

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 17 October 1984

8 EXAMINER HEARING

9 IN THE MATTER OF:

10 Application of TXO Production Com- CASE
11 pany for compulsory pooling, Lea 8383
12 County, New Mexico.

13 BEFORE: Gilbert P. Quintana, Examiner

14
15 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

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

18 For the Oil Conservation Division: Jeff Taylor
19 Attorney at Law
20 Legal Counsel to the Division
21 State Land Office Bldg.
22 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

23
24 For the Applicant:
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

MR. QUINTANA: We will call next Case 8383.

MR. TAYLOR: The application of TXO Production Corporation for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico.

The applicant has requested that this case also be continued.

MR. QUINTANA: Case 8383 will be continued until October 31st, 1984.

(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. 8383, heard by me on OCT. 17 1984.
Gilbert P. Quintana 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 31 October 1984

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of TXO Production Cor- CASE
10 poration for compulsory pooling, 8383
11 Lea County, New Mexico.

12 BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

13 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

14
15
16 A P P E A R A N C E S

17
18
19 For the Oil Conservation Division: Jeff Taylor
20 Attorney at Law
21 Legal Counsel to the Division
22 State Land Office Bldg.
23 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

24 For the Applicant: W. Thomas Kellahin
25 Attorney at Law
KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN
P. O. Box 2265
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

I N D E X

DAVID M. HUNDLEY

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	3
Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner	12

JOHN TITTL

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	14
------------------------------------	----

E X H I B I T S

TXO Exhibit One, Plat	5
TXO Exhibit Two, Correspondence	8
TXO Exhibit Three, Memo	10
TXO Exhibit Four, AFE	11
TXO Exhibit Five, Production Map	15
TXO Exhibit Six, Contour Map	17
TXO Exhibit Seven, Contour Map	19
TXO Exhibit Eight, Contour Map	20
TXO Exhibit Nine, Cross Section	20

1
2
3 MR. STOGNER: We will now call
4 Case Number 8383.

5 MR. TAYLOR: The application of
6 TXO Production Corporation for a compulsory pooling, Lea
7 County, New Mexico.

8 MR. KELLAHIN: If the Examiner
9 please, I'm Tom Kellahin of Santa Fe, New Mexico, appearing
10 on behalf of the applicant and I have two witnesses to be
11 sworn.

12 MR. STOGNER: Are there any
13 other appearances in this matter?

14 If not, will the witnesses
15 please stand to be sworn?

16 (Witnesses sworn.)

17 DAVID M. HUNDLEY,
18 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
19 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

22 Q Mr. Hundley, for the record would you
23 please state your name and occupation?

24 A My name is David Hundley. I'm a landman
25 for TXO Production Corp., Midland, Texas.

1
2 Q Mr. Hundley, have you previously testi-
3 fied before the Oil Conservation Division as a landman and
4 had your qualifications accepted and made a matter of re-
5 cord?

6 A Yes, I have.

7 Q Pursuant to your employment as a landman
8 with TXO Production Corporation, have you made a study of
9 the land matters that are relevant to this compulsory pool-
10 ing application?

11 A Yes, I have.

12 Q Would you describe generally for the Exa-
13 miner what TXO proposes to accomplish with this compulsory
14 pooling application?

15 A TXO seeks an order pooling all the miner-
16 al interests in the Drinkard and Strawn formations under-
17 lying the east half southeast quarter, and all mineral in-
18 terests in all other formations from the surface to 11,500
19 feet underlying the northeast quarter southeast quarter of
20 Section 33, Township 16 South, Range 37 East, Lea County,
21 New Mexico.

22 Q In order to form the necessary spacing
23 and proration units for the various pools involved in the
24 application, Mr. Hundley, have there been interest owners
25 that have as of today failed to agree to participate in the
drilling of the well or otherwise made some agreement with
TXO as the operator?

A Yes.

1
2 Q And have you been in contact with, or at-
3 tempted to notify those companies and individuals of TXO's
4 application?

5 A Yes, we have.

6 MR. KELLAHIN: At this time,
7 Mr. Stogner, we tender Mr. Hundley as an expert petroleum
8 landman.

9 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Hundley is so
10 qualified.

11 I'd to like to interject at
12 this time, if I may, the docket and the advertisement both
13 said the northeast half of the southeast quarter. This was
14 a typographic error; fortunately, however, most people that
15 read our ads understand our descriptions and we see no prob-
16 lem with this having to readvertise and delaying the process
17 any longer.

18 So we will continue .

19 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you.

20 Q Let me refer to Exhibit Number One, Mr.
21 Hundley, which is the land plat, and have you simply ident-
22 ify for us the east half of the southeast quarter of the
23 section, and tell us generally where this property is lo-
24 cated.

25 A Okay. The proposed location is the
circle in red on the yellow colored tract, which is, of
course, the east half of the southeast quarter of Section
33, 16 South, 37 East.

1
2 This is about a mile from the stateline
3 to the east and we are several miles east of the City of
4 Lovington.

5 Q In the event the operator is able to ob-
6 tain production out of the Lovington Paddock Pool, what ac-
7 reage would be dedicated to the well?

8 A The spacing for the Paddock formation is
9 40 acres and for this well would be the northeast quarter of
10 the southeast quarter, Section 33.

11 Q In the event the operator obtains produc-
12 tion out of either the West Knowles Drinkard or the Casey
13 Strawn Pools, what will be the acreage dedication to the
14 well?

15 A The proration unit for both the Drinkard
16 and Strawn formations is 80 acres and will be the east half
17 of the southeast quarter of Section 33, or all of the ac-
18 reage colored yellow on the exhibit.

19 Q All right. Mr. Hundley, do you have a
20 copy of the amended application that was filed for the ap-
21 plicant in this case?

22 A Yes, I do.

23 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin, the
24 amended application that you're referring to --

25 MR. KELLAHIN: Was filed Sep-
tember 28th, --

MR. STOGNER: Thank you, sir.

MR. KELLAHIN: -- 1984.

1
2 Q Mr. Hundley, if you'll refer to page two
3 of the amended application, all of the companies and indivi-
4 duals named on page two and then going on to page three,
5 will those companies' and individuals' interest change be-
6 tween a 40-acre proration unit and an 80-acre proration
7 unit?

8 A No, they will not.

9 Q When we go down the list of individuals
10 and companies, Mr. Hundley, let's have you indicate for us
11 what is the status with regards to those companies or indi-
12 viduals participating in this well, starting off with Sun
13 Oil Company?

14 A Okay. Sun Oil Company has agreed to
15 lease to TXO.

16 Q All right, sir, Moncor?

17 A They've also decided to lease.

18 Q Shipp?

19 A Mr. Shipp's interest, we believe, is not
20 applicable to this tract of land --

21 Q All right, sir.

22 A -- for further study.

23 Q Cleroy?

24 A Both Cleroy and Lanroy have agreed to
25 lease.

Q McGinley?

A Mr. McGinley has not agreed to anything
and requested that he be force pooled.

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 All right, and Sohio?

A Sohio, to be frank, could not make a decision in time and said go ahead and force pool us and we will try to participate before you drill the well.

Q All right. Petco?

A Petco did not want to lease or participate and asked to be force pooled.

Q All right. James Woods?

A Mr. Woods did not wish to participate, either.

Q Getty Oil?

A Getty Oil Company wishes to lease.

Q Felmont Oil?

A Felmont is like Mr. Shipp. We believe that they are not involved in this.

Q All right, Mr. Hundley, let's turn to Exhibit Number Two, which is a package of correspondence to the various parties to be subject to the pooling order, and if you'll simply identify for us the party, the date of the correspondence, and the purpose of your letter.

A Okay. The first one is a letter dated September 13th, 1984, to Cleroy, Inc., Lanroy, Inc., and J. R. McGinley, notifying them of the hearing, giving them the opportunity to lease or participate and also attached are the copies of the certified receipts.

With this letter we sent an Authority for Expenditure form should the addressee want to participate.

1
2 Q And what, if any, response did you re-
3 ceive from Mr. Cleroy or Lanroy, Inc.?

4 A Cleroy and Lanroy, Inc. have both signed
5 oil and gas leases.

6 Mr. McGinley has elected not to lease.

7 Q Okay.

8 A Or participate.

9 Q All right, sir, let's go to the next let-
10 ter, which is Sohio Petroleum.

11 A Okay, it's the same form letter dated
12 September 13th, 1984, giving Sohio the opportunity to lease
13 or participate and enclosing an AFE.

14 Q And you have attached to that the return
15 receipt card indicating that Sohio has received the letter.

16 A Yes.

17 Q All right, and what, if any, response did
18 you receive from Sohio?

19 A Sohio indicates a willingness to do some-
20 thing but they asked that we go ahead and force pool their
21 interest.

22 Q All right, sir, and the Petco, Limited,
23 letter.

24 Q Petco, Limited's letter, the same date,
25 on the same form with the certified receipts attached. Petco
has repoded that they wish to be force pooled.

Q All right, sir, and finally, Mr. Woods.

A Another letter on the same form dated

1
2 September 13th, 1984, certified receipts. Mr. Woods has not
3 responded to any of our correspondence and so he does not
4 choose to lease or participate.

5 Q All right, Mr. Hundley, let's turn to
6 what is marked as Applicant Exhibit Number Three and have
7 you identify this document.

8 A This is an interoffice memorandum from
9 TXO Production Corp. Accounting Department. It reflects the
10 overhead rates that our Accounting Department has instructed
11 us to use in preparation of operating agreements.

12 As you can see, on the left side of the
13 page, various areas of operation that TXO's involved in.

14 In the middle of the page is the well
15 depth and on the right side of the page is the -- are the
16 rates we'd like to use beginning April 1, 1984, through
17 March 31, 1985.

18 Q Is the Lea County, New Mexico property
19 that's the subject of this case in the West Texas District?

20 A Yes, it is.

21 Q And would this be a well at a depth be-
22 tween 4000 and 12,000 feet?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And what is the overhead charge you would
25 propose to include, then, in the forced pooling order on a
monthly basis while drilling and then during operations?

A The drilling well rate would be \$5,233.
The operating or producing well rate would be \$524 per

1
2 month.

3 Q Based upon your experience, Mr. Hundley,
4 in your opinion is that a fair and reasonable rate to in-
5 clude in the pooling order?

6 A Yes, it is.

7 Q All right, sir, let's turn then to Exhi-
8 bit Number Four and have you identify that exhibit for us.

9 A Exhibit Number Four is an Authority for
10 Expenditure, or AFE, for the drilling of the Carter F No. 1
11 Well, to be located 1980 from the south and 660 from the
12 east of Section 33, Township 16 South, Range 37 East, Lea
13 County, New Mexico. The proposed total depth is 11,500
14 feet.

15 Q Is this the proposed Authority for Expen-
16 diture that has been circulated among the various parties
17 involved in this well?

18 A Yes, it is.

19 Q And is it one that's been found accept-
20 able by those parties?

21 A Several of the parties we've sent it to
22 have signed it and returned it.

23 Q All right, sir, in your opinion is the
24 Authority for Expenditures as estimated on this Exhibit Four
25 fair and reasonable?

A Yes.

Q All right, sir. Mr. Hundley, when does
TXO propose to commence the drilling of this well?

1
2 A Are you familiar with the COPAS attach-
3 ment to operating agreements?

4 Q Is that going to be submitted as part of
5 the evidence today?

6 A No, COPAS is an acronym for an accounting
7 organization that sets out standards for the oil and gas in-
8 dustry, and we attach, as do most other companies, an ac-
9 counting procedure to our operating agreement that is pre-
pared by or under the direction of COPAS.

10 Q How thick is this COPAS?

11 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,
12 we'll be happy to bring you a copy of the COPAS attachment
13 this afternoon.

14 It's a model form used by, I
15 believe, virtually all operators in handling their account-
16 ing procedures, one of the provisions of which includes the
calculations of what we characterize as overhead.

17 I'd be happy to submit one of
18 those to you.

19 MR. STOGNER: Please do and we
20 will just make that a part of Exhibit Number Three.

21 MR. KELLAHIN: All right, sir.

22 Q Mr. Hundley, I'm somewhat confused also
23 on your statements about the interest of Mr. Shipp and Fel-
24 mont Oil Corporation. You have these on the list but you
stated that they are not included in that. For what reason?

25 A Okay. When we received the farmout

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

agreement from Texaco, Texaco also allowed us to examine their title opinions which they had prepared on this tract of land. The title opinion was dated May of 1982.

Subsequent investigations into the title and curative work revealed that the interest of Mr. Shipp would not be applicable to forced pooling hearing, and the same with Felmont Oil Corporation.

Q Okay.

MR. STOGNER: I have no further questions of Mr. Hundley.

Are there any other questions of this witness? If not, he may be excused.

JOHN TITTL,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q Mr. Tittl, will you please state your name and occupation?

A My name is John Tittl. I'm a geologist for TXO Production Corporation in Midland, Texas.

Q Mr. Tittl, have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division as a geologist?

A Yes, sir, I have.

Q And pursuant to your employment as a geo-

1
2 logist have you made an examination of the various geologic
3 and producing facts involved in this application?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, we
6 tender Mr. Tittl as an expert geologist.

7 MR. STOGNER: He is so quali-
8 fied.

9 Q Let me refer you, Mr. Tittl, to what we
10 have marked as Applicant Exhibit Number Five and have you
11 identify that for us.

12 A Yes, sir. That's a production map for
13 approximately one mile, a one mile radius around our pro-
14 posed drill location.

15 It's been color coded as to production,
16 starting shallow or going deeper, Paddock formation is
17 colored in green and production is given in cumulative pro-
18 duction of oil and gas over current production as of June or
19 average daily rate as of March, 1984.

20 Next is the Drinkard in pink and finally
21 the Strawn in blue.

22 Q The Paddock wells are spaced on 40 acres?

23 A Yes, sir.

24 Q And the Strawn and Drinkard are on 80
25 acres.

 A Uh-huh, that's correct.

 Q All right, let me direct your attention
first of all to the Paddock wells, Mr. Tittl.

1
2 If you'll look to the south in the Unit
3 letter A of Section 4.

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q There's a Mesa Petroleum Hightower well

6 --

7 A Yes, sir.

8 Q -- with a dry hole symbol? Would you de-
9 scribe for us what that well, what formation that well pene-
10 trated?

11 A Yes, sir. The Mesa Hightower was drilled
12 to the Drinkard and both the Paddock and Drinkard formations
13 were tested with DST's. I've got the DST data.

14 Mesa decided after DSTing both of those
15 formations that the well was uneconomic and thus it was
16 plugged.

17 Q All right, sir, let's look to the north
18 of the proposed location to the Texaco Carter Well and have
19 you describe for us generally the quality of that well in
20 all three of these pools.

21 A Yes, sir, the Texaco Carter Well was
22 drilled recently to the Strawn formation as a west offset to
23 the Casey Strawn Pool.

24 Upon completion, Texaco completed in the
25 Strawn, made 565 barrels and the well went inactive. They
could not make their production expectations and they plug-
ged back to the Drinkard formation, which has cumed only
4000 barrels of oil and was making 6 barrels of oil a day.

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

It's almost a stripper rate.

Q All right, let's go to Exhibit Number Six, Mr. Tittl, and have you describe that one for us.

A All right. Exhibit Six is mapped on the top of the Paddock formation. You can see the Paddock producers are colored in green on here.

There are a number of significant wells on here.

The Mesa Hightower, earlier described on the letter A of Section 4, is a dry hole in the Paddock.

The Mesa Meyers No. 2, location C of Section 3, just to the east of there, was also dry in the Paddock, and the Texaco Carter, another significant well, as per this request, just north of the tract was not tested in the Paddock. Log analyses indicates it to be unproductive.

I can give DST data on this Mesa Hightower or the Mesa 2 Meyers in Section 3, but it would almost suffice to say neither one indicated a productive horizon in the Paddock.

Q As a geologist, Mr. Tittl, do you have an opinion with regards to the risk factor penalty percentage that ought to be included in the forced pooling order when we're discussing the possibility of a successful commercial well in the Paddock formation?

A Yes, sir, I believe we should receive the maximum penalty of 200 percent.

Q Upon what do you base that opinion?

1
2 A Well, the fact that the three wells I
3 just mentioned, the two Mesa wells and the Texaco well, all
4 are unproductive in the Paddock formation.

5 The Mesa Petroleum Meyers Well has cumed
6 38,000 barrels from the Paddock and I believe we would re-
7 quire just a bit more oil from the Paddock to -- to meet our
8 economics on that well, so there is quite a bit of risk.

9 As you can see, we're going down dip from
10 the main Paddock production which extends from the Cox wells
11 in the north half of 33 back toward the west in the
12 Lovington Paddock Pool.

13 Q All right, sir, let me direct your
14 attention to the Drinkard Pool now and have you identify for
15 us and describe Exhibit Number Seven.

16 A All right, Exhibit Number Seven is also
17 mapped on the top of the Drinkard formation; contour
18 interval 100 feet. The Drinkard producers are outlined in
19 pink. A number of wells here also penetrated the Drinkard
20 and proved to be unproductive.

21 The two good examples again drilled to --
22 for a Drinkard test were the Mesa Hightower, Letter A,
23 Section 4, Mesa Meyers No. 2, Letter C, Section 3, and the
24 Texaco Carter, which had been plugged back to the Drinkard
25 and is proving to be uneconomic, having cumed only 4000
barrels of oil.

 The wells, the Hightower and the Mesa No.
2 again were DST tested when drilled by Mesa and were quite
tight.

1
2 I've got a DST result on the C&K No. 1
3 Shipp, which is 1980 south and west of Section 34, a real
4 good well. It's cumed 314,000 barrels of oil in the Drinkard and the DST data from that well and the cumulative production suggest that these wells were dry and there was no
5 bypass production, establishing a risk to the south and to
6 the north of our location with an unproductive oil,
7 seemingly unproductive cumulative production of the Texaco
8 Carter.

9
10 Q When you look at the Mesa Petroleum
11 Meyers No. 1 Well in the far northwest quarter of Section 3,
12 you find both a dry hole above and below the structural position of the Meyers No. 1 Well in the immediate offsets on
13 each side.

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q In terms of assessing the penalty risk
16 factor for purposes of the Drinkard production, Mr. Tittel,
17 what is your opinion?

18 A I believe the Drinkard in there results,
19 production results primarily from fractures, and the Mesa
20 No. 1 Meyers has ben completed in the Drinkard. It's only
21 making 5 barrels of oil a day and now it's cumed 7000; quite
22 uneconomic considering the depth to drill.

23 And the fractures are on the flank of
24 this structure that are on the 42 -- -4200 contour and possibly the limited production may be explained by a very
25 limited fracture system resulting in a small amount of poro-

1
2 sity in that well and a lack of it in the two offsetting dry
3 holes.

4 Q What percentage, then, concerning the
5 risk factor penalty would you recommend for the Drinkard?

6 A Again I would like to ask for the 200
7 percent penalty. Looking at our production map we see the
8 best Drinkard wells are the four wells in the eastern area
9 of Section 34; the C&K No. 2 Shipp in location M of Section
10 34 has cumed 55,000 barrels of oil and is just barely econo-
11 mic by our corporation economics.

12 Q All right, sir, let's turn your attention
13 now to the Strawn production and Exhibit Number Eight.

14 A All right. The Strawn map is again map-
15 ped on top of the Strawn. You can see most of the wells
16 weren't drilled deep enough. There is three dry holes on
17 the map, Getty Meyers, Section 33; Mesa No. 7, West Knowles,
18 location G in 34 and location P in 34, also drilled by Mesa,
19 No. 1 West Knowles.

20 Q In terms of assessing the penalty factor
21 fo the Strawn potential, Mr. Tittl, do you have an opinion
22 as to that percentage?

23 A I'd like to ask for the maximum penalty
24 in this case, also. This can be demonstrated most effec-
25 tively by looking at the cross section, the next exhibit.

Q All right, let's go to Exhibit Number
Nine.

A Okay, you can see this well goes between

1
2 the best Strawn producer in the Casey Strawn Pool, the Mesa
3 West Knowles No. 4, location B of 34. The well has cumed
4 706,000 barrels of oil, 680-million cubic feet of gas, and
5 it was making 320 barrels a day in March.

6 And you'll note the Texaco well, which
7 was drilled in '82, the other side of the cross section.

8 This is hung stratigraphically on this
9 Strawn marker at the base. You'll note the top of the
10 Strawn is interpreted as an erosion horizon up here.

11 And what I'd like to demonstrate from
12 this cross section is you see the perforations on the West
13 Knowles Unit from 11,350, approximately, down to 11,400; the
14 porosity indicated by the CNL-FDC log on here I think is
15 correlative with the porosity perforated in the Texaco Lea
16 Carter No. 1, correlating straight across.

17 This well was opened in all these zones,
18 acidized, flowed some oil, 41 barrels of oil, eventually was
19 IPed for pumping 43 barrels of oil a day, but it only cumed
20 565 barrels of oil. It appears either, which is always pos-
21 sible in a well, Texaco had a difficulty in their completion
22 attempt, or just the porosity there has either been drained
23 by the Casey Strawn Pool or the permeability is limited and
24 would only surrender 500 barrels of oil to that wellbore.

25 Q Mr. Tittl, were Exhibits Five through
Nine prepared by you?

A Yes, sir, they were.

Q In your opinion, Mr. Tittl, will approval

1
2 of this application allow TXO to have an opportunity to pro-
3 duce oil and gas that might not otherwise be produced?

4 A Yes, sir, I believe so.

5 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, we
6 move the introduction of TXO's Exhibits One through Nine.

7 MR. STOGNER: Exhibits One
8 through Nine will be admitted into evidence.

9 I have no questions of this
10 witness.

11 Are there any further questions
12 of Mr. Tittl? If not, he may be excused.

13 Mr. Kellahin, is there anything
14 further that you have in this case?

15 MR. KELLAHIN: Just the submit-
16 tal of the COPAS procedure and we'll do that, Mr. Examiner.

17 MR. STOGNER: Will that be done
18 today sometime?

19 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes.

20 MR. STOGNER: Does anybody else
21 have anything further in Case Number 8383?

22 If not, this case will be left
23 open pending the receipt of the COPAS.

24
25 (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

Michael E. Stagner
8383
84
Oil Conservation Division Examiner