1	INDEX	
2	February 7, 1991 Examiner Hearing	
3	Case No. 10240	
4		PAGE
5	APPEARANCES	3
6	DIVISION WITNESS:	
7	ROY JOHNSON Direct Examination by Mr. Stovall	4
8	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	7
9	* * *	
10		
11	EXHIBITS	Admtd
12	DIVISION EXHIBIT	
13	1	6
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		•
23		
2 4		
25		

APPEARANCES ROBERT G. STOVALL, ESQ. FOR THE DIVISION: General Counsel Oil Conservation Division State Land Office Building Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

1	EXAMINER STOGNER: Call the next case, No. 10240,
2	which is in the matter of the hearing called by the Oil
3	Conservation Division on its own motion for an order
4	creating and extending certain pools in Lea and Roosevelt
5	Counties, New Mexico.
6	Call for appearances.
7	MR. STOVALL: Robert G. Stovall of Santa Fe on behalf
8	of the Division.
9	EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any other appearances?
10	Do you have a witness, Mr. Stovall?
11	MR. STOVALL: I think so, yes.
12	EXAMINER STOGNER: We will have you stand and be
13	sworn.
14	(Whereupon the witness was duly
15	sworn.)
16	ROY JOHNSON,
17	the Witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was
18	examined and testified as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. STOVALL:
21	Q. What's your name?
22	A. Roy Johnson.
23	Q. As where do you work?
24	A. Here.
25	Q. In what capacity?

- A. Senior geologist.
- Q. With what agency?
 - A. Oil Conservation Division.
- Q. And are you prepared to make certain recommendations with respect to the nomenclature of certain pools in Lea and Roosevelt Counties, New Mexico?
 - A. I am.
- Q. Are your recommendations prepared in the form of an exhibit?
 - A. They are.
 - Q. How is that exhibit identified?
- 12 A. 1.

- Q. Have you compared that exhibit with the docket that's had been prepared for today and noticed any differences?
- A. There were two differences between the exhibit and the docket. The exhibit is wrong, paragraph F, concerning the East Nadine-Abo pool. It should read oil not gas. And paragraph T, in the East Lusk-Bone Spring pool, it appears on the docket as Section 36 and it should be Section 35.
- Q. Other than those differences, you recommend that the nomenclature for the pools as stated in the docket and shown on your exhibit be adopted?
 - A. I do.

1	Q. Do you have anything further to add to your
2	testimony?
3	A. No.
4	Q. You have looked at the exhibit prepared in this
5	case; is that correct?
6	A. I have.
7	MR. STOVALL: I move the admission of Exhibit 1, and I
8	have nothing further.
9	EXAMINER STOGNER: Assuming there is no objection,
10	Exhibit 1 will be admitted in evidence.
11	(Division Exhibit 1 was admitted
12	in evidence.)
13	EXAMINER STOGNER: I don't have any questions of this
14	witness. If there are no questions, he may be excused.
15	If there is nothing further in Case No. 10240, this case
16	will be taken under advisement. Hearing adjourned.
17	(The foregoing hearing was concluded at the
18	approximate hour of 2:25 p.m.)
19	* * *
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
2) ss. COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
3	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4	
5	I, Susan G. Ptacek, a Certified Court Reporter and
6	Notary Public, do HEREBY CERTIFY that I stenographically
7	reported the proceedings before the Oil Conservation
8	Division, and that the foregoing is a true, complete and
9	accurate transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as
10	appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed
11	under my personal supervision.
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to nor
13	employed by any of the parties hereto, and have no interest
14	in the outcome thereof.
15	DATED at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 11th day of March,
16	1991.
17	Olexan) 11 Placed
18	SUSAN G. PTACEK My Commission Expires: Certified Court Reporter
19	December 10, 1993 Notary Public
20	I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
21	a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 10240
22	heard by me on 1 Ferrary 1991.
23	Oil Conservation Division
2 4	On Conservation Division

25