

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 22 August 1984

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of Getty Oil Company for CASE
10 downhole commingling, Eddy County, 8315
11 New Mexico.

12 BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner
13

14 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

15
16
17 A P P E A R A N C E S
18

19
20 For the Oil Conservation Division: W. Perry Pearce
21 Attorney at Law
22 Oil Conservation Commission
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

23 For the Applicant: William F. Carr
24 Attorney at Law
25 CAMPBELL & BLACK P. A.
P. O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

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

2

I N D E X

DON STEINNERD

Direct Examination by Mr. Carr	3
Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner	13

E X H I B I T S

Getty Exhibit One, Plat	5
Getty Exhibit two, Schematic	7
Getty Exhibit Three, C-115s	8
Getty Exhibit Four, Curves	8
Getty Exhibit Five, Pressure Data	9

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. STOGNER: We will call next Case Number 8315.

MR. PEARCE: That case is on the application of Getty Oil Company for downhole commingling in Eddy County, New Mexico.

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with the law firm Campbell & Black, P. A., of Santa Fe, appearing on behalf of Getty Oil Company.

I have one witness.

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

(Witness sworn.)

DON STEINNERD,
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?

A My full name is Donald James Steinnerd. I reside in Hobbs, New Mexico.

Q By whom are you employed and in what ca-

1
2 capacity?

3 A I'm employed by Getty Oil Company in the
4 capacity of Area Engineer.

5 Q Have you previously testified before this
6 Commission or one of its examiners and had your credentials
7 as a petroleum engineer accepted and made a matter of re-
cord?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Are you familiar with the application
10 filed in this case on behalf of Getty?

11 A Yes, I am.

12 Q Are you familiar with the subject area?

13 A Yes.

14 MR. CARR: Mr. Stogner, are the
15 witness' qualifications acceptable?

16 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Steinnerd,
17 would you briefly state what Getty seeks to accomplish with
this application?

18 A Getty seeks blanket approval to downhole
19 commingle all current wells and proposed wells in the Gray-
20 burg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres and Fren Seven Rivers Pools
underlying our Skelly Unit.

21 MR. CARR: Mr. Stogner, as you
22 are probably aware, the application requested blanket ap-
23 proval for downhole commingling within the Skelly Unit.

24 It also in the alternative re-
25 quested downhole commingling for six wells which Getty pro-

1
2 poses to drill and also for downhole commingling authority
3 for two existing single completions.

4 The case was advertised only
5 for the blanket commingling portion of the case and if you
6 deem it advisable to recommend an order approving blanket
7 commingling, the other two portions of the case will become
8 moot.

9 MR. STOGNER: Will you be put-
10 ting on testimony today for the whole unit?

11 MR. CARR: Well, we're going to
12 request -- yes, we're requesting approval for blanket com-
13 mingling of the entire unit.

14 MR. STOGNER: And then the les-
15 ser --

16 MR. CARR: If that should fail,
17 there are particular wells for which approval would be
18 needed.

19 MR. STOGNER: Thank you, Mr.
20 Carr. Please continue.

21 Q Mr. Steinnerd, have you prepared certain
22 exhibits for introduction in this case?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Will you please refer to what's been
25 marked as Getty Exhibit Number One, identify this and review
it for Mr. Stogner?

A Exhibit Number One is a plat showing the
unit boundaries of the Skelly Unit, which is operated by

1
2 Getty Oil Company. It is marked by the hatched marks sur-
3 rounding about six or so sections.

4 The yellow areas marked are just addi-
5 tional areas that we're not applying for that are operated
6 by Getty Oil Company and the symbols, although a legend is
7 not present, the solid black circles are the Grayburg-Jack-
8 son wells and the hexagon are the Grayburg -- I mean are the
9 Fren Seven Rivers wells.

10 The Skelly Unit consists of two -- two
11 principal production pays, the two that we're proposing to
12 downhole commingle.

13 Q Mr. Steinnerd, does this plat also show
14 the offsetting owners?

15 A Yes, it does, the operators.

16 Q Does the -- or what is the status of the
17 lands within the unit?

18 A The status of the lands within the unit
19 are 100 percent owned and operated by Getty Oil Company.

20 Q Are there any wells within the unit for
21 which downhole commingling of these zones has previously
22 been approved by the Oil Conservation Division?

23 A Yes. Recently our Skelly Unit Well No.
24 11, which is in Section 21 on the eastern edge of the sec-
25 tion, was approved on January 24, 1984, by Order Number R-
7429.

Q And the same zones were approved for
downhole commingling in that case as you are seeking now for

1
2 the entire unit.

3 A That is correct.

4 Q Would you state for Mr. Stogner the exact
5 formations which you are seeking authority to downhole com-
6 mingle?

7 A We are seeking authority for the Fren
8 Seven Rivers and the Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres.

9 Q Are the -- all of these formations uni-
10 tized?

11 A Yes, they are, the entire -- all horizons
12 under the subject Skelly Unit are unitized.

13 Q Is the ownership common, therefore, in
14 each of the zones to be commingled?

15 A Yes, they are.

16 Q Working interest as well as royalty in-
17 terest.

18 A That is correct.

19 Q Would you now refer to what's been marked
20 as Getty Exhibit Number Two?

21 A Exhibit Number Two is a proposed, typical
22 completion for infill wells which will be drilled on the
23 Skelly Unit. It consists of 8-5/8ths set an approximate
24 depth of 700 feet; final production casing will be 5-1/2
25 inch casing set at approximately 3900 feet cemented to sur-
face.

26 The Fren Seven Rivers production will be
27 plus or minus 2100 to plus or minus 2400.

1
2 The Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres
3 perforations will be plus or minus 3100 to 3600.

4 The well will produce through tubing set
5 at or near the bottom of the Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San An-
6 dres perforations.

7 Q What treatment does Getty give to each of
8 the zones?

9 A Typically the Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San
10 Andres will be acidized, in most cases fractured.

11 The Fren Seven Rivers typically is just
12 acidized.

13 Q Would you now refer to Getty Exhibit Num-
14 ber Three?

15 A Yes. Exhibit Number Three is the last
16 page of the C-115s that are submitted to the State for show-
17 ing production by pool in the Skelly Unit.

18 Specifically noted at the bottom are the
19 GOR's, which were calculated based on this production, with
20 the Fren Pool, Fren Seven Rivers Pool, 374 standard cubic
21 foot per barrel and the Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres if
22 508 standard cubic foot per barrel.

23 Q Will you now review Exhibit Number Four?

24 A Yes. Exhibit Number Four consists of two
25 production curves.

26 The first one is for the Fren Seven Riv-
27 ers and on the curve the lower part of the page shows a de-
28 cline curve for both the oil, water, and gas production on

1 the Skelly Unit.
2

3 The second page consists of a similar
4 production curve for the Grayburg-Jackson production.

5 Q What is the source of the data depicted
6 on these graphs?

7 A This is production data based on the C-
8 115s.

9 Q And this is the data that's filed monthly
10 with the Oil Conservation Commission.

11 A Yes, it is.

12 Q Are both zones to be commingled in the
13 subject wells capable of only marginal production?

14 A Yes. Typically, right now, the average
15 production on the Skelly Unit is less than 10 barrels of oil
16 per day.

17 Q That's per well?

18 A Per well.

19 Q Are the zones flowing or being artifi-
20 cially lifted?

21 A All wells are being artificially lifted.

22 Q Would you now go to your Exhibit Number
23 Five, which is a compilation of pressure data and review
24 this for the Examiner?

25 A Yes. Exhibit Number Five consists of two
pages, the top page being the bottom hole pressure of nine
wells located randomly throughout the unit, whereby we shut
the wells in for five days, shot a fluid level, and reported

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

the dead weight test shut-in tubing pressure and extrapolated a bottom hole pressure.

The second page is a similar set of data for Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres wells, and shown, although it is a wide range within each reservoir, the average of these wells for the Fren Seven Rivers showed an average bottom hole pressure of 592 psi and the for the Grayburg-Jackson the average of those wells shown was 620 psi.

Q Mr. Steinnerd, in your opinion will these pressure differentials result in gas migration between the commingled zones?

A No, it will not.

Q Have you taken production data and calculated an average rate of production from each zone?

A Yes. At the present time, based on June C-115 production data, the Fren Seven Rivers on a per well basis with 52 producing wells, produces 5.8 barrels of oil per day.

The Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres with 59 producing wells produces an average of 7.3 barrels of oil per day per well.

Q Do these wells produce any gas?

A Yes, marginal, very little.

Q And are they producing water?

A Yes, they are.

Q Are you prepared to make a recommendation to Mr. Stogner as to the allocation of production to each of

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

the commingled zones?

A We recommend that the application be based on tests after completion as per methods approved by the District Supervisor in Artesia.

Q So you would work with the District Supervisor on a well-by-well basis after downhole commingling is affected and the zones are tested?

A That is correct.

Q Would you anticipate any problems with the compatibility of the fluids produced from each of the zones?

A No, I would not. Currently production is being commingled at the surface and produced waters are being commingled and reinjected and we have seen no problems to date.

Q And --

A There's some slight scaling tendencies but those are being treated with scale inhibitor.

Q Have you received approval from this Commission for surface commingling of the oils?

A Yes, we have.

Q And do you happen to have the order number approving that surface commingling?

A Yes, I do. Surface commingling was approved January 31st, 1973, by Order PC-450.

Q Mr. Steinnerd, are the reservoir characteristics of these pools such that underground waste will

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

not be caused by the proposed downhole commingling?

A Yes.

Q In your opinion will granting this application result in the increased recovery of hydrocarbons?

A Yes.

Q Will the value of the commingled production exceed the sum of the values of the production from each of the individual zones?

A Yes, it will.

Q In your opinion will economic savings result from the proposed downhole commingling?

A Yes.

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

A Yes, it would.

Q Does Getty request that the order resulting from this hearing be expedited?

A Yes, we do. We anticipate Federal approvals within thirty days and upon acquiring all approvals we will be immediately drilling the six proposed wells at this time.

Q Were Exhibits One through Five prepared by you?

A Under me.

Q And have you reviewed them and can you testify to their accuracy?

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.

MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Stogner, we would offer into evidence Getty Exhibits One through Five.

MR. STOGNER: Exhibits One through Five will be admitted into evidence.

MR. CARR: That concludes my direct of Mr. Steinnerd.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STOGNER:

Q I'll have some questions. I'm just formulating them at this moment, if you'll bear with me, please.

A Sure.

Q Mr. Steinnerd, or Mr. Carr, in reviewing for this hearing today, this case in particular, I was somewhat baffled and confused on the events leading up to segregation of Fren San Andres and the Grayburg-Jackson-San Andres-Queen -- Seven Rivers-Queen-Grayburg-San Andres Pool. Could you please enlighten me and for the record go over the -- what led up to this and what -- why the two pools were in this particular area were segregated?

A Specifically, the way we just report production -- let me go back a moment. For the --

Q Please.

A -- entire unitized area is all Federal,

1
2 Federal acreage.

3 When the unit was -- operating agreement
4 was made all horizons were unitized, not just the two that
5 we're requesting. Typically the only two horizons that have
6 production under the unitized interval are the Fren Seven
7 Rivers and the Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres.

8 The Grayburg-Jackson-Queen-San Andres is
9 -- is basically the name that is utilized to report the pool
10 productio data on the C-115s. There were not -- there is
11 not a specific pool name designated in the unit agreement as
12 being that interval unitized. The entire vertical limits of
13 the wellbores are unitized under the Skelly Unit operating
14 agreement.

15 Typically, the unit was developed whereby
16 both the Fren Seven Rivers and the Grayburg-Jackson were
17 drilled with separate wells until Skelly Unit Well No. 11
18 was downhole commingled. The only other wells on the unit
19 that were downhole commingled were injection wells and they
20 had tubing strings whereby the injection was kept separate.

21 Getty's proposing to drill wells to exa-
22 mine the possibility of reducing our density of wells in the
23 area and subsequently better drain and produce remaining re-
24 serves under the Skelly Unit.

25 That leads us up to why we're here today
requesting approval to downhole commingle in the proposed
wells, plus any other well, let's say, in the future that
would possibly result in some mechanical problems, since

1
2 there are many wells on the same well pad offsetting, let's
3 say a Fren Seven Rivers from a Grayburg-Jackson. We would
4 then be able to go in and abandon the one well and downhole
5 commingle and maintain production with the other offset
6 well.

6 Q Are you familiar with why there was two
7 different, here again, why there was two different pools es-
8 tablished where in some parts where the Fren Seven Rivers
9 Pool does not exist the Jackson -- the Grayburg-Jackson Pool
10 does include the Seven Rivers in those areas?

11 A There are two separate producing hori-
12 zons. I don't know if this is answering your question.

13 In some areas, for instance, in the
14 northeast end of the -- of the unitized area, the Fren Seven
15 Rivers is not productive. The Grayburg-Jackson is in other
16 areas, so typically some wells, for instance, were drilled
17 up in the northeast end of the unit, Section 14, you'll no-
18 tice there are only Grayburg-Jackson wells. In other areas
19 there are both Fren Seven Rivers and Grayburg-Jackson.

19 Q In that particular area in the northeast
20 does the Seven Rivers exist?

21 A It does exist but it's nonproductive.

22 Q Nonproductive. Do you know if there's --
23 further north, outside of your unit, do you know if there is
24 existing production in the Seven Rivers formation from any
25 of those wells, by chance?

A In the -- let's see, if I'm not mistaken,

1
2 the record, I would like to read in what the order says and
3 it's very short.

4 "IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that
5 the vertical limits of the Grayburg-Jackson (Queen-Grayburg-
6 San Andres Pool) as previously established and defined by
7 Commission order, are hereby extended to include the Seven
8 Rivers formation, excepting in that area where said pool is
9 overlain by the Fren Seven Rivers Pool."

10 Order No. . 2. "That the North
11 Fren Yates Seven Rivers Associated Pool is hereby abolish-
12 ed."

13 As you can see by this, I'm
14 still a little confused on why the Seven Rivers in this par-
15 ticular area was not included in the Grayburg-Jackson, and
16 reading in this order, it mentions that the difference in
17 ownership, but this being all unitized in this particular
18 area, the ownership is common in both the Grayburg-Jackson
19 and the Fren Seven Rivers.

20 A That is correct.

21 Q So anywhere outside this area the Seven
22 Rivers is included in the Grayburg-Jackson-Seven Rivers-
23 Queen-Grayburg-San Andres Pool, except for this little area
24 that you're --

25 A I don't have the order. I'm not sure
what areas it actually pertains to unless it specifically
talked to pools only.

MR. STOGNER: I'm going to take

1
2 administrative notice of Order No. R-5011. This is one I
3 found by preparing for this case today, that -- that con-
4 cerns this particular area.

5 Now then, let's go back to
6 this, your exhibits in here and your testimony today.

7 A If I might ask, Mr. Examiner, are you
8 stating that according to that order that what we're
9 requesting is not necessary, that it's your impression that
10 all this was unitized and might save us considerable --

11 Q No, that's not it at all. The order
12 clearly states that the Seven Rivers in this particular area
13 is indeed in the Fren Seven Rivers Pool; however, I just
14 wanted to bring that out, that everything outside this par-
15 ticular area is in the Jackson-Grayburg-Seven Rivers --

16 A Okay.

17 Q -- Pool, and by that order, the way I in-
18 terpret it, the reason it split was because there was diver-
19 sity in ownership.

20 A It may be very well outside the unit
21 areas but not on the unit.

22 Q My next question, when was the Skelly
23 Unit established?

24 A I do not have that date in front of me.
25 I believe it was in the late sixties or early seventies.
That's as close as I can pin it down.

I can easily find that out, though.

Q Would you please, sir?

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.

Q At the present time is there both, is there waterflood in the Fren Seven Rivers?

A There's waterflooding in both Fren Seven Rivers and the Grayburg-Jackson.

Q And do you propose for downhole commingling for these injection wells?

A No, we do not.

Q You do not. What is the average pressure, injection pressure in both zones?

A The Fren Seven Rivers typically has a limit on some wells by State law at 1300 psi.

The Grayburg-Jackson at 2000.

There are some older wells prior to the date when the limits were set that have no limits at all.

Q In those areas that have no limits on the injection wells, are they in a particular area or are they scattered throughout the unit?

A It's based on the date -- they're scattered throughout the unit. I assume it's based on the date when the -- prior to the date when the limits were set out and some additional wells at a later period of time that were converted to injection.

Q Does Getty operate these particular wells that don't have a limit at the 13 or 1500 psia?

A It's very, very close to it, yes.

Q Very close to it. Where is the water

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

coming from for both of the injection zones?

A We are getting water currently from both zones, both the producing wells in the Fren Seven Riverg and the Grayburg-Jackson produce water. We are taking that water and re-injecting it. In addition, we are buying make-up water from the City of Carlsbad to inject.

Typically the injection pressure is maintained by controls at the wellhead. We have one plant operating -- two plants operating injection for both horizons; one injection distribution system.

Q On Exhibit Number Five there's some wide variance of bottom hole pressures. Can we go into a little more detail on why that could possibly be?

A Part of the reason is we -- is the reason why we want to go ahead and additionally drill infill wells. We feel that the density of the wells within the unit is not sufficient to adequately drain the reserves.

We feel that the injection wells are just in some cases not able to stimulate and reach the zones that are producing in these producing wells.

Q Do you feel it could be possible cross-flow of water and hydrocarbons in some of these wells that may have a high Fren Seven Rivers bottom hole pressure and a low Grayburg-Jackson-San Andres?

A Except the Well No. 11, right now the only wells that are currently open in both these pools, see, that is the only one, is Well No. 11, I do not anticipate

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

that there is crossflow existing out there at the current time that is pressuring up, what you're asking, the Fren Seven Rivers Pool.

I do not feel that in the producing wells there would be a chance for damage resulting from any crossflow. Adequate surface equipment can be utilized on the well to lift any fluids that are in the wellbore.

Q How about in the event any of these wells are shut-in for any extended period of time?

A If they would be shut-in for an extended period of time there could be a possibility of crossflow.

Q Has any of these wells in the past been shut-in for any extended period of time?

A No, they have not, only electrical problems or some on a very short term duration has resulted in shutting in.

Q Has Getty plugged and abandoned any of the wells in either formation?

A I believe there is one well, Well No. 71, I came across in reviewing this unit again, that has been plugged and abandoned. Any others I'm not sure of. The majority of the wells are operating.

Getty would be happy to include in the order that the wells, for instance, were shut-in for, let's say, a period of 60 days, or something to that effect, that Getty would go in and physically set a plug or whatever would be necessary to restrict any communication in 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

wellbore.

Q How are the Fren Seven Rivers injection wells marked on this Exhibit Number One? I see some injection wells but I -- I don't know whether they're Grayburg-Jackson or Fren Seven Rivers injection.

A Okay. Excuse me for one minute. It does not appear on this particular schematic that there are -- there's a legend that describes which is Fren Seven Rivers injectors and which is a Grayburg-Jackson injector.

Q I'm sorry, please repeat that.

A The injection wells are just those wells with an arrow through it but it does not appear that the legend differentiates between a Seven Rivers or a Grayburg-Jackson injector.

Q Could you please submit to me a --

A We could submit a --

Q -- that information?

A -- improved plat that would show that.

Q I would take that as an amended Exhibit Number One.

MR. STOGNER: I have no further questions at this time.

Are there any other questions of this witness?

MR. CARR: No questions.

MR. STOGNER: Is there anything further in this case?

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. CARR: Nothing further.

MR. STOGNER: I'm going to
leave the record open until an amended Order --

MR. CARR: Exhibit Number One.

MR. STOGNER: Exhibit Number
One is submitted.

If there is nothing further in
Case Number 8315 the hearing is adjourned.

(Hearing concluded.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of case no. 8315, heard by me on August 22, 1984.

Michael E. Stegner, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

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 19 September 1984

8 EXAMINER HEARING

9
10
11 IN THE MATTER OF:

12 Application of Getty Oil Company
13 for downhole commingling, Eddy
14 County, New Mexico.

CASE
8315

15
16
17
18 BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Oil Conservation
Division:

Jeff Taylor
Attorney at Law
Legal Counsel to the Division
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For the Applicant:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. STOGNER: We will now call
Case Number 8315.

MR. TAYLOR: The application of
Getty Oil Company for downhole commingling, Eddy County, New
Mexico.

MR. STOGNER: Mr. Counselor,
this case was heard on August 22nd, 1984; however, it was
not advertised in the Artesia paper at that time and it had
to be readvertised at this time.

We will now call for any
appearances or additional testimony at this time.

Appearing that there is none,
this case will be taken under advisement.

(Hearing concluded.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY
that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Con-
servation Division was reported by me; that the said tran-
script is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing,
prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

For the Oil Conservation Division
I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the hearing held on
the 19th day of August, 1984.
Michael A. Slagwitz, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division