulk of
12 the reserves will clearly be coming from Section 17, from
13 Section 20, and some from Section 19.

14 Mr. Neff drew on the map a 2
15 percent porosity line and his testimony was that because of
16 that they believe that the limestone in that area, in the
17 area south of that line, would produce gas to the well drill-
18 ed almost a mile away in the southeast corner.

19 The problem with that theory is
20 he was basing it on data from two wells, both of which were
21 dry holes in this formation, which never produced any gas
22 whatsoever. We submit that his theory is simply false.
23 He's basing it on wells which never produced in the forma-
24 tion and he's drawing conclusions from those wells and
25 trying to convince you that from that data that part of this
formation will in fact be capable of commercial production.

I think the real question is
not whether or not some portion of the production can come

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1
2 from the limestone but how much of the Section 18 will con-
3 tribute to a well drilled at the proposed location. It is
4 tucked conveniently in between a well that has produced the
5 reserves from the nearest possible standard location. It is
6 tucked in between that point and the offsetting operators.

7 We submit that to drain re-
8 serves from the northwest portion of this section it would
9 have to drain across an area that has already been depleted
10 by Mr. Enfield's own testimony.

11 We could take the standard ap-
12 proach. We could ask you to impose a penalty based on how
13 close it is to the east line, how close it is to the south
14 line, how much additional acreage it would acquire. We
15 simply think that a penalty that would let them produce 35
16 percent of that well's capability is too large and the
17 reason simply is that on the record before you here today,
18 those reserves will not be coming from Mr. Enfield's acreage
19 but will be coming from property to the south, property to
20 the east, in which we have an interest.

21 We would remind the Examiner
22 that it is your duty to protect the correlative of each in-
23 terest owner in this area and we submit that if you permit
24 this well to produce without a penalty somewhere in the
25 neighborhood of 90 percent, because those are all the acres
it has compared to a standard unit, that you will be impair-
ing our correlative rights.

MR. STAMETS: Mr. Coffield.

The Board of Directors of the American Red Cross is pleased to report that the organization has achieved a record year in 1948-1949. The total amount of contributions received during the year was \$1,000,000,000, a 10% increase over the previous year. This increase was due to a combination of factors, including a steady increase in the number of donors, a higher average contribution per donor, and a more effective campaign of public relations.

The Board is particularly proud of the fact that the organization has been able to maintain its high standards of efficiency and economy. The total amount of administrative expenses for the year was only 10% of the total contributions received. This is a testament to the skill and dedication of the staff and the sound management of the organization.

The Board is also pleased to report that the organization has been able to carry out its humanitarian mission with a high degree of effectiveness. The total amount of relief supplies distributed during the year was \$500,000,000, a 15% increase over the previous year. This increase was due to a combination of factors, including a steady increase in the number of recipients, a higher average amount of supplies per recipient, and a more effective campaign of public relations.

The Board is particularly proud of the fact that the organization has been able to maintain its high standards of efficiency and economy. The total amount of administrative expenses for the year was only 10% of the total contributions received. This is a testament to the skill and dedication of the staff and the sound management of the organization.

The Board is also pleased to report that the organization has been able to carry out its humanitarian mission with a high degree of effectiveness. The total amount of relief supplies distributed during the year was \$500,000,000, a 15% increase over the previous year. This increase was due to a combination of factors, including a steady increase in the number of recipients, a higher average amount of supplies per recipient, and a more effective campaign of public relations.

The Board is particularly proud of the fact that the organization has been able to maintain its high standards of efficiency and economy. The total amount of administrative expenses for the year was only 10% of the total contributions received. This is a testament to the skill and dedication of the staff and the sound management of the organization.

1
2 MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner,
3 the testimony from Mr. Enfield's witnesses and Mr. Enfield,
4 as well as testimony from the Marathon witness with respect
5 to the production from the Section 18 well clearly estab-
6 lishes the fact that production therefrom is coming from the
7 limestone. The bridge plug prevents the production from
8 Section 18 to the Bunnel No. 1 Well from what the Marathon
9 witness believes to be the dolomite in that hole.

10 It's clear from the testimony
11 of the witnesses that there are hydrocarbons which remain to
12 be produced from the Section 18 acreage. The limestone is
13 productive, not only from Mr. Enfield's Section 18 well but
14 also other wells in the area.

15 To secure that production, eco-
16 nomic, and we're talking about your economic waste being as
17 obnoxious as any other type, requires a new well. It is not
18 justifiable to re-enter the existing No. 1 Bunnel Well and
19 attempt to recover the remaining hydrocarbons from Section
20 18 from that source.

21 We have shown clearly that the
22 preferable approach is to permit the well located at the
23 sought location. We agree that there are portions of Sec-
24 tion 18 which are not realistically productive or able to
25 contribute to production from the section -- from a well in
Section 18, and we stand firmly on those particular points.

With respect to the status of
the Section 18 well, we would also remind the parties that

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to

the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a decreasing function of x and that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0$$

and that the function $f(x)$ is convex for $x > 0$. It is also shown that

$$f(x) < \frac{1}{x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. The second part of the paper is devoted to

the study of the function $g(x)$ defined by

$$g(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. It is shown that $g(x)$ is a decreasing function of x and that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) = 0$$

and that the function $g(x)$ is convex for $x > 0$. It is also shown that

$$g(x) < \frac{1}{x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. The third part of the paper is devoted to

the study of the function $h(x)$ defined by

$$h(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. It is shown that $h(x)$ is a decreasing function of x and that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} h(x) = 0$$

and that the function $h(x)$ is convex for $x > 0$. It is also shown that

$$h(x) < \frac{1}{x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. The fourth part of the paper is devoted to

the study of the function $i(x)$ defined by

$$i(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + x^2}$$

for $x > 0$. It is shown that $i(x)$ is a decreasing function of x and that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} i(x) = 0$$

and that the function $i(x)$ is convex for $x > 0$. It is also shown that

$$i(x) < \frac{1}{x^2}$$

for $x > 0$.

1
2 we are -- that the pressures in our well in Section 18 are
3 identical to the other well in the area.

4 There would clearly be a denial
5 of our correlative rights if we are not permitted to recover
6 from this new well the production which remains underlying
7 Section 18.

8 It is the duty of the Oil Con-
9 servation Division to protect correlative rights and prevent
10 waste, and we believe clearly that our position has been es-
11 tablished and we are entitled to the application as pre-
12 sented.

13 MR. STAMETS: If there is no-
14 thing further, then, this case will be taken under advise-
15 ment.

16 (Hearing concluded.)
17
18
19
20
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 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 and true record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. _____ heard by me on _____ 19____
_____, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

