

## **Brooks, David K**

---

**From:** Perrin, Charlie  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 16, 2002 11:27 AM  
**To:** Brooks, David K; Catanach, David  
**Subject:** hearing

David

Lets ask for a continuance for these operators. I believe the majority of these wells will be in compliance before June 1,

The following operators continue to work on their plans

R J enterprise, working on plan  
J C well service Working on plan  
Chaparral Energy well worked over waiting for disposal well completion  
NM&O waiting on facility work on disposal,  
Smokey, selling to Rio Chama,  
Hart working on plan  
Torreon working on plan  
Mountain states, working on plan  
Noel Reynolds working on plan

These operators are in compliance

Clayton Investment well is P&A DISMISS  
Manana Gas inc DISMISS  
Phoneix Hydrocarbons DISMISS  
Laquinta Oil Co DISMISS  
US Enercorp DISMISS

In discussing Jimmy Roberson wells with the BLM they indicated,  
"BLM HAS REFUSED ROBERSON AS THE OPERATOR, WELLS WILL REVERT BACK TO OTHER OPERATORS"  
which will be Central Resources and Elm Ridge

Thanks and have a great week  
Charlie

ps, FYI it is my understanding from talking to David Catanach that we can not dismiss any part of the case until we put it on.

## Brooks, David K

---

**From:** Perrin, Charlie  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2002 8:54 PM  
**To:** Brooks, David K  
**Subject:** closet well///\\ inactive well dismiss and continue list

David

Thanks for letting me know on the closet well. I will talk to you next week, I know you are busy and I understand.

attached is the request for dismissal and for continuance for the hearing,  
if you have any questions let me know  
Thanks



David Brooks.doc

Charlie

David Brooks

Here is a list of the operators going to hearing on January 24, 2002.

Docket NO. 03-02

CASE 12739-A Continued From October 18,2001 Hearing,

Chaparral energy Inc, 1, well has been worked over and ready to produce waiting on SWD, **DISMISS**

Phoenix Hydrocarbons Operating Corp, 2, Wells are P&A **DISMISS**

Manana Gas Inc, 2, Wells are in compliance **DISMISS**

R-J Enterprises 3 plugged 1 producing **DISMISS**

**Please request an extension until April 2002 for the following operators in this case**

J C Well Service, 10 **extension till April**

N M & O Operating co, 9, ALL but two are producing, **extension till April**

Smokey Oil Company, 1, selling well to Rio Chama, **extension till April**

Clayton investment Co, 1, well to be P&A, on **extension till April**

Hart Oil & Gas inc. 40, working on **extension till April**

Jimmy Roberson Energy Corp, 6, working on **extension till April**

Laquinta Oil CO, 2, BLM, Pat Hester, checking to see if tribe took wells, on **extension till April**

Torreón Oil Co, 7, has plugged 3 and still working on **extension till April**

Noel Reynolds, 2, will be worked on after TORREON, on **extension till April**

U S Enercorp LLC, 3, working on **extension till April**

Mountain States Petroleum Corp, 9, **extension till April**

**David, I believe I have covered all the operators we took to hearing and asked for the continuance on! I will be out of the office till Wednesday morning,**

**Talk to you then**

**Thanks for your help**

**Charlie**

## Brooks, David K

---

**To:** Perrin, Charlie  
**Subject:** RE: hearing

Charlie:

The continued hearing for Aztec is set for January 24. Let's wait till the week of January 22; then request dismissal of those operators who are in full compliance and a further continuance for those that need additional time, assuming you think they are making reasonable progress. If most are making reasonable progress, but a few are not, that would seem to be the best procedure. On the other hand, if many are NOT making reasonable progress, it might be well to proceed with the hearing to get one step further toward getting compliance orders. Since the orders we are seeking in these proceedings are compliance orders that will give the operators alternatives, not plugging orders, proceeding with the hearing won't hurt the ones who are progressing, and we will have the orders so we can move to enforcement against the recalcitrant ones. If you have questions please let me know.

DB

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Perrin, Charlie  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 10, 2002 3:26 PM  
**To:** Brooks, David K  
**Subject:** hearing

David

The inactive operators seem to be in the process of doing some type of work.  
I expect a few to be ready to dismiss in the next few weeks,  
sense all the operators are in one group, what do you want me to do  
I think I need to ask for the continuance for all the operators, but do I bring them up at the first opportunity after they are in compliance to dismiss their part of the case,

Thanks  
Charlie

## Brooks, David K

---

**To:** Perrin, Charlie  
**Subject:** RE: Hearing

Charlie:

I believe that if the operators are working on their wells it is appropriate to request another continuance. You should decide how long based on how long you think is reasonable to allow under the circumstances so that most of the wells will be back in compliance.

Let me know what will be your suggested time frame.

DB

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Perrin, Charlie  
**Sent:** Monday, January 07, 2002 9:30 AM  
**To:** Brooks, David K  
**Subject:** Hearing

David

So far in my research it appears that every operator we took to hearing is in the process of conducting compliance, do we ask for a continuance for 90 days to keep it active?

hope you had a great weekend and are ready for a super week  
Charlie