1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2	ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
3	OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
4	CASE 10,599
5	
6	EXAMINER HEARING
7	
8	
9	
10	IN THE MATTER OF:
11	
12	Application of Mewbourne Oil Company for
13	compulsory pooling and an unorthodox gas well location, Eddy County, New Mexico
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
16	
17	ORIGINAL RECEIVED
18	DFC 07 1992
19	BEFORE: MICHAEL E. STOGNER, EXAMINER OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
20	
21	
22	STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
23	SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
24	November 19, 1992
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	FOR THE DIVISION:
4	ROBERT G. STOVALL
5	Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division
6	State Land Office Building Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
7	
8	FOR THE APPLICANT:
9	HINKLE, COX, EATON, COFFIELD & HENSLEY Attorneys at Law
10	By: JAMES G. BRUCE 218 Montezuma
11	P.O. Box 2068 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2068
12	Santa re, New Mexico 67304 2006
13	* * *
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2		Page Number
3	Appearances	2
4	Exhibits	4
5	PAUL HADEN	
6	Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	5
7	Examination by Examiner Stogner	15
8	DEXTER HARMON	
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	17
10	Examination by Examiner Stogner	22
11	Certificate of Reporter	27
12	* * *	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		4
1	EXHIBITS	
2	APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS:	
3	Exhibit 1	7
4	Exhibit 2	7
5	Exhibit 3	8
6	Exhibit 4	11
7	Exhibit 5	12
8	Exhibit 6	13
9	Exhibit 6A	13
10	Exhibit 7	13
11	Exhibit 8	14
12	Exhibit 9	18
13	Exhibit 10	19
14	Exhibit 11	20
15	Exhibit 12	20
16	* * *	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had
2	at 8:45 a.m.:
3	EXAMINER STOGNER: Let's call the next case,
4	Number 10,599.
5	MR. STOVALL: Application of Mewbourne Oil
6	Company for compulsory pooling and an unorthodox gas
7	well location, Eddy County, New Mexico.
8	EXAMINER STOGNER: Call for appearances.
9	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce from the
10	Hinkle Law Firm in Santa Fe, representing the
11	Applicant.
12	I have two witnesses to be sworn.
13	EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other appearances in
14	this matter?
15	Will the witnesses please stand to be sworn
16	at this time?
17	(Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
18	EXAMINER STOGNER: You may proceed.
19	PAUL HADEN,
20	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn
21	upon his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. BRUCE
24	Q. Will you please state your full name and city
25	of residence?

1	A. My name is Paul Haden. I reside in Midland,
2	Texas.
3	Q. And who do you work for and in what capacity?
4	A. I work for Mewbourne Oil Company as a
5	petroleum landman.
6	Q. And have you previously testified before the
7	Division as a landman and been accepted as an expert
8	petroleum landman?
9	A. Yes I have.
LO	Q. And are you familiar with the land matters
11	involved in this case?
12	A. Yes, I am.
13	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Haden
14	as an expert landman.
15	EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Haden is so qualified.
16	Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Haden, would you briefly
۱7	state what it is that Mewbourne seeks in this
18	Application?
19	A. Mewbourne seeks an order pooling all mineral
20	interests from the base of the Abo formation to the
21	base of the Morrow formation underlying the south half
22	of Section 36, Township 17 South, Range 27 East, for
23	all pools, formations spaced on 160 and 320 acres.
24	Mewbourne also requests approval of an
25	unorthodox gas well location for its south-half spacing

unit.

- Q. Referring to Exhibit 1, would you discuss its contents?
- A. Exhibit Number 1 is a land plat of the area. The acreage shaded in yellow is our proposed spacing unit for this well. The red dot indicates our proposed location, which is 990 feet from the west line and 660 from the south line of said Section 36.

This well will be drilled to test the Morrow formation, sufficient to test the Morrow formation.

- Q. Mr. Haden, the ownership looks pretty broken up here. Will you have another map or plat later on identifying in a little better detail the offset ownership?
 - A. Yes, I will.
- Q. Okay. Moving on to Exhibit 2, would you discuss the parties whom you seek to force-pool?
- A. Exhibit Number 2 is a listing of the ownership currently uncommitted and Mewbourne Oil Company's interest in this land.

We are currently pooling Alma DeShaza

Granberry; Walter E. Granberry, Jr.; Gene Reischman,

Personal Representative of the Estate of L.J.

Reischman, Deceased; Kathryn Kersey Alexander and Marie

Kersey Wade, Trustees of the Revocable Living Trust of

1	Harold Kersey and Mary Ellen Kersey; Judyann Medeiros,
2	trustee of the Thelma Kersey Methvin Trust dated April
3	30th, 1987; Margaret Holcomb; Peyton Yates, Frank
4	Yates, Jr., and S.P. Yates, Personal Representatives of
5	the Estate of Martin Yates, III, Deceased; S.P. Yates,
6	B.W. Harper and Frank Yates, Jr., Personal
7	Representatives of the Estate of Lillie M. Yates,
8	Deceased; Yates Petroleum Corporation; Thomas W. Flynn;
9	and Fina Oil and Chemical Company.
10	MR. STOVALL: Mr. Haden, would you provide a
11	copy of the exhibit to the court reporter so he can get
12	a spelling of all these names?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, he has that.
14	MR. STOVALL: He has that, oh, good.
15	Q. (By Mr. Bruce) With respect to these people
16	on Exhibit 2, are there any who you could not locate?
17	A. There is one particular individual, being
18	Thomas W. Flynn. His last known address was in
19	Riverside, Florida, which in our later exhibits
20	shows his address, which the letter was returned to us.
21	Q. Okay. As to the other interest owners,
22	moving on to Exhibit 3, could you discuss your efforts
23	to obtain your voluntary joinder?
24	A. Okay. Looking at Exhibit Number 3, Fina Oil
25	and Chemical Company was first contacted April 8th,

1992. They have since furnished us a farmout agreement, which we have been negotiating the terms of such agreement with them and changes of the terms of the farmout agreement which we've requested.

You'll note on November 5th, 1992, we had submitted them an amendatory letter as to their farmout agreement.

They currently are reviewing the contents of this letter, and I have previously been over to their office to discuss the contents of this letter, and they indicated these probably would be okay with their company.

Also --

- Q. But you haven't received final approval?
- A. I have not received an executed agreement from them and final approval of same.

As to Yates Petroleum Corporation and the Yates entities, being the estate of Martin Yates, III, and Lillie M. Yates, both deceased, there is some correspondence contained in this Exhibit Number 3. They tentatively have agreed to join us in this well as to the extent of their interest in the spacing unit.

They are waiting for us to deliver them a joint operating agreement for their consideration prior to finally joining us in this well, of which we are in

the process of submitting the same to them.

The other -- You'll note there are some other individuals and companies.

Kersey and Company, a letter dated May 21st, 1992, that -- We offered to purchase their interests at that time. There is a later letter in here requesting them to farm out or join. Mr. Kersey, apparently, I've been told, died sometime in September. Since that time, they evidently have sold some of their interest, some of these parties being Margaret Holcomb, Kathryn Kersey Alexander and Marie Kersey Wade, trustees; Alma Granberry; Judyann Medeiros, Trustee; and they had sold also to Gene Reischman -- actually, the estate of Lester J. Reischman.

All these people have agreed to sell their interests to us. We are finalizing a trade with them in this regard as to the preparation of a mutually acceptable form of assignment.

- Q. Once again, those last -- I think it was about five people you mentioned, they derived their interest from Kersey and Company?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And your first contact with Kersey was about six months ago?
 - A. That's also correct.

1	Q. Now, if this force-pooling is granted and you
2	later come to terms with any of these parties, will
3	they be will you notify the OCD that they're no
4	longer bound by the pooling order?
5	A. Yes, I will. They will be dismissed from the
6	force-pooling.
7	Q. And in your opinion, have you made a good-
8	faith effort to obtain the voluntary joinder of these
9	parties?
10	A. Yes, I think we have.
11	Q. Does Mewbourne request that it be named
12	operator of this well?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. In referring to Exhibit 4, would you briefly
15	itemize the well cost for the proposed well?
16	A. Exhibit Number 4 is an estimated well cost.
17	This well is to be drilled to an approximate depth of
18	10,050 feet. The cost to casing point is \$448,100, and
19	the total completed cost is \$762,305.
20	Q. And is this proposed cost in line with the
21	cost of other wells that Mewbourne and other operators
22	have drilled to this depth in this area?
23	A. Yes, that's correct.
24	Q. And in fact, Mewbourne has about four or five
25	other wells they've drilled within a mile or two of

12 1 this well; is that correct? 2 Α. Yes, that's also correct. Do you have a recommendation as to the 3 0. amounts that Mewbourne should be paid for the 4 5 supervision and administrative expenses? Α. We're recommending \$6425 a month be allowed 6 7 for a drilling well and \$642 per month be allowed for a 8 producing well. And are these amounts in line with the 9 0. 10 amounts normally charged by Mewbourne and other 11 operators in this area for wells of this type? 12 That's what our records show. 13 Q. And what penalty do you recommend against nonconsenting interest owners? 14 15 Costs, well costs, plus 200 percent. This is a figure used in operating agreements in this area of 16 17 New Mexico. Our geologist will also discuss the 18 19 reasonableness of the proposed penalty as well as the 20 proposed unorthodox location.

Q. Was notice of the force-pooling portion of this Application given to all of the persons you

previously listed, other than Thomas W. Flynn?

21

22

23

24

25

A. Yes, these are described in a packet of data marked Exhibit Number 5.

1	Q. And these are the letters and certified
2	return receipts?
3	A. That's also correct.
4	Q. Now, moving to the unorthodox location part
5	of the Application, please refer to Exhibits 6 and 6A
6	and discuss the offset operators.
7	A. Exhibit Number 6 is a plat with a numbers
8	allocated to different tracts.
9	And tract 1 it represents in the west half of
10	the northeast quarter of Section 35, Mewbourne Oil
11	Company as the owner. And tract 2, being the east half
12	of the northeast quarter, Section 35, is Mewbourne Oil
13	Company and Devon Energy Corporation.
14	All these other tracts are listed on this
15	plat, and the Exhibit 6A describes the tract ownership.
16	Q. And it itemizes who is the owner of each
17	tract?
18	A. Right, that's what it does.
19	Q. And have all of these offset operators or
20	lessees been notified of the unorthodox location
21	portion of the Application?
22	A. Yes, they have, and you'll see in Exhibit
23	Number 7, they were notified the offset owners or
24	operators were notified.
25	Also attached is a couple of waiver letters

1	executed by A.W. Rutter, Jr., independent executor of
2	the estate of A.W. Rutter. Also G.L. Wilbanks, W.E.
3	Jeffers, and Arco Oil and Gas Company. Also Fina Oil
4	and Chemical Company.
5	Q. And is Exhibit 8 your affidavit regarding the
6	notice given to all persons interested in this case?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. And were Exhibits 1 through 8 prepared by you
9	or under your direction?
LO	A. Yes, that's correct.
L1	Q. And in your opinion, is the granting of this
L2	Application in the interests of conservation and the
L3	prevention of waste?
L4	A. Yes.
L5	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, at this time I move
L6	the admission of Exhibits 1 through 8.
L7	EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 1 through 8 will
L8	be admitted into evidence.
19	MR. STOVALL: Mr. Bruce, we would request
20	that you or Mr. Haden prepare Exhibit A to Exhibit 8,
21	if you will, which lists the parties to whom the notice
22	was given.
23	MR. BRUCE: Okay.
24	MR. STOVALL: It just
25	THE WITNESS: This being the same parties

1 who --MR. STOVALL: Yeah, it would be the same 2 parties that show up in the letter. It's just easier 3 4 to manage, when you're looking at it --5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I understand. 6 MR. STOVALL: -- and checking it, to not have 7 to go through every single letter. **EXAMINATION** 8 BY EXAMINER STOGNER: 9 10 Mr. Haden, in referring to Exhibit Number 2, Q. on the first page I show Yates show up twice. 11 On that first tract or first amount of 12 13 acreage described you have Yates Petroleum Corporation uncommitted down there at the bottom. 14 15 Α. Right. 16 Q. And then if you go on down to the bottom of the page, you have Yates Petroleum Corporation again, 17 but they show to have joined. 18 19 What's --20 That's a typo. Α. 21 Oh, okay. Q. 22 Α. That should have had "uncommitted" in parentheses there. My secretary is good, but 23 occasionally she makes mistakes. 24 25 Q. So looking at the bottom of the second page,

1	Mewbourne controls or owns 42 approximately 42 1/2
2	percent, and you're force-pooling, at this time,
3	approximately 57 1/2 percent; is that correct?
4	A. That's right.
5	Q. On your overhead charge of \$6425 and \$642,
6	this is for a well
7	MR. STOVALL: 10,050.
8	Q. (By Examiner Stogner) going to a depth of
9	10,050?
LO	A. Right.
L1	Q. Now, you mentioned these figures were
L2	utilized in other compulsory pooling cases or voluntary
L3	pooling orders in the surrounding area.
L4	A. Right, these rates were described in the
L5	previous testimony of a Case Number 10,484. And an
L6	order was issued under that, being R-9684. This was as
L7	to the north half of Section 35 in Township 17 South,
L8	Range 28 East.
L9	Q. And what was the depth of that well?
20	A. That was roughly 10,500, as I recall.
21	Q. A Morrow test, essentially?
22	A. Right.
23	EXAMINER STOGNER: I have no other questions
24	of Mr. Haden at this time. You may be excused.
25	Mr. Bruce?

1	MR. BRUCE: Okay, one thing I'd like to point
2	out, in the case that Mr. Haden just mentioned he did
3	present testimony on the rates. I don't remember
4	exactly what the dollar figures were that the OCD
5	granted for overhead rates.
6	THE WITNESS: I've got those if you'd like
7	them.
8	EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay, why don't you read
9	them to me?
10	MR. BRUCE: The actual rates granted were
11	\$6167 and \$626.50, although Mr. Haden did testify as to
12	the rates he just requested.
13	Call Mr. Harmon to the stand.
14	DEXTER HARMON,
15	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn
16	upon his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. BRUCE:
19	Q. Would you please state your name for the
20	record?
21	A. My name is Dexter Harmon.
22	Q. And where do you reside?
23	A. Midland, Texas.
24	Q. Who are you employed by and in what capacity?
25	A. I'm employed by Mewbourne Oil Company. I'm a

district geologist. 1 2 Q. Have you previously testified before the 3 Division as an expert petroleum geologist? 4 Α. Yes, I have. 5 Q. And are you familiar with the geological matters relating to this case? 6 7 Α. Yes, I am. Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Harmon as an 8 Q. 9 expert petroleum geologist. EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Harmon is so 10 11 qualified. 12 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Harmon, would you please 13 refer to Exhibit Number 9 and discuss the production in the area of interest? 14 15 Exhibit Number 9 is a Morrow production study 16 of all the wells that have penetrated the Morrow in a 17 nine-section area. 18 You can see on this map, there have been ten 19 Morrow wells drilled in this area, of which four of 20 them are good wells, being the well in the north half 21 of Section 1, the west half of Section 6, and the two wells in Section 7. 22 On this map you can see that we'd like to 23 24 drill our Chalk Bluff 36 State Number 1 at a proposed

location of 660 from the south line and 990 from the

25

west line, Section 36, 17 South, 27 East, Eddy County,
New Mexico.

Also shown on this map is a cross-section, K to K', which will delineate the different Morrow sands that we're interested in.

- Q. Why don't you move on to that cross-section and discuss those sands? And that is marked Exhibit 10.
- A. Exhibit 10 is a Morrow stratigraphic cross-section labeled K to K'. It goes from the northwest to the southeast through this nine-section area. This is the general strike deposition of -- direction of the Morrow sands. It's a four-well cross-section.

Each well shows a resistivity log and porosity log, except for the Mewbourne Chalk Bluff Federal Number 2, which is a cased-hole log.

It shows all of the stands given a color that we're interested in hitting in this area, Middle Morrow Green Sand, Lower Morrow Orange and Brown Sand and a basal Morrow Yellow Detrital zone, and of all the pay in different wells in this area.

The first well in the cross-section, Carper Sivley Magruder Number 15, had a drill stem test in the Morrow that covered an interval of 9545 to 9850.

During this drill stem test, they reported flowing 7

million cubic feet of gas a day. The well was later

IP'd from what we call Lower Morrow Brown Sand

perforations for 60 barrels of oil per day, but the

production never showed up in the production book, so I

guess it was never hooked up.

The next two wells on the cross-section were drilled by Mewbourne Oil Company. The first one is the Chalk Bluff Federal Number 2, which is currently producing from the Lower Morrow Orange Sand at about 1.8 million cubic feet of gas a day, and the other well is the Chalk Bluff "6" State Number 1, which is producing from the Lower Morrow Brown Sand at a current rate of over 2 million cubic feet of gas a day.

We've got isopachs of the sand, a couple of the sands shown in cross-section.

- Q. Mr. Harmon, does the Brown Sand show up in the Mewbourne well immediately to the south of the proposed location?
- A. The Lower Morrow Brown Sand is not present in the Mewbourne Chalk Bluff Federal Number 2 well in the north half of Section 1, but it is the sand that was perf'd and IP'd in the well in Section 35, and also it's the big producer in our well in Section 6, and it is one of the main objectives of this prospect.
 - Q. Would you then move on to Exhibits 11 and 12

together, which are the isopachs, and discuss them for the Examiner?

A. Exhibit Number 11 is a gross Lower Morrow Brown Sand isopach. It's contoured on a 10-foot interval. It's the Lower Morrow Brown Sand on the cross-section.

You can see the south half of Section 36, the proposed location is marked by a circle, while the standard location is marked by and X.

In this area we feel like we need ten foot of net porosity to make a good well in one of these Morrow sands.

A lot of these numbers on the map are -- the numbers on the map are the net porosity greater than 8 percent over the gross sand, and you can see that in a lot of instances the net porosity does not equal the gross amount of sand, so you need a little more gross sand to insure that you get a -- ten foot of net sand and you're able to make a commercial well.

- Q. And does the same apply to the Orange Sand?
- A. Yes.

Q. With respect to the compulsory-pooling portion of the Application, what risk do you -- risk penalty do you recommend against nonconsenting interest owners?

1	A. We recommend well costs plus 200 percent.
2	Q. And in your opinion, is that justified by the
3	geologic risk involved in drilling this well?
4	A. Yes, it is.
5	Q. And were Exhibits 9 through 12 prepared by
6	you?
7	A. Yes, they were.
8	Q. And in your opinion, is the granting of this
9	Application in the interests of conservation and the
10	prevention of waste?
11	A. Yes, it is.
12	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, at this time I
13	would move the admission of Exhibits 9 through 12.
14	EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 9 through 12 will
15	be admitted into evidence at this time.
16	EXAMINATION
17	BY EXAMINER STOGNER:
18	Q. Mr. Harmon, you said that nine foot of net
19	porosity is needed to get a good well. Is this for
20	each zone or a combination, say, the Orange and the
21	Brown?
22	A. Nine foot Excuse me, ten foot of net
23	porosity is what we're looking for to make a well, and
24	we could have a few feet in Orange and a few feet in
25	Brown. If it added up to 10, we'd be happy and set

pipe on the well.

- Q. Okay. Now, referring back to your cross-section, you show a Yellow zone, the Yellow Detrital, and --
- A. That zone produced in the Chalk Bluff Federal Number 2, in the north half of Section 1. We set a cast-iron bridge plug above that zone -- it was a poor producer -- in 9 of 92, and we're currently producing out of the Lower Morrow Orange Sand. The well has been recompleted.
- Q. Do you propose to test this, I assume, according to your map, that you propose to at least --
- A. We'll drill through the zone and certainly evaluate it.
- Q. And that 10,050 foot will give you enough depth to be able to penetrate that zone?
- A. Yes, it will. You can see from the structure on our isopach maps that we'll be going updip, oh, almost 70 feet, and that should take care of it.
- Q. You show another proposed well, and that is the Chalk Bluff Federal Number 3. That's not the subject of this case today, but is this well going to be based upon what you find in this one today, or the well that you're proposing today?
 - A. That well is already -- The case has already

1	been heard for that well, and it was approved, and that
2	well will be spudding before the end of the month.
3	Q. Okay. Would that have been the previous
4	case, Order R-9684, that was alluded to earlier?
5	MR. BRUCE: No, no.
6	MR. STOVALL: That was just an unorthodox-
7	location case, right? You were talking about a force-
8	pooling case?
9	MR. BRUCE: The force-pooling case was heard
10	early this year.
11	MR. HADEN: That was back in June or
12	MR. BRUCE: The case regarding overhead rates
13	was heard sometime early this year, and this the
14	case on the Chalk Bluff Number 3 was heard in October
15	of this year.
16	EXAMINER STOGNER: And that was a compulsory-
17	pooling case?
18	MR. BRUCE: The Which?
19	EXAMINER STOGNER: For the Number 3?
20	MR. BRUCE: The Chalk Bluff Number 3 was not.
21	It was a nonstandard location and simultaneous
22	dedication.
23	MR. STOVALL: Is that the one where the
24	Has an order been issued on that?
25	MR. BRUCE: Yes, about two weeks ago.

1	MR. STOVALL: Is that the one where the
2	Division granted an exception to its standard policy
3	and allowed simultaneous production?
4	MR. BRUCE: Yes, the two wells the
5	existing well in the south half, which is the Chalk
6	Bluff Number 1, and then that proposed well that the
7	Examiner was talking about.
8	MR. STOVALL: But that order did permit those
9	two wells to produce simultaneously?
10	MR. BRUCE: That's correct.
11	MR. STOVALL: The Number 1 was a fairly low
12	producer; is that right?
13	MR. BRUCE: That's correct.
14	MR. STOVALL: Okay.
15	THE WITNESS: And we'll be spudding that well
16	before the end of the month. We're waiting on a rig
17	right now, which is
18	Q. (By Examiner Stogner) Mr. Harmon, since
19	we're on the Number 3 subject, were you the witness at
20	that particular case?
21	A. Yes, I was.
22	Q. Did you have the same geological information
23	presented at that time as you are today?
24	A. Yes, I did.
25	Q. And did it extend up there into Section 36,

1	so if I lay these over with those exhibits I'd see the
2	same geological information?
3	A. These are the same maps.
4	Q. Okay. In fact, I see that they were prepared
5	in September of 1992, looking down at the bottom of
6	these exhibits.
7	A. All we've added is a proposed location of 36.
8	EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other questions of
9	Mr. Harmon?
10	If not, he may be excused.
11	Mr. Bruce, do you have anything further in
12	this case?
13	MR. BRUCE: Nothing further, Mr. Examiner.
14	EXAMINER STOGNER: Pending the additional
15	attachment to Exhibit Number 8, which will be submitted
16	as Exhibit Number 8A, the list for Mr. Stovall I'll
17	keep the record open for that particular information.
18	Other than that, I'll take this case under advisement.
19	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded
20	at 9:15 a.m.)
21	* * *
22	I do hereby to My that the foregoing is
23	a constituent of the proceedings in the Exeminer treating of Care No. 10599.
24	Medrd by me of 19 flor. 1992.
25	Oil Conservation Division

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
4) ss. COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
5	
6	I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court
7	Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the
8	foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil
9	Conservation Division was reported by me; that I
10	transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true
11	and accurate record of the proceedings.
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or
13	employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in
14	this matter and that I have no personal interest in the
15	final disposition of this matter.
16	WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL November 22nd, 1992.
17	lice for a
18	STEVEN T. BRENNER
19	CCR No. 7
20	My commission expires: October 14, 1994
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	